

# White Court School



## Impact of Pupil Premium 2015-2016

## Impact of Pupil Premium

2015-2016

Pupil Premium 2015/2016	
Number of pupils eligible	65 October, 67 End of year
Amount received per pupil	Service - £300 Looked After - £1,900 FSM - £1,300
Total Pupil Premium Grant received	£86,125

In the academic year 2015 – 2016, the focus of PPG spending was based on six key outcomes, aimed ultimately, to accelerate the progress in Literacy and Maths of PP children.

### Key Outcomes:

- **Well-being support**  
To support children to develop their emotional well-being in order to become ready to learn.
- **Targeted support**  
Small group and one to one sessions aimed at closing the gap based on particular needs of children.
- **Enriching the curriculum**  
To provide a range of opportunities for all children, regardless of their background.  
To develop the children's environment into a rich learning environment.
- **Staff training**  
To raise the profile of PP amongst staff.  
To develop the High Quality teaching of staff.
- **Extending school support**  
To offer support for the disadvantaged children in receipt of Pupil Premium funding.
- **Parental engagement**  
To raise the profile of PP amongst parents and carers.  
To develop the skills of parents and carers in order to support their children.

## Steps Progress and Age Related Expectations in academic year 2015 – 2016:

Progress of PP pupils is above the cohort	Progress of PP pupils is equal to the cohort
---	--

### Year 1:

Steps Progress Autumn 1 – Summer 2	Reading	Writing	Maths
Cohort – 87	6.4	6.3	6.3
Non PP – 78	6.4	6.3	6.3
PP - 9	6.7	6.4	6.4
PP (non SEN) - 7	6.4	6.6	6.6

At or above Age Related Expectations	Reading	Writing	Maths
Non-PP	83%	80%	83%
PP	89%	89%	89%

In Year 1, the PP group made more progress than the Non-PP group. All year 1 PP children passed the Phonics Screening. 89% of the PP group made Age Related Expectation by the end of the Year. The child who did not make A.R.E. is monitored for poor attendance, which is a barrier to their learning.

### Year 2:

Steps Progress Autumn 1 – Summer 2	Reading	Writing	Maths
Cohort - 86	5.0	5.0	5.3
Non PP - 77	5.1	4.9	5.4
PP - 9	4.4	5.6	4.8
PP (non SEN) - 7	5.0	5.7	5.0

At or above Age Related Expectations	Reading	Writing	Maths
Non-PP	79%	69%	81%
PP	67%	67%	33%

The amount of progress made in Year 2 by the PP group exceeded the rest of the cohort in Writing, was equal to the cohort in Reading, but was slightly below for Maths. However, due to their lower starting point, the number of PP children achieving A.R.E. was less than the Non-PP children. Writing had the smallest difference at -2%, Reading was -12%, but Maths was -48%. Of the children who did not achieve A.R.E. for Maths (6), 2 are on the SEN register. Next year, Prime Time will continue to focus on acceleration in Maths, as this is a weak area for this particular PP cohort. During the year 2015 -2016, the main Prime Time focus in Year 2 was emotional support for many of the children. Until this need was met, closing the Literacy and Numeracy gap is difficult, as the particular children are not ready to learn. One of the PP group joined the school in November.

Year 3:

Steps Progress Autumn 1 – Summer 2	Reading	Writing	Maths
Cohort - 90	5.3	4.8	5.1
Non PP – 82	5.3	4.7	5.0
PP - 6	5.2	5.7	7.0
PP (non SEN) - 3	5.7	5.7	7.3

At or above Age Related Expectations	Reading	Writing	Maths
Non-PP	78%	69%	81%
PP	50%	17%	33%

In Year 3, the number of children who achieved A.R.E. was significantly below the Non-PP children. However, all of the Non-SEN PP children made more progress than the cohort, and the whole PP group made more progress in Writing and Maths. The progress made in Maths was significantly higher by all PP children compared to the rest of the cohort. The starting points of the children who did not reach A.R.E. were all below A.R.E. when they were in Year 1, for some it was p levels. Accelerated progress was made by PP cohort in Maths and Writing, and for Non-SEN PP in Reading (PP SEN was very close -0.1) if this continues, number of children achieving A.R.E. will continue to close in the future.

Year 4:

Steps Progress Autumn 1 – Summer 2	Reading	Writing	Maths
Cohort – 90	3.8	5.1	4.6
Non PP – 79	3.9	5.2	4.5
PP - 11	3.3	4.6	4.7
PP (non SEN) - 9	4.0	5.4	5.3

At or above Age Related Expectations	Reading	Writing	Maths
Non-PP	66%	71%	67%
PP	40%	30%	70%

In Year 4, the non-SEN PP group made more progress than the non-PP group, making impact upon closing their attainment gaps. In Maths, more PP children achieved A.R.E. compared to the rest of the cohort. However, in Reading and Writing, the number of PP children achieving A.R.E. was significantly lower compared to the non-PP cohort. As a result, actions have been put in place to ensure a greater number of the PP children achieve A.R.E. in the next academic year.

Year 5:

Steps Progress Autumn 1 – Summer 2	Reading	Writing	Maths
Cohort - 83	5.0	5.8	5.4
Non PP - 73	5.0	5.8	5.3
PP - 10	5.1	5.6	5.7
PP (non SEN) - 7	5.3	5.9	5.4

At or above Age Related Expectations	Reading	Writing	Maths
Non-PP	82%	78%	81%
PP	70%	70%	70%

In Year 5, PP children made exceeded progress compared to the rest of the cohort in Reading and Maths. The Non-SEN PP group also made more progress in Writing. The A.R.E. of the PP children was below the non-PP cohort, but not significantly (1 child).

Year 6:

Steps Progress Autumn 1 – Summer 2	Reading	Writing	Maths
Cohort - 84	4.1	4.6	4.6
Non PP - 73	4.1	4.6	4.4
PP - 11	4.4	4.8	5.9
PP (non SEN) - 9	4.4	4.9	5.4

At or above Age Related Expectations	Reading	Writing	Maths
Non-PP	86%	85%	85%
PP	64%	55%	73%

In Year 6, the PP and SEN PP children made more progress than the Non-PP cohort in all subjects. The A.R.E. of the PP children was below the non-PP cohort. The greatest difference was in Writing.

EYFS:

1 child entered EYFS working at ARE. 2 children were below ARE.

For PP children the lowest area was PSE (For non-PP it was writing and number).

66.7 % of PP children made 6+ points of progress (100% of non-SEN PP children made 6+ points of progress). This was compared to 83.8% of non-PP children.

## End of Year Data

### Year 1 Phonics Screening:

Phonics Screening	Cohort working at ARE	Pupil Premium working at ARE	Non PP working at ARE
		93%	100%

### End of Key Stage 1 SATs:

At or above required standard	All	Non-Pupil Premium	Pupil Premium	Difference to Non-PP cohort	Pupil Premium not SEN	Difference to Non-PP cohort
Reading	80%	82%	67%	-15%	86%	+4%
Writing	70%	70%	67%	-3%	86%	+16%
Maths	78%	83%	33%	-50%	43%	-40%

As reflected in the Year 2 Teacher Assessments, Maths was the area with the biggest difference between the PP and Non-PP cohorts. For the PP children who are not SEN, there was a positive difference compared to their cohort in Reading and Writing. There was a negative difference between the PP cohort including SEN and the rest of the cohort. In writing this was 3%, but for Reading it was a larger 15%.

### End of Key Stage 2 SATs:

At or above required standard	National Average	All	Non-Pupil Premium	Pupil Premium	Difference to Non-PP cohort	Difference to National Average	Pupil Premium not SEN	Difference to Non-PP cohort
Reading	66%	83%	88%	55%	-33%	-11%	67%	-21%
Maths	70%	86%	88%	73%	-15%	+3%	89%	+1%
G.P.S.	72%	88%	92%	64%	-28%	-8%	78%	-14%
Combined	53%	73%	77%	46%	-31%	-7%	56%	-21%

The end of Key Stage 2 SATs data shows that the PP cohort did not perform as well as the Non-PP cohort. However, this gap is a lot smaller when compared to the National Average. When taking into consideration the SEN pupils, this also closes the gap. The gap is smallest in Maths, which is actually 3% above the National Average. The largest gap is Reading, with -33%, although compared to the National average, this is only -11%.

### End of Key Stage 2 Teacher Assessments:

At or above A.R.E.	All	Non-Pupil Premium	Pupil Premium	Difference to Non-PP cohort	Pupil Premium not SEN	Difference to Non-PP cohort
Reading	83%	86%	64%	-22%	78%	-8%
Maths	83%	85%	73%	-12%	89%	+4%
Writing	81%	85%	55%	-30%	67%	-18%
Science	91%	92%	82%	-10%	89%	-3%

The Teacher Assessments for the end of Key Stage 2, follow similar trends to the SATs results. The gap for Maths is the smallest, with Reading and Writing larger. However, when SEN children are considered, this gap reduces more for Reading than Writing.

