

Pupil premium strategy statement (primary)

1. Summary information					
School	St Agnes CofE Primary School				
Academic Year	2017-18	Total PP budget	177560	Date of most recent PP Review	July 2017
Total number of pupils	475	Number of pupils eligible for PP	133	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Dec 2017

2. Current attainment		
	<i>Pupils eligible for PP (your school)</i>	<i>Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)</i>
% achieving in reading, writing and maths	43%	61% *
% making progress in reading	89.3%	71%**
% making progress in writing	100%	76/79%**
% making progress in maths	92.9%	71/75%**

*Cornerstones; **ASP confirmation

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP, including high ability)	
In-school barriers <i>(issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills)</i>	
A.	Language acquisition at the higher level required by the 2014 curriculum is constrained by proportions of EAL pupils (87%) ***
B.	Paucity of experience resulting in limited response and understanding to wide range of subjects and topics
C.	Nursery and new reception children not school ready on entry; physically as well as academically
External barriers <i>(issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)</i>	
D.	Limited availability of time after school and lack of a high level of support available for homework and enrichment activities

4. Desired outcomes		
	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>
A.	Improved individual attainment across all 3 areas and combined	Attainment gap to be diminished compared with non-disadvantaged pupils
B.	Greater participation in wider range of lessons demonstrating resilience and independent learning	Active participation and engagement in pupil learning, utilising the opportunities and experiences provided

*** SIMS confirmation

5. Planned expenditure					
Academic year	2017-18				
The three headings below enable schools to demonstrate how they are using the pupil premium to improve classroom pedagogy, provide targeted support and support whole school strategies.					
i. Quality of teaching for all					
Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
Improved individual attainment across all 3 areas and combined	Personal target setting across 3 areas with dedicated PP teacher	Range of ability means the challenge is different for each pupil and therefore requires a quality and highly individualised approach to acquire greater depth and mastery. This is confirmed by the success seen in previous years in adopting this approach.	PP teachers teach and assess rigorously with all targets recorded along with next steps. The inclusion manager leads and monitors PP teacher performance to ensure a high standard is maintained and delivered.	4 PP teachers Inclusion manager SU	Dec 17
	Provision of pre-school and after school tuition, 1 to 1/2	To maximise learning experiences, which pupils otherwise do not have after school, ensuring the provision of equality of opportunity	PP teachers teach and assess rigorously with all targets recorded along with next steps. The inclusion manager leads and monitors PP teacher performance to ensure a high standard is maintained and delivered.	4 PP teachers Inclusion manager SU	Dec 17
Total budgeted cost					140,000
ii. Targeted support					
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
Confidence in sharing own voice and opinions with others in all lessons and social situations	Music Therapy	Opportunity for PP with more complex needs to build resilience and independence. This is confirmed by the success seen in previously in adopting this approach, particularly as a long term process, for individual pupils with complex needs, who have struggled with their self-esteem, confidence and social skills – which is much needed to succeed academically.	High quality specialist teaching and assessment from One Education	Vic Kayee SL	Dec 17
Total budgeted cost					10,000
iii. Other approaches					
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?

Participation in greater range of stimulating creative and social activities	Learning Lounge after school provision	Opportunity to develop all round skills which can then be employed in all areas of the curriculum and school life	PP teachers supervise own pupils for range of activities and link to targets where possible	PP teachers SU	Dec 17
Greater participation in wider range of lessons demonstrating resilience and independent learning	Provision of services which enrich the curriculum through a variety of approaches and mediums including educational visits, external professional visitors, subscriptions to resources, events and programs	Pupils are exposed to a greater degree and breadth of experiential challenges, which they would otherwise not have access to. This provision engages pupils with a greater level of independent learning, having experienced resilience building skills through enriching experiences.^	Effective planning and provision from accredited sources and previously successful endeavours. Timetabled and planned in to the school calendar.	Inclusion manager SBM SU	July 2018
Total budgeted cost					26,572 (includes underspend from previous year of £1572)

^Positively MAD experience; Waddow Hall residential

6. Review of expenditure				
Previous Academic Year		2016-17		
i. Quality of teaching for all				
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost
Diminish difference between disad and national non-dis by 10%	Personal target setting across 3 areas with dedicated PP teacher	<i>Range of ability means the challenge is different for all pupils in acquiring greater depth and mastery</i> - on attainment success criteria was not met, however on progress the difference was exceptionally diminished	Review provision methodologies in Early Years and KS1 – as the needs differ from KS2 – and require a distinctive approach.	174, 428
ii. Targeted support				
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost
Confidence in sharing own voice and opinions with others in all lessons and social situations	Music Therapy	<i>Opportunity for PP with more complex needs to build resilience and independence</i> - Criteria was confidently met with pupils demonstrating, in a range of situations and contexts, an increase in confidence, verbal fluency and shining in self-esteem.	Approach to be continue. Changes to approach would allow for more opportunities earlier on in the academic year to recognise and celebrate successes as opposed to the end of the year.	5, 100
iii. Other approaches				
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost

Participation in greater range of stimulating creative and social activities	Learning Lounge after school provision	<i>Opportunity to develop all round skills which can then be employed in all areas of the curriculum and school life - success criteria met with pupils attending and responding well to the provision. Skills developed are used well in pupil learning.</i>	Continue with provision and extend variety of experiences.	678
Confident use of IT to support research and homework	Ipad/laptop availability	<i>Access to IT that may not be available at home in a supervised environment - not to be continued due to technological limitations and constraints restricting access. Security and potential internet safety concerns reduced effectiveness of the approach.</i>	Not to be continued with iPads. Provision of IT resources such as laptops will be done where risks are minimised such as the ICT suite.	0 Ipad purchases included in the ICT budget.

7. Additional detail

In this section you can annex or refer to **additional** information which you have used to inform the statement above.

**Cornerstones;*

***ASP confirmation*

**** SIMS confirmation*

^Positively MAD experience; Waddow Hall residential

Appendix 1

Attainment and progress analysis by year group 2016-17 – Pupil premium and non-pupil premium

Appendix 1

Attainment and progress analysis by year group 2016-17

Disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils

Nursery Reading

Year	Filter	Attainment								Progress					
		16-26 months		22-36months		30-50months		40-60months		Less than		Expected		Greater than	
N	All 45	0	0%	3	7%	40	89%	3	7%	9	20%	9	20%	27	60%
	FSM 6	0	0%	0	0%	6	100%	0	0%	1	17%	1	17%	4	67%
	XFSM 39	0	0%	3	8%	32	82%	3	8%	8	21%	9	23%	23	59%
	PP 7	0	0%	0	0%	7	100%	0	0%	1	14%	0	0%	6	86%
	XPP 38	0	0%	5	13%	25	67%	3	8%	8	21%	9	23%	22	58%
FSM attainment is below ARE with most children working within the age related phase below in all groups. Progress is higher for both PP and FSM children with both groups of children having more children making accelerated progress 67% compared to 59% (FSM) and 86% compared to 58%. Continued rate of progress in this area should see the gaps diminished in all groups and more children reaching the ARE in Reading. Average rate of progress across the year for SEN children was 6.5 with 67% of this group achieving accelerated progress, no children in this group are FSM or PP.															

Nursery Writing

Year	Filter	Attainment								Progress					
		16-26 months		22-36months		30-50months		40-60months		Less than		Expected		Greater than	
N	All 45	0	0%	7	16%	35	78%	2	4%	5	11%	18	40%	22	49%
	FSM 6	0	0%	0	0%	6	100%	0	0%	1	17%	2	33%	3	50%
	XFSM 39	0	0%	7	18%	30	77%	2	5%	4	10%	16	41%	19	48%
	PP 7	0	0%	0	0%	7	100%	0	0%	1	14%	2	29%	4	57%
	XPP 38	0	0%	7	18%	29	76%	2	5%	4	10%	16	42%	18	47%
Baseline data was exceptionally low in this area as 40 (89%) children in the cohort were EAL and took a little longer than usual to settle. As in Reading, FSM attainment is below ARE with most children working within the age related phase below, in all groups, at the end of the academic year. However, XFSM and XPP achievement shown at least two children in each group achieving ARE. Again, progress is higher for both PP and FSM children with both groups of children having more children making accelerated progress 50% compared to 48% (FSM) and 57% compared to 47%(PP). Although, the															

differential between the FSM and XFSM is smaller (-2%). Continued rate of progress in this area should see the gaps diminished in all groups and more children reaching the ARE in Writing. Average rate of progress across the year for SEN children was 3 with 43% of this group achieving accelerated progress, again no children in this group are FSM or PP.

Nursery Number

Year	Filter	Attainment								Progress					
		16-26 months		22-36months		30-50months		40-60months		Less than		Expected		Greater than	
N	All 45	1	2%	12	27%	26	58%	6	13%	3	7%	10	22%	32	71%
	FSM 6	0	0%	0	0%	6	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	5	83%
	XFSM 39	1	3%	12	31%	20	51%	6	15%	3	8%	9	23%	27	69%
	PP 7	0	0%	0	0%	7	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1	14%	6	86%
	XPP 38	1	3%	12	32%	19	50%	6	16%	3	8%	9	24%	26	68%

Only 6 children out of the cohort meeting ARE in this area of learning. However, 71% of this cohort did make accelerated progress when data was compared from on entry. Out of all groups XPP children were higher but the differential between all was only 1% or 2% so is hardly comparable. PP and FSM children have 100% of their children working within the 30-50 age phase which is one below. XPP and XFSM have been less successful with only 51%(FSM) or 50%(XFSM) children in this age phase. Progress for both XPP(68%) and XFSM(69%) is significantly lower when compared to FSM(83%) or PP(86%) children with a differential of 14% and 18%. Diminishing the difference should be a focus for the Reception staff, securing basic number in 30-50 months.

Reception Reading

Year	Filter	Attainment								Progress					
		40-60months S or lower		Emerging		Expected		Exceeding		Less than		Expected		Greater than	
R	All 62	26	42%	14	23%	18	29%	4	6%	20	33%	15	25%	25	42%
	FSM 4	3	75%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%
	XFSM 58	23	40%	14	24%	17	29%	4	7%	17	29%	14	24%	25	43%
	PP 6	3	50%	1	17%	2	33%	0	0%	3	50%	2	33%	1	17%
	XPP 56	20	36%	13	23%	15	27%	0	0%	18	30%	15	25%	23	38%
<p>Attainment in this area is low with only 35% of children making ARE. Many children are working within the 40-60 with 23% working in Emerging ELG age related phase in XPP and XFSM. Progress is lower in the accelerated band with more children achieving expected progress for both PP and FSM children with both groups of children. However, less children achieved expected rate of progress in both FSM (75%) and PP (50%) which will need addressing in the autumn term in Year One. Average rate of progress across the year for SEN children was 2.6 with 36% of this group achieving accelerated progress, one FSM child in this group made 2 steps progress which is below expectations and will need addressing.</p>															

Reception Writing

Year	Filter	Attainment								Progress					
		40-60months S or lower		Emerging		Expected		Exceeding		Less than		Expected		Greater than	
R	All 62	29	47%	11	18%	19	30%	3	5%	20	33%	20	33%	20	33%
	FSM 4	2	50%	1	25%	1	25%	0	0%	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%
	XFSM 58	27	47%	10	17%	18	29%	3	5%	17	29%	19	33%	20	34%
	PP 6	3	50%	1	17%	2	33%	0	0%	4	67%	1	17%	1	17%
	XPP 56	23	41%	10	18%	17	30%	3	5%	16	29%	19	34%	19	34%
<p>The attainment for children reaching ARE or higher in the area of Writing is 36%. However, rates of progress were lower than both reading and number with 33% of children making less than expected progress. Only FSM 1 child made expected progress and no FSM children achieved accelerated progress. PP progress was lower than XPP with a much larger differential 17%.</p> <p>Dedicated teaching focused on language needs to be planned to bridge the gaps in this area of learning. 45% of the SEN children made accelerated progress with 27% making expected progress and 27% making less than expected progress.</p> <p>More focus on talk for writing should diminish the difference with additional carefully targeted intervention programmes by additional teachers.</p>															

Reception Number

Year	Filter	Attainment								Progress					
		40-60months S or lower		Emerging		Expected		Exceeding		Less than		Expected		Greater than	
R	All 62	27	44%	14	23%	17	27%	4	7%	20	33%	21	35%	19	32%
	FSM 4	2	50%	1	25%	1	25%	0	0%	1	25%	3	75%	0	0%
	XFSM 58	25	43%	13	22%	16	28%	4	7%	19	33%	18	31%	19	33%
	PP 6	2	33%	2	33%	2	33%	0	0%	2	33%	3	50%	1	17%
	XPP 56	25	45%	12	21%	15	27%	4	7%	18	33%	18	33%	18	33%
This area of learning has 44% still working at 40-60 months or below. When comparing groups, the XFSM children have achieved more children achieving accelerated progress with 33%. Within the SEN group, boys were more successful than girls with 71% of boys achieving accelerated progress compared to 25% of SEN girls. Progress was lower than expected with more children making less than expected progress in this area of learning compared to both Reading and Writing.															

Total children 62 -Two children cannot be added to the progress data as they started in the Summer 2 Term- Both children were not entered in our final profile results. Across the year we had 4 children join who were INA. Two of these children joined us at towards the end of the Summer Term.

There are only 4 FSM and 6 PP pupils in the whole cohort therefore limited conclusions can only be drawn.

Attainment and progress analysis by year group 2016-17
Disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils
KS1 and KS 2 READING

Year	Filter	Attainment								Progress					
		B		EM		EP		EC		Less than		Exp		Greater than	
1	All 61	6	9.8%	12	19.7%	20	32.8%	23	37.7%	18	29.5%	18	29.5%	25	41%
1	FSM 7	0	0	3	42.9%	1	14.2%	3	42.9%	3	42.8%	2	28.6%	2	28.6%
1	XFSM 54	6	11.1%	9	16.7%	19	35.2%	20	37%	15	27.8%	16	29.6%	23	42.6%
1	PP 15	2	13.3%	3	20%	6	40%	4	26.7%	5	33.3%	3	20%	7	46.7%
1	XPP 46	4	8.7%	9	19.6%	14	30.4%	19	41.3%	13	28.3%	15	32.6%	18	39.1%
FSM attainment is high in Exceeding and no pre-emerging (however numbers are low (7) for comparison purpose. FSM – 1 SEN pupil; XFSM – 7 SEN pupils XPP – attainment and progress is better overall. PP – 4 SEN; XPP – 4 SEN															
2	All 63	7	11.1%	7	11.1%	18	28.6%	31	49.2%	4	22.2%	11	17.5%	38	60.3%
2	FSM 6	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	2	33.3%	2	33.3%	2	33.3%	1	16.7%	3	50%
2	XFSM 57	6	10.5%	6	10.5%	16	28.1%	29	50.9%	12	21%	10	17.5%	35	61.5%
2	PP 12	1	8.4%	3	25%	4	33.3%	4	33.3%	5	41.7%	1	8.3%	6	50%
2	XPP 51	6	11.18%	4	7.9%	14	27.4%	27	52.9%	9	17.6%	10	19.6%	32	62.8%
FSM SEN – 2 pupils; XFSM SEN – 11 pupils FSM numbers are low for comparison purpose (6) however at expected attainment is better than XFSM. However low attainment and progress at FSM is over influenced by the 2 SEN pupils PP SEN – 4 pupils (1/3); XPP SEN – 9 pupils (1/5) PP SEN pupils have made progress in their own individual tracking, but for whole school tracking, this is not reflected.															
3	All 60	10	16.7%	3	5%	25	41.7%	22	36.6%	11	18.3%	1	1.7%	48	80%
3	FSM 11	1	9.1%	1	9.1%	4	36.4%	5	45.4%	1	9.1%	1	9.1%	9	81.8%
3	XFSM 49	9	18.4%	2	4.1%	21	42.8%	17	34.7%	10	20.4%	0	0	39	79.6%
3	PP 18	2	11.1%	1	5.6%	8	44.4%	7	38.9%	2	11.1%	1	5.6%	15	83.3%
3	XPP 42	8	19%	2	4.8%	17	40.5%	15	35.7%	9	21.4%	0	0	33	78.6%
Overall majority have made expected or better in attainment and progress. FSM SEN – 1 pupil; XFSM SEN – 9 pupils PP SEN – 2 pupils; XPP SEN – 8 pupils FSM and PP performing well at exceeding attainment and across progress. Low numbers of SEN pupils in both FSM and PP, conversely there are higher numbers of SEN pupils in XFSM and XPP.															
4	All 60	10	16.7%	18	30%	28	46.7%	4	6.6%	13	21.7%	9	15%	38	63.3%
4	FSM 15	1	6.7%	5	33.3%	9	60%	0	0	2	13.3%	2	13.3%	11	73.4%
4	XFSM 45	9	20%	13	28.9%	19	42.2%	4	8.9%	11	24.4%	7	15.8%	27	60%
4	PP 29	3	10.3%	9	31%	14	48.3%	3	10.4%	4	13.8%	4	13.8%	21	72.4%

4	XPP 31	7	22.6%	9	29%	14	45.2%	1	3.2%	9	29%	5	16.1%	17	54.9%
<p>FSM SEN – 2 pupils; XFSM SEN – 8 pupils</p> <p>FSM pupils exceeding in progress but not attainment.</p> <p>PP performing better at expected and above in attainment and progress. Proportionally there are HA pupils in both FSM and PP.</p> <p>PP SEN – 4 pupils; XPP SEN – 6 pupils</p> <p>Low numbers of SEN pupils in both FSM and PP, conversely there are higher numbers of SEN pupils in both XFSM and XPP.</p>															
5	All 62	18	29.1%	26	41.9%	17	27.4%	1	1.6%	21	33.9%	15	24.2%	26	41.9%
5	FSM 7	3	42.9%	1	14.2%	3	42.9%	0	0	3	42.9%	1	14.2%	3	42.9%
5	XFSM 55	15	27.3%	25	45.5%	14	25.4%	1	1.8%	18	32.7%	14	25.5%	23	41.8%
5	PP 18	5	27.5%	5	27.8%	8	44.4%	0	0	5	27.8%	3	16.7%	10	55.5%
5	XPP 44	13	29.5%	21	47.7%	9	20.5%	1	2.3%	16	36.4%	12	27.2%	16	36.4%
<p>FSM SEN – 2 pupils; XFSM SEN – 9 pupils</p> <p>FSM performing better at attainment and exceeding progress however XFSM progress is better at expected</p> <p>PP SEN – 4 pupils; XPP SEN – 7 pupils</p> <p>PP have performed better at attainment and in progress apart from expected.</p> <p>2 ASD pupils in XFSM and XPP will effect progress and attainment.</p> <p>There has been an issue with ascribing pupils as exceeding attainment, compared with when they were in Y4, due to over reliance on test results (mark zones were changed as they were deemed to be too generous) as forming basis of teacher judgement.</p>															
6	All 64	3	4.6%	14	21.9%	33	51.6%	14	21.9%	6	9.4%	12	18.8%	46	71.8%
6	FSM 14	2	14.3%	3	21.4%	6	42.9%	3	21.4%	3	21.4%	2	14.3%	9	64.3%
6	XFSM 50	1	2%	11	22%	27	54%	11	22%	3	6%	10	20%	37	74%
6	PP 28	2	7.1%	6	21.4%	15	53.6%	5	17.9%	3	10.7%	6	21.4%	19	67.9%
6	XPP 36	1	2.8%	8	22.2%	18	50%	9	25%	3	8.3%	6	16.7%	27	75%
<p>Overall majority of pupils have met or exceeded attainment and particularly in progress.</p> <p>FSM SEN – 7 pupils; XFSM SEN – 5 pupils</p> <p>FSM have underperformed in comparison to XFSM but 50% of FSM pupils are SEN.</p> <p>PP SEN – 9 pupils; XPP SEN – 3 pupils</p> <p>PP pupils have performed better at expected attainment and progress, but not in terms of less than expected progress or attainment or exceeding. Again, there are more SEN pupils (32%) who are PP compared to 8% XPP SEN.</p> <p>To note: 6 INA pupils (XPP/XFSM)</p>															

KS1 and KS 2 Writing

Year	Filter	Attainment								Progress					
		B		EM		EP		EC		Less than		Exp		Greater than	
1	All 61	11	18.1%	10	16.4%	24	39.3%	16	26.2%	20	32.8%	29	47.5%	12	19.7%
1	FSM 7	2	28.6%	1	14.2%	2	28.6%	2	28.6%	3	42.8%	2	28.6%	2	28.6%
1	XFSM 54	9	16.7%	9	16.7%	22	40.7%	14	25.9%	17	31.5%	27	50%	10	18.5%
1	PP 15	4	26.7%	2	13.3%	6	40%	3	20%	6	40%	6	40%	3	20%
1	XPP 46	7	15.2%	8	17.4%	18	39.1%	13	28.5%	14	30.4%	23	50%	9	19.6%

FSM – 1 SEN pupil; XFSM – 7 SEN pupils

PP – 4 SEN; XPP – 4 SEN

PP performing at same rate for both attainment (expected) and progress (exceeding) overall, with a difference of less than 10% between advantaged and disadvantaged.

Overall, writing is lower indicative of EAL pupil challenges and from EYFS to Year 1 curriculum expectations.

2	All 63	11	17.5%	8	12.7%	21	33.3%	23	36.5%	14	22.2%	1	1.6%	48	76.2%
2	FSM 6	2	33.3%	0	0	3	50%	1	16.7%	3	50%	0	0	3	50%
2	XFSM 57	9	15.8%	8	14%	18	31.6%	22	38.6%	6	10.5%	1	1.8%	50	87.7%
2	PP 12	3	25%	1	8.4%	4	33.3%	4	33.3%	5	41.7%	0	0	7	58.3%
2	XPP 51	8	15.7%	7	13.7%	17	33.3%	19	37.3%	20	39.2%	1	2%	30	58.8%

Overall progress is good as is attainment, particularly at the exceeding end.

FSM numbers are too low to make any conclusive judgements

PP and XPP attainment is quite similar as is progress expected and above.

3	All 60	10	16.7%	16	26.7%	28	46.6%	6	10%	11	18.3%	15	25%	34	56.7%
3	FSM 11	1	9%	5	45.5%	3	27.3%	2	18.2%	1	9%	5	45.5%	5	45.5%
3	XFSM 49	9	18.4%	11	22.4%	25	51%	4	8.2%	10	20.4%	10	20.4%	29	59.2%
3	PP 18	2	11.1%	7	38.9%	7	38.9%	2	11.1%	2	11.1%	6	33.3%	10	55.6%
3	XPP 42	8	19%	9	21.5%	21	50%	4	9.5%	9	21.4%	9	21.4%	24	57.2%

Similar pattern between PP and FSM pupils with both groups doing better at exceeding attainment and progress both below and at expected.

However, both are underachieving at the lower and expected attainment (middle achievers) and not exceeding in progress.

4	All 60	7	11.6%	28	46.7%	16	26.7%	9	15%	8	18.3%	6	5%	46	76.7%
4	FSM 15	1	6.7%	6	40%	7	46.6%	1	6.7%	1	13.3%	0	0	14	86.7%
4	XFSM 45	6	13.3%	22	48.9%	9	20%	8	17.8%	7	20%	5	6.7%	33	73.3%
4	PP 29	2	6.9%	11	37.9%	11	37.9%	5	17.3%	2	10.3%	2	3.5%	25	86.2%
4	XPP 31	5	16.1%	17	54.8%	5	16.2%	4	1.9%	6	25.8%	4	6.5%	21	67.7%

Note: many of the PP pupils are identified as higher attaining children and PP and XPP numbers are fairly equal.

5	All 62	19	30.6%	21	33.9%	18	29%	4	6.5%	25	40.3%	7	11.3%	30	48.4%
5	FSM 7	3	42.9%	1	14.3%	2	28.5%	1	14.3%	3	42.8%	2	28.6%	2	28.6%
5	XFSM 55	16	29.1%	20	36.4%	16	29.1%	3	5.4%	22	40%	5	9.1%	28	50.9%
5	PP 18	6	33.3%	3	16.7%	8	44.4%	1	5.6%	6	33.3%	3	16.7%	9	50%
5	XPP 44	13	29.5%	18	40.9%	10	22.7%	3	6.9%	19	43.1%	4	9.1%	21	47.8%

Overall low attainment ad progress.

FSM are performing better at attainment than progress and XFSM are have better progress than attainment.

PP outperform in attainment except in exceeding, but in progress have done very well.

6	All 64	4	6.3%	12	18.8%	33	51.5%	15	23.4%	2	3.1%	0	0	62	96.9%
6	FSM 14	0	0	5	35.7%	6	42.9%	3	21.4%	0	0	0	0	14	100%
6	XFSM 50	4	8%	7	14%	27	54%	12	24%	2	4%	0	0	48	96%
6	PP 28	0	0	7	25%	15	53.6%	6	21.4%	0	0	0	0	28	100%
6	XPP 36	4	11.1%	5	13.9%	18	50%	9	25%	2	5.6%	0	0	34	94.4%

Overall most pupils have achieved expected or above attainment and exceeding progress.

Curriculum content has been closely monitored to ensure full coverage as well as robust moderation practices.

Progress exceeds expectations partly due to low on entry data from Year 5.

KS1 and KS 2 Maths

Year	Filter	Attainment								Progress					
		B		EM		EP		EC		Less than		Exp		Greater than	
1	All 61	5	8.2%	19	31.1%	28	46.1%	9	14.6%	25	41%	32	52.4%	4	6.6%
1	FSM 7	0	0	4	57.1%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	4	57.1%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%
1	XFSM 54	5	9.2%	15	27.8%	26	48.2%	8	14.8%	21	38.9%	30	55.6%	3	5.5%
1	PP 15	2	13.3%	5	33.3%	6	40.1%	2	13.3%	8	53.3%	6	40%	1	6.7%
1	XPP 46	3	6.5%	14	30.4%	22	47.9%	7	15.2%	17	37%	26	56.5%	3	6.5%
PP and FSM pupils underperforming in attainment and progress compared to their non-disadvantaged peers however, almost half of PP pupils are SEN. Non PP and non FSM have outperformed. PPG staff not utilised as much for maths as English.															
2	All 63	8	12.7%	7	11.2%	20	31.7%	28	44.4%	9	14.3%	3	4.8%	51	80.9%
2	FSM 6	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	2	33.3%	2	33.3%	1	16.7%	0	0	5	83.3%
2	XFSM 57	7	12.3%	6	10.5%	18	31.6%	26	45.6%	8	14%	3	5.3%	46	80.7%
2	PP 12	2	16.7%	2	16.7%	4	33.3%	4	33.3%	1	8.3%	1	8.3%	10	83.4%
2	XPP 51	6	11.8%	5	9.8%	16	31.4%	24	47%	8	15.7%	2	3.9%	41	80.4%
Low numbers for FSM so not much conclusive comments can be made. PP have outperformed XPP in progress however XPP have achieved better in attainment. Overall, vast majority of pupils have achieved or exceeded in attainment and exceeded in progress.															
3	All 60	10	16.7%	13	21.7%	26	43.3%	11	18.3%	8	13.3%	19	31.7%	33	55%
3	FSM 11	1	9.1%	4	36.3%	3	27.3%	3	27.3%	1	9%	5	45.5%	5	45.5%
3	XFSM 49	9	18.4%	9	18.4%	23	46.9%	8	16.3%	7	14.3%	14	28.6%	28	57.1%
3	PP 18	2	11.1%	5	27.8%	7	38.9%	4	22.2%	2	11.1%	5	27.8%	11	61.1%
3	XPP 42	8	19%	8	19%	19	45.3%	7	16.7%	6	14.3%	14	33.3%	22	52.4%
Middle attainers of disadvantaged pupils underperforming in comparison, but doing better at exceeding attainment. No conclusive patterns emerge from this.															
4	All 60	6	10%	36	60%	9	15%	9	15%	6	15%	11	13.3%	43	71.7%
4	FSM 15	2	13.3%	8	53.4%	2	13.3%	3	20%	1	13.3%	5	26.7%	9	60%
4	XFSM 45	4	8.9%	28	62.2%	7	15.6%	6	13.3%	5	15.5%	6	8.9%	34	75.6%
4	PP 29	2	6.9%	17	58.6%	3	10.3%	7	24.2%	1	6.9%	7	20.7%	21	72.4%
4	XPP 31	4	12.9%	19	61.3%	6	19.4%	2	6.4%	5	22.5%	4	6.5%	22	71%
PP similar number to XPP. Outperforming XPP in all areas. FSM exceeding in attainment and at expected progress.															
5	All 62	15	24.2%	25	40.3%	5	27.4%	5	8.1%	11	17.7%	15	24.2%	36	58.1%
5	FSM 7	3	42.8%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	5	71.4%

5	XFSM 55	12	21.8%	24	43.6%	16	29.1%	3	5.5%	10	18.2%	14	25.4%	31	56.4%
5	PP 18	4	22.2%	4	22.2%	8	44.4%	2	11.2%	2	11.1%	4	22.2%	12	66.7%
5	XPP 44	11	25%	21	47.7%	9	20.5%	3	6.8%	9	20.4%	11	25%	24	54.6%

FSM numbers are too small however are exceeding in attainment and progress.

PP pupils have outperformed advantaged peers in most cases in attainment and progress.

6	All 64	7	10.9%	12	18.8%	31	48.4%	14	21.9%	6	9.4%	0	0	58	90.6%
6	FSM 14	2	14.3%	2	14.3%	8	57.1%	2	14.3%	2	14.3%	0	0	12	85.7%
6	XFSM 50	5	10%	10	20%	23	46%	12	24%	4	8%	0	0	46	92%
6	PP 28	2	7.1%	5	17.9%	15	53.6%	6	21.4%	2	7.1%	0	0	26	92.9%
6	XPP 36	5	13.9%	7	19.5%	16	44.4%	8	22.2%	4	11.1%	0	0	32	88.9%

FSM attainment better than XFSM but not progress. To Note there are 50% pupils who are SEN FSM so progress is still very good.

PP pupils have outperformed XPP in attainment and progress although overall all pupils have done well in attainment and particularly exceeding in progress.

Of concern are the middle attainers in non-disadvantaged.

Medical and attendance matrix

Year group	1	2	3	4	5	6
1						
2		2				
3			1			
4	1	2	2	4		
5		1	1		1	
6	1	2	2	2	4	4

This shows the number of pupils with medical conditions, which impacts their attendance, throughout their primary school experience. For example, there are 4 pupils in Year 6 currently with medical needs and we can track how many there were from when they were in Year 1 (1 pupil) , in Year 2 (2 pupils) and so on.