

# Kentmere Academy – Pupil Premium Impact Report 2016/17



# Pupil Premium Impact Report

The Government believes that the Pupil Premium, which is additional to main school funding, is the best way to address the current underlying inequalities between children, ensuring that funding to tackle disadvantage reaches the pupils who need it most.

The Pupil Premium is allocated to schools and is clearly identifiable. It is for schools to decide how the Pupil Premium is spent, since they are best placed to assess what additional provision should be made for the individual pupils within their responsibility. The Pupil Premium is allocated to schools per Free School Meals (FSM) pupil (any pupil who has been eligible for Free School Meals during the last six years). It is also allocated to children in care (LAC or CLA), adopted children and those who have parents in the armed services.

Schools are free to spend the Pupil Premium as they see fit. However, they will be held accountable for how they have used the additional funding to support pupils. Since September 2012, schools have been required to publish online information about how they have used the Pupil Premium.

## 2016-17 Financial Year – Impact Review

**Named Governor responsible for the monitoring of Pupil Premium – Mr Simon Day**

<b>Pupil Premium Grant Summary</b>	
Number of pupils	326
Number of pupils eligible for PPG	106
PPG at £1320 per pupil	£129,320
Looked after children entitlement at £1900 per pupil	£15,200
Total PPG received	£144,560
Total PPG allocated expenditure for 2016/17	£144,725
Under/over spend in 2015/16	£165.00 overspend
<b>Internal Barriers to future attainment of PP pupils</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. High proportion of pupils with EAL giving rise to:                  poor vocabulary acquisition                  low comprehension / inference and deduction skills</li> <li>2. Retention of previous learning in maths and English</li> <li>3. Ability to reason and explain connections in number</li> <li>4. Ability to apply writing conventions consistently</li> <li>5. Behavioural issues linked to individual circumstances</li> </ol>	
<b>External Barriers to future attainment of PP pupils</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Attendance – PA for PP children last year was 0.34% compared to 2.41% of all pupils. Tracking is termly and actions to tackle PA are in place. It is monitored termly by the school's attendance officer with written reports to SLT</li> <li>7. Limited access to good language role models in the home environment</li> <li>8. Narrow life experiences outside of school</li> <li>9. Low parental aspirations</li> <li>10. High mobility rates</li> <li>11. High levels of deprivation</li> <li>12. Parenting skills / Difficult home circumstances that can impact children's daily life in school</li> </ol>	

Desired outcomes	Success Criteria
PP children will continue to attain in-line or better than their non-PP peers	In line with whole school targets, at least 85% of PP children will be at age-related expectations or above at the end of the year. 30% will be above age-related expectations. This will be closely monitored through termly PP data reports to SLT and at half termly Pupil Progress meetings.
To accelerate the progress of all PP children	Assessment data will show that 100% of PP children make good or better progress (6 steps or more). This will be closely monitored through termly PP data reports to SLT and at half termly Pupil Progress meetings.

**Our Pupil Premium allocation amounts to: £144,560 and is based on 106 children**

Objective	Project	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice	Cost	Impact
<p>To ensure high quality support for vulnerable children.</p> <p><b>Internal barriers 1, 2, 3 and 4</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Additional TA support in classes.</li> </ul>	<p>OFSTED recommendations on PP spending 2012</p> <p>Children respond well to additional support and this has been successful in the past in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• supporting inclusion</li> <li>• accelerating progress.</li> </ul>	<p>£18, 983 (TA3) £18, 983 (TA3) £9492 (TA / pm)</p>	<p>The provision of additional TA support has enabled the provision of quality first teaching and high quality interventions across the school eg Year 5 and 6 Morning Maths Boosters to improve speed and accuracy in arithmetic and Reading Boosters focussed on inference, deduction and use of language: both interventions successfully addressing barriers to future attainment 1,2 and 3.</p> <p>As a result, school data shows the excellent progress of pupil premium pupils. The following figures represent the percentage of PP pupils making good or outstanding progress:</p>

Objective	Project	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice	Cost	Impact
				<p><b>Maths</b>  Nursery – 100%  Reception - 100%  Year 1 – 100%  Year 2 – 100%  Year 3 – 96%  Year 4 – 100%  Year 5 – 92%  Year 6 – 96%</p> <p><b>Reading</b>  Nursery – 67% (2/3 children)  Reception – 100%  Year 1 – 100%  Year 2 – 100%  Year 3 – 88% (21/24)  Year 4 – 100%  Year 5 – 88% (21/24)  Year 6 – 100%</p> <p><b>Writing</b>  Nursery – 67% - 2/3 children  Reception – 100%  Year 1 – 100%  Year 2 - 100%  Year 3 – 96%  Year 4 – 100%  Year 5 – 88% (21/24)  Year 6 – 100%</p>

Objective	Project	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice	Cost	Impact
				<p>Across the whole school, Pupil Premium children attain broadly in line with their non-Pupil Premium peers. The following figures show the percentage of children at ARE at the end of Summer 2016</p> <p><b>Maths</b> PP – 73% non-PP – 71%</p> <p><b>Reading</b> PP – 72% non-PP – 70%</p> <p><b>Writing</b> PP - 73.6% non-PP – 75.6%</p>
<p>To provide small group, tailor made support, to close the gaps in children's spelling knowledge.</p> <p><b>Internal barriers 2 and 4</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Targeted support and intervention to raise attainment in spelling / writing</li> </ul>	<p>Outcomes of pupil progress meetings / moderation Raising attainment in spelling is a key objective of the 2016/17 School Development Plan. Small group intervention work has had impact in previous years. Research from Education Endowment Foundation supports this approach.</p>	<p>£9,492 TA3 (pm)</p>	<p>In the vast majority of year groups, attainment in writing is good and PP children attain broadly in line with or above the year group average</p> <p>All <b>Reception</b> - <b>76%</b> at and above ARE, <b>90% of PP</b> at and above</p> <p>All <b>Year 1</b> - <b>72%</b> at and above ARE, <b>68% of PP</b> at and above</p> <p>All <b>Year 2</b> - <b>78%</b> at and above ARE, <b>60% of PP</b> at and above (however the high percentage of PP who are also SEND has a significant impact – with <b>SEND factor removed, 100% are at and above ARE</b>)</p> <p>All <b>Year 3</b> - <b>73%</b> at and above ARE <b>75% of PP</b> at and above</p> <p><b>Year 4</b> - <b>70%</b> at and above ARE, <b>62% of PP</b> (however the high percentage of PP who are also SEND has a significant impact – with <b>SEND factor removed, 80%</b> are at and above ARE)</p> <p>All <b>Year 5</b> - <b>60%</b> at and above ARE, <b>63% of PP</b> at and above</p>

Objective	Project	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice	Cost	Impact
				<b>All Year 6 - 86%</b> at and above ARE, <b>85% of PP</b> at and above
<p>To provide additional support for targeted children</p> <p><b>Internal barriers 1, 2, 3 and 4</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Before school boosters in maths and reading and Lunchtime Booster Sessions in KS1 Phonics</li> </ul>	<p>Tracking and monitoring of small group interventions have proved that the provision of targeted interventions has a high level of impact on the attainment and progress of the children involved. Research from Education Endowment Foundation supports this approach.</p>	<p>£2,373 x2 (TA3)</p>	<p>Additional Booster sessions aimed at Years 2 and 6 made a considerable contribution to the end of key stage results for PP children:</p> <p>Year 6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reading – school disadvantaged 67% at ARE which is broadly in line with all pupils nationally at 71%</li> <li>Writing - school disadvantaged 85% at ARE which is above all pupils nationally at 76%</li> <li>Maths - school disadvantaged 85% at ARE which is above all pupils nationally at 75%</li> </ul> <p>Year 2 (comparisons are with last year's data for all pupils nationally as this year's figures are not currently available)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reading - school disadvantaged 73% at ARE which is broadly in line with all pupils nationally at last year's figure of 74%</li> <li>Writing - school disadvantaged 60% at ARE which is broadly in line with all pupils nationally at last year's figure of 66%</li> <li>Maths - school disadvantaged 60% at ARE which is just below all pupils nationally at last year's figure of 73%</li> </ul> <p>Phonics Boosters significantly raised attainment in the Year 1 Screening Test, which 91% of pupils passed.</p>
<p>To ensure that all children feel safe at all times of the day providing relevant small</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lunchtime intervention and support- Invitation</li> </ul>	<p>We aim to meet the social and emotional needs of the children at all times. The impact of Invitation Club, last year, in terms of</p>	<p>£2,373 x2 (TA3)</p>	<p>Invitation Club has helped to meet the social and emotional needs of targeted children at lunch times</p> <p>Whole school behaviour reports show that the children who attend Invitation Club all prove to have a much</p>

Objective	Project	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice	Cost	Impact
<p>group or 1:1 support.</p> <p><b>Internal barrier 5</b> <b>External barrier 12</b></p>	club	lowering the figures for pupil behaviour at lunchtimes and the subsequent impact of minimising the disruption of afternoon lessons, was such that this project is to be continued.		<p>more settled time in class in the afternoon and referrals to the Consequence Room decreased for these children.</p> <p>In recent surveys, 97% of pupils agreed that they feel safe and secure in school. 98% say that playtimes and lunchtimes are well organised. 92% of parents say the school deals effectively with any unacceptable behaviour</p>
<p>To ensure high quality provision outside of the school day, supporting healthy life choices and encouraging extra-curricular activities, social interaction and developing skills.</p> <p><b>External barriers 8, 11, 12</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Before / after school programme, with vulnerable children given priority</li> </ul>	Tackling the issue of improving children's health and wellbeing is a nationwide initiative that must be addressed by schools and our most vulnerable children should be given access to this in order to minimise potential barriers to it in their home situations.	£51,318 teacher/TA support	<p>Attendance at extra-curricular activities has increased – across the school - 47% of children attended one or more clubs compared with 37% in 2015-16</p> <p>Clubs that are run by external agencies are observed to ensure high standards of behaviour and enjoyment</p> <p>Clubs are analysed half termly for attendance: the PE leader maintains records to ensure PP and PP+ children are well represented at these clubs. She also ensures that those clubs that are not well attended are changed</p> <p>In a recent pupil survey, 88% of pupils agreed that Kentmere has a good range of extra-curricular activities.</p>
<p>To ensure the highest of standards in appearance can be maintained.</p> <p><b>External barrier 11</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PE kits, Uniform</li> </ul>	<p>Many children, including our most vulnerable, do not always have the means to provide appropriate uniform.</p> <p>We believe a pride in our appearance underpins the foundations for good</p>	£200	<p>100% of children wear uniform; children are encouraged to take pride in their appearance to reflect a pride in their school.</p> <p>In a recent pupil survey, this pride was reflected by the 99% of children who think Kentmere is a good school and the 94% of parents who are sufficiently impressed with the school to recommend it to a friend.</p>

Objective	Project	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice	Cost	Impact
		behaviour and ensuing academic success.		
<p>To provide breakfast and before school provision for children to ensure all children begin school with sufficient food.</p> <p><b>External barriers 11 and 12</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Breakfast club provision (every day)</li> </ul>	<p>The context of the school is such that many parents / carers, including CAF / ChIN / LAC children are in need of support to provide for their basic needs. Parents should be offered access to breakfast club and its provision of a free meal in order to make the best possible start to the children's' day at school.</p>	<p>£4,746 (TA3 support x2) £1102 (TA 1 support) Kitchen staff x2 (£2204)</p>	<p>206 children were registered for the club with priority invitations to CAF / ChIN / LAC children and other parents in need of support. On average 110 attend daily. Children who attend morning booster provision are also permitted to attend Breakfast Club and this has help attendance at these interventions.</p>
<p>To provide sensory support for vulnerable children</p> <p><b>Internal barrier 5</b> <b>External barrier 12</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rainbow Room / Sensory Snack Boxes</li> </ul>	<p>We aim to provide those children who need help to maintain appropriate behaviour, with means of self-regulation and support to manage and understand their feelings. This project successfully achieves these aims whilst also having a positive impact on classroom based behavioural incidents, which subsequently minimises disruption to lessons.</p>	<p>£1000</p>	<p>Use of Sensory Snack boxes within class and the opportunity for vulnerable children to request the use of the Rainbow Room has provided them with a means of self-regulation, thus preventing issues escalating within a class and minimising interruptions for other pupils.</p> <p>Whole school data shows a term on term decrease on the number of behaviour incidents that are classroom based.</p> <p>In a recent survey 97% of children said that they are well supported in terms of managing their feelings.</p>

Objective	Project	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice	Cost	Impact
<p>To provide musical opportunities for vulnerable children.</p> <p><b>External barriers 8, 9, 11</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brass Band lessons and instrument hire</li> </ul>	<p>Due to financial constraints, many children may not learn to play an instrument. In providing free music tuition and the performance experiences that go with it, we aim to help widen pupils' life experiences and raise their aspirations.</p>	<p>£1000</p>	<p>Free brass and drum lessons open to all of KS2 children.</p> <p>Opportunities to play at Rochdale Music Festival, school Christmas and Summer Fairs</p>
<p>To provide a variety of support and input from specialist Speech and Language Therapist.</p> <p><b>External barrier 7</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specialist Speech and Language Therapy Provision- 1 speech and language therapist (1 day a week) 1 speech and language therapy assistant (every afternoon)</li> </ul>	<p>High proportions of EAL, a lack of good language role-models in the home environment and other barriers to parents taking the initiative in tackling speech and language issues mean it is important that the school makes provision for this.</p>	<p>Speech and language therapist - 12 visits at £225 (£2,475) and £9492 TA3 (pm)</p>	<p>Targeted children have made at least good progress across all subjects.</p>
	<b>Total</b>		<b>£144,725</b>	

## Impact Data

**NB – this is data from 2015-16. Tables will be up-dated with this year's figures when Raise Online is published.**

### KS1 Impact Data

#### Diminishing the Gap – Key Messages

At the end of Reception 76% of disadvantaged pupils achieved the GLD compared with 69% of all pupils nationally

At the end of KS1, RAISE Online data shows the attainment of Pupil Premium children at Kentmere is broadly in line with that of all pupils nationally and all non-disadvantaged pupils nationally, (see Tables 1 and 2)

In-school data shows the percentage of PP children at and above age related expectations is broadly in line with their PP peers (see Table 3)

Year 1 Phonics - 100% of disadvantaged pupils reached the expected standard compared to 86% of all pupils nationally – a difference of +14%

75% of disadvantaged pupils were below age related expectations when they entered EYFS, therefore the attainment figures in the tables below indicate that the allocation of PP spending in relation to these pupils and their education is highly effective.

**Table 1 shows the percentage of disadvantaged pupils in school who are at and above ARE compared with all pupils nationally.**

Subject	At ARE			Above ARE		
	All National	School	% difference	National	School	% difference
Reading	74%	81%	+7%	24%	19%	-5%
Writing	65%	69%	+4%	13%	6%	-7%
Maths	73%	81%	+8%	18%	6%	-12%

**Table 2 shows the percentage of disadvantaged pupils in school who are at and above ARE compared with all non-disadvantaged pupils nationally.**

Subject	At ARE			Above ARE		
	National	School	% difference	National	School	% difference
Reading	78%	81%	+3%	27%	19%	-8%
Writing	70%	69%	-1%	16%	6%	-10%
Maths	77%	81%	+4%	20%	6%	-14%

**Table 3 shows a comparison between the attainment of KS1 PP and non-PP pupils within school**

Key Stage 1	PP At ARE	PP At and above ARE	non-PP At ARE	non-PP At and above ARE
Reading	56.3%	81.3%	42.9%	82.1%
Writing	52.9%	68.8%	39.3%	67.9%
Maths	70.6%	81.3%	60.7%	82.1%

## KS2 Impact Data

### Diminishing the Gap – Key Messages

RAISE Online data from 2013 – 2015, based on APS, shows an improving trend in terms of diminishing the gap between the attainment of disadvantaged children at Kentmere at the end of KS2, compared to the national average (see Table 1)

This trend has continued and the percentage gap in attainment between our disadvantaged pupils and all pupils nationally has significantly diminished (see Table 2); this is also the case when disadvantaged pupils at Kentmere are compared with all non-disadvantaged pupils, nationally (see Table 3)

In-school data shows that the percentage of disadvantaged pupils at and above age related expectations is higher than that of their non-disadvantaged peers, across all three subjects (see table 4)

A higher percentage of our disadvantaged pupils made expected or better progress than the percentage of all pupils nationally (Table 5) and all non-disadvantaged pupils, nationally (Table 6)

Within school a higher percentage of disadvantaged pupils made expected progress than non-disadvantaged in reading, writing and maths. This was also the case for the percentage of disadvantaged pupils who achieved more than expected progress in reading and writing. In maths the percentage of children who made more than expected progress was broadly in line with that of non-disadvantaged. These figures put our disadvantaged children significantly above all pupils nationally for progress in maths and reading (in the top 10% of the country) and in line with the progress of all pupils nationally for writing (see table 5).

Across the whole school the progress of disadvantaged pupils is broadly in-line with that of non-disadvantaged (see Table 8)

Most of the Year 6 2015-16 cohort entered KS1 at the emerging stage of GLD, therefore the end of KS2 progress and attainment figures below indicate that the allocation of PP spending in relation to these pupils and their education is highly effective.

Table 1 shows the difference in attainment between disadvantaged pupils in school who are at and above ARE compared with all pupils nationally (measured in APS until 2015).

	2013	2014	2015
	Difference between school PP and all pupils nationally	Difference between school PP and all pupils nationally	Difference between school PP and all pupils nationally
Mathematics	-3.5	-4.2	-1.1
Reading	-3.6	-3.4	-0.6
Writing	-3.4	-3.7	-1.0
Grammar/Punctuation/Spelling	-3.9	-4.5	-2.9

Table 2 shows the percentage of disadvantaged pupils in school who are at and above ARE compared with all pupils nationally in 2016

Subject	At ARE - 2016			Above ARE - 2016		
	All National	School	% Difference	National	School	% Difference
Reading	66%	93%	+27%	19%	63%	+44%
Writing	74%	93%	+19%	15%	27%	+12%
Maths	70%	93%	+23%	17%	37%	+20%
Maths, Reading and Writing combined	53%	93%	+40%	5%	7%	+2%
English Grammar, Punctuation & Spelling	72%	93%	+21%	22%	50%	+28%

**Table 3 shows the percentage of disadvantaged pupils in school who are at and above ARE compared with non-disadvantaged pupils nationally in 2016**

Subject	At ARE - 2016			Above ARE - 2016		
	National	School	% Difference	National	School	% Difference
Reading	71%	93%	+22%	23%	63%	+40%
Writing	79%	93%	+14%	18%	27%	+9%
Maths	75%	93%	+18%	20%	37%	+17%
Maths, Reading and Writing combined	60%	93%	+33%	7%	7%	0%
English Grammar, Punctuation & Spelling	78%	93%	+15%	27%	50%	+23%

**Table 4 shows a comparison of attainment at the end of KS2 between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils, within school**

Key Stage 2	disadvantaged at ARE	Disadvantaged at and above ARE	Non-disadvantaged at ARE	Non-disadvantaged at and above ARE
Reading	60.7%	92.9%	80.0%	86.7%
Writing	64.3%	92.9%	80.0%	86.7%
Maths	53.6%	92.9%	60.0%	86.7%

**Table 5 - shows the % of disadvantaged pupils and non-disadvantaged pupils who made expected and more than expected progress in Reading, Writing and Maths from the end of KS1 to the end of KS2; these are then compared to the figures for ALL pupils, nationally.**

	Expected Progress				More Than Expected Progress			
	School - % of PP pupils achieving Expected Progress	School - % of Non-PP achieving Expected Progress	National - % of ALL pupils achieving Expected Progress	% difference between school PP and All children nationally	School - % of PP achieving More Than Expected Progress	School - % of Non-PP achieving More Than Expected Progress	National - % of ALL pupils achieving More Than Expected Progress	% difference between school PP and All children nationally
Reading	93%	85%	66%	+27%	63%	15%	19%	+44%
Writing	93%	85%	74%	+19%	27%	8%	15%	+12%
Maths	93%	85%	70%	+23%	37%	38%	17%	+20%

**Table 6 - shows the scaled scores of disadvantaged pupils and non-disadvantaged pupils in relation to making expected or better progress in Reading, Writing and Maths from the end of KS1 to the end of KS2; these are then compared to the figures for ALL non-disadvantaged pupils, nationally.**

Expected or Better Progress (scaled score)					
	Progress of school disadvantaged pupils	Progress of ALL pupils, nationally	Progress of all non-disadvantaged pupils, nationally	Difference between school disadvantaged and all pupils, nationally	Difference between school disadvantaged and all non-disadvantaged pupils, nationally
Reading	6.83	5.80	3.08	+1.03	+3.75
Writing	1.93	1.67	0.98	+0.26	+0.95
Maths	4.70	4.35	3.42	+0.35	+1.28

**Table 7 - End of KS2 Progress Data**

Based on the above information, this table shows the percentile distribution of progress scores across the 3 subjects at the end of KS2

<b>Reading</b>	<b>Writing</b>	<b>Maths</b>
<b>Top 10%</b>	<b>In-line with national</b>	<b>Top 10%</b>

**Table 8 - An overview of the progress of disadvantaged pupils compared with non-disadvantaged across the school 2015-16**

<b>Whole school</b>	<b>Percentage of children making good and outstanding progress, across the school</b>	
	<b>Disadvantaged</b>	<b>Non-disadvantaged</b>
<b>Reading</b>	<b>135 (96.4%)</b>	<b>173 (96.1%)</b>
<b>Writing</b>	<b>134 (95.7%)</b>	<b>171 (95.0%)</b>
<b>Maths</b>	<b>136 (97.1%)</b>	<b>174 (96.6%)</b>