



Market Rasen Church of England Primary School

Pupil Premium Strategy

2017-2018

1. Summary information					
School	Market Rasen Church of England Primary School		Pupil Premium Champions		Andrew Smith (Staff) Mike Eckersley (Governor)
Academic Year	2017/18	Total PP budget	£114,840	Date of most recent PP Review	N/A
Total number of pupils	305	Number of pupils eligible for PP	88	Date for next internal review of this strategy	December 2017
2. Current attainment (2017 Year 6 Data)					
	<i>Pupils eligible for DPP (your school)</i>		<i>Pupils not eligible for PP (national average) 2016 Nationals (2017 not published yet)</i>		<i>Gap</i>
% achieving expected + in reading, writing and maths	54%		60%		-6%
% expected + in Reading	69%		71%		-2%
% expected + in Writing	62%		79%		-17%
% expected + in Maths	62%		75%		-13%
% expected + in GAPS	69%		78%		-9%
3. Current Attainment GAP in Federation APS AS of Term 6 2017					
Year Group	Reading		Writing		Maths
Year Two	0.4		0.6		0.2
Year Three	0.5		0.7		0.3
Year Four	1.1		1.2		0.5
Year Five	1.3		1.3		0.9
Year Six	1.1		1.2		1.6
0.5 =1/2 term gap 1.0 =1 term gap 1.5 =1.5 term gap 2.0=2 term gap 2.5 =2.5 term gap 3.0 = 1 year gap					

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.	Groups of PP children (identified on a termly basis) have gaps in their learning in reading, writing and maths, especially those identified with SEND.	
B.	Across the school, children who are DPP and not SEND, as a group, have similar attainment and progress to those who are not DPP. Our DPP SEND children do worse. (See analysis at the end of this PP Statement)	
C.	End of Key Stage data shows that our DPP children do better at KS2 than they do at KS1. This is due to good progress over time however we want to accelerate the progress of DPP children in KS1.	
D.	Our DPP “greater depth” children at key points (end of Reception and End of KS1) are not always still “greater depth” further up the school. Conversion rate school wide at the end of 2017 was (R) 46%, (W) 71% and (M) 67%	
E.	There is a lack of space to be able to deliver evidence based interventions meaning children are accessing such lessons in spaces that are not conducive to Quality First Teaching.	
External barriers <i>(issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)</i>		
F.	Attendance for the group of children eligible for the Deprivation Pupil Premium is always below that of Non DPP children.	
G.	Many parents who need support from our parental support advisor (PSA) are in the DPP group.	
H.	Many of our DPP children need emotional, social and mental health support.	
4. Desired outcomes		
	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>
A.	Evidence based interventions to be used on targeted children and groups to close the progress and attainment gap for the DPP group. Measured through APS progress.	<i>Data held on the evidence based intervention tracking will show that the packages used are having a positive impact of DPP learners. The APS gap between DPP and Not DPP will close. Current gap (end of 2017) can be seen at the end of this statement.</i>
B.	Barriers to learning removed though SEND support Measured through APS progress.	<i>The APS gap between DPP SEND and DPP NOT SEND will diminish. This to be measured in termly datapacks going forward.</i>
C.	Improved outcomes at the end of KS1 more in line with national other. Measured through % of DPP children who are expected +.	<i>The % of DPP children who are expected + will be higher than DPP children nationally and will close on the gap between DPP School and DPP National in 2017.</i>
D.	Improved amount of DPP children will be Greater Depth at KS1 and Key Stage Two Children who are Greater Depth at Key Points (R/KS1) will still be GD as they move up the school. Measured through % on track to the GD	<i>The % of DPP children achieving GD will rise. The % of children who are still GD will increase above the end of 2017 figures.</i>
E.	A disused cloakroom will be converted into a bright, warm leaning environment. Measured through the new space being available.	<i>New space to be in use September 2017.</i>
F.	Attendance of the DPP group will increase. Measured through % attendance DPP VS Not DPP in school and National.	<i>The gap between DPP and Not DPP in school will reduce to less than the 2017 Gap (0.8%)</i>

G.	Additional Support for parents will be provided from our parent support advisor. Measured through % of DPP parents accessing PSA Support.	<i>A significant % of DPP parents will have accessed our PSA.</i>
H.	Additional support for parents will be provided from ELSA trained teaching assistants. Measures though the % of DPP children accessing this support.	<i>A significant % of DPP children will have accessed ELSA support.</i>

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?
To improve attainment and achievement of all DPP learners including the most able .	Employ additional teaching assistants for in class support. This spending allows us to have 82 hours per week of this valuable support. Some of these hours are linked to vulnerable individuals. Teachers directed to support MA DPP learners. KS1 have significant amount of TA support to close the gap at the end of Y2. (£68,751)	Teaching assistants provide valuable support in classrooms. Evidence of this comes from TA observations. Although EEF only puts their added value at +1 month our TAs are used for evidence based intervention not just in class support.	Teaching assistants are well trained. Teaching assistants have performance management targets that are set and reviewed. Review of lesson observations, in year data and evidence based intervention data. Initial September deployment will be based on need.	AS Ex HT NA HOS CB Senco	Gap closure data (DPP Vs Not DPP and DPP NOT SEND VS DPP SEND) will be reviewed on a termly basis. Deployment can be fluid based on need. Pupil Premium Champion governors to review data at regular meetings.
Total budgeted cost					£68,751

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?
To enhanced attainment and achievement for DPP learners.	French coach employed to teach the class to enable class teacher to undertake "catch the bus" intervention with DPP children (More able too not just less able) on a weekly basis. (£11,580)	EEF cites improvement of +8 months for enhanced feedback. Analysis of staff questionnaire show they feel that it has a positive benefit.	Termly work scrutiny. Review of DPP progress data. Staff to be asked to annotate any CTB work so its impact can be monitored.	GE	Termly; gap closure data and review of work books for CTB work now annotated.
To deliver Easter Schools (4 days) for targeted DPP children. (More able and Less able)	Staff taught intervention schools outside of term time. (£2,800)	Historically this has been successful in raising attainment. DPP outcomes are always better than DPP national and close to national other.	End of Year Data for participants.	SB	July 2018
To provide additional support to DPP children to remove barriers to learning e.g- emotional, behavioural, mental health.	Member of staff to work afternoons to work on the range of issues that come up from STAPS reports, Educational Psychology, TAC or CP meetings or SEND needs. (£5,000)	At least 30 children need some sort of intervention for this. Agencies that used to provide support for this kind of thing are less available.	SENCO review of the work being done. Review of data of children being targeted.	NA/NC/CB	April 2018
Total budgeted cost					£19,380
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?
Attendance of the DPP group will increase and the gap to our non DPP will close.	Breakfast club (£5712)	Has historically raised attendance levels. EEF report 4/11/16 shows +2 months progress.	Termly checks of attendance for invited children.	NA	Termly Pupil Premium Governor to review in our regular meetings.
To explore ways to support our DPP	Buyback of Specialist teaching and applied	37% DPP children also have SEND support profiles.	Termly review of data. SENCO monitoring	LMG	Termly through data packs.

children with Special Educational Needs	psychology service. (£2478) Additional training for staff. Highlighting this vulnerable group to staff.	STAPS reports and interventions are very useful in ensuring individual SEN needs are met in DPP children. We know our DPP SEND children don't make as much progress as our DPP NOT SEND.			
To improve attendance, barriers to learning and improve wellbeing.	To employ a parent support advisor (PSA) to support DPP families with a range of barriers to improve learning; behaviour, attendance, routines, parenting etc. (£6313)	Many of our children and families require additional support.	High quality PSA employed. SENCo to review work on weekly basis.	LMG	April 2018
To provide additional space for evidence based interventions	Employ building company (TOPCON) to refurbish a disused cloakroom into a colourful, bright learning space. (Best value principles applied) (£7000)	Teachers and Teachings assistants regularly cannot find space to do evidence based interventions. School NOR has increased from 240-310 in the last 7 years making space an issue, particularly group space.	Refurbishment to be completed by September 2017 and in use Term 1.	AS/BD	Governor's resources committee to review the refurbishment for quality.
Total budgeted cost					£21,503

6. Review of expenditure			
Previous Academic Year		2016/2017	
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)

<p>To improve attainment and achievement of all DPP learners including the most able.</p>	<p>Employ teaching assistants for in class support. This spending allows us to have 82 hours per week of this valuable support. (£46,895) Some of these hours are linked to vulnerable individuals. Teachers directed to support MA DPP learners. KS1 have significant amount of TA support to close the gap at the end of Y2.</p>	<p>The analysis at the end of this statement shows that our DPP children without SEND made similar or better progress than non DPP children.</p> <p>Analysis of children more able at R or KS1 shows that the majority are not still GD in KS2.</p>	<p>More focus using this resource of More Able DPP. To be built into our able and more able project 2017/18. Continue with this additional support.</p>
---	---	---	---

ii. Targeted support			
esired 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)
To enhanced attainment and achievement for DPP learners.	French coach employed to teach the class to enable class teacher to undertake “catch the bus” intervention with DPP children (More able too not just less able) on a weekly basis. (£11,700)	Information gathered from staff through questionnaire show they feel it is a positive approach that accelerates progress for DPP children. Data shows that DPP not SEND children have made good progress.	Some timetabling work needs to be done to ensure classes who have CTB directly after collective worship are not disadvantaged if it over runs. Reminder to staff to use CTB for the most able DPP not just the least able. Continue with this approach.
To upskill support staff in delivering evidence based interventions.	Staff training in evidence based interventions. Primarily Maths (£5000)	See Evidence Based intervention tracking for full information. Project X - Positive impact for many participants. Switch on Reading -Positive impact for most participants 1st Class Number -Positive Impact for some participants Success at arithmetic -Positive impact for most participants.	We will use the knowledge we have gained this year to refine who we invite to do each package. Continue with this approach.
To deliver Easter and summer Schools (4 days each) for targeted DPP children. (More able and Less able)	Staff taught intervention schools outside of term time. (£8000)	Easter school took place. Summer school did not due to staffing constraints. Easter school was well attended. Attainment measures were in line with 2017 National. Awaiting new ASP service update to see how DPP compared with Not DPP nationally.	We will hold another Easter School this year. We will have a renewed focus of More able DPP within the week.

To employ a teaching assistant to deliver evidence based interventions.	Additional time for teaching assistants to deliver evidence based interventions. (£3213)	See two boxes above.	See two boxes above
To accelerate a targeted group of PP children in English and Maths	To employ a specialist teacher to work with a group of SEND learners to ensure they receive the diet they need. (April-Sept 2016) (£13,610)	Though the children made progress we have moved away from this strategy.	We now longer pursue this strategy.
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)
Attendance of the DPP group will increase and the gap to our non DPP will close.	Breakfast club (£7833)	The gap between DPP and non DPP was 0.8% which is lower than National. Our PA rate for non DPP is much lower than national.	We will continue with this strategy however we will downstaff as we can provide this will fewer staff freeing up money for other DPP projects/approaches.
To explore ways to support our DPP children with Special Educational Needs	Buyback of Specialist teaching and applied psychology service. (£2660)	Many SEND DPP children have benefited from this resource.	We will continue with this approach. Next year we are going to work hard on closing the gap between DPP SEND children and Non SEND DPP.
To improve attendance, barriers to learning and improve wellbeing.	To employ a parent support advisor (PSA) to support DPP families with a range of barriers to improve learning; behaviour, attendance, routines,	Many DPP families have received support from this resource.	We will continue with this approach. We need to add capacity for a member of staff to work with children on their emotional, social, behavioural and mental health needs alongside the PSA. This is something we plan to launch in the 2017/18 academic year.

7. Additional detail

See whole school attainment and progress gaps with and without SEND below.

Attainment and Progress DPP NON SEND VS DPP SEND 2016-2017 Market Rasen

Governors: How to read this table.

The table on the left is attainment where the children are at the end of the year. This allows you to compare how Deprivation Pupil Premium (DPP) children did compared to Not DPP children. It also allows you to see how well DPP who do not have SEND have done compared to Not DPP. The table on the right is progress which shows how much progress the children have made from the start of the year to the end of the year. This allows you to compare how Deprivation Pupil Premium (DPP) children did compared to Not DPP children. It also allows you to see how well DPP who do not have SEND have done compared to Not DPP.

	ATTAINMENT												PROGRESS											
	Reading				Writing				Maths				Reading				Writing				Maths			
	Not DPP	DPP	DPP Not SEND	DPP SEND	Not DPP	DPP	DPP Not SEND	DPP SEND	Not DPP	DPP	DPP Not SEND	DPP SEND	Not DPP	DPP	DPP Not SEND	DPP SEND	Not DPP	DPP	DPP Not SEND	DPP SEND	Not DPP	DPP	DPP Not SEND	DPP SEND
Year One	4.8 (30)	4.4 (11)	5.0 (8)	2.7 (3)	4.7 (30)	4.1 (11)	4.9 (8)	2.2 (3)	4.7 (30)	4.5 (11)	5.0 (8)	3.0 (3)	2.5 (30)	2.2 (11)	2.6 (8)	1.2 (3)	2.6 (30)	2.1 (11)	2.5 (8)	1.0 (3)	2.5 (30)	2.3 (11)	2.5 (8)	1.7 (3)
	Not DPP to DPP Gap= 0.4 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= -0.2				Not DPP to DPP Gap= 0.6 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= -0.2				Not DPP to DPP Gap= 0.2 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= -0.3				Not DPP to DPP Gap= 0.3 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= -0.1				Not DPP to DPP Gap= 0.5 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= 0.1				Not DPP to DPP Gap= 0.2 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= 0.0			
Year Two	7.7 (30)	7.3 (11)	7.6 (8)	6.5 (3)	7.5 (30)	7.0 (11)	7.5 (8)	5.8 (3)	7.7 (30)	7.5 (11)	7.7 (8)	7.0 (3)	3.0 (30)	2.7 (11)	3.0 (8)	2.2 (3)	2.9 (30)	2.7 (11)	3.0 (8)	2.3 (3)	2.9 (30)	2.8 (11)	2.9 (8)	2.5 (3)
	Not DPP to DPP Gap= 0.4 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= 0.1				Not DPP to DPP Gap= 0.0 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= 0.0				Not DPP to DPP Gap= 0.2 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= 0.0				Not DPP to DPP Gap= 0.3 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= 0.0				Not DPP to DPP Gap= 0.2 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= -0.1				Not DPP to DPP Gap= 0.1 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= 0.0			
Year Three	10.9 (32)	9.7 (10)	11.0 (4)	8.8 (6)	10.8 (32)	9.6 (10)	10.9 (4)	8.8 (6)	10.8 (32)	10.3 (10)	10.9 (4)	9.8 (6)	2.9 (32)	2.8 (10)	3.0 (4)	2.6 (6)	3.0 (32)	2.9 (10)	3.0 (4)	2.9 (6)	3.0 (32)	2.8 (10)	2.9 (4)	2.6 (6)
	Not DPP to DPP Gap= 1.2 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= -0.1				Not DPP to DPP Gap= 1.2 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= -0.1				Not DPP to DPP Gap= 0.5 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= -0.1				Not DPP to DPP Gap= 0.1 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= -0.1				Not DPP to DPP Gap= 0.1 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= 0.0				Not DPP to DPP Gap= 0.2 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= 0.1			
Year Four	13.6 (36)	12.2 (14)	13.4 (10)	9.7 (4)	13.6 (36)	12.3 (14)	13.3 (10)	9.9 (4)	13.6 (36)	12.7 (14)	13.5 (10)	10.9 (4)	3.1 (36)	2.6 (14)	3.0 (10)	2.3 (4)	3.2 (36)	2.5 (14)	2.7 (10)	2.4 (4)	3.1 (36)	2.6 (14)	2.7 (10)	3.1 (4)
	Not DPP to DPP Gap= 1.4 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= 0.2				Not DPP to DPP Gap= 1.3 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= 0.3				Not DPP to DPP Gap= 0.9 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= 0.1				Not DPP to DPP Gap= 0.5 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= 0.1				Not DPP to DPP Gap= 0.7 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= 0.5				Not DPP to DPP Gap= 0.5 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= 0.4			
Year Five	16.4 (27)	15.4 (16)	16.5 (8)	14.3 (8)	16.4 (27)	15.2 (16)	16.5 (8)	14.0 (8)	16.4 (27)	14.8 (16)	16.3 (8)	13.4 (8)	3.2 (27)	3.7 (16)	3.3 (8)	3.0 (8)	3.3 (27)	3.3 (16)	3.1 (8)	3.4 (8)	3.0 (27)	2.9 (16)	2.9 (8)	3.0 (8)
	Not DPP to DPP Gap= 1.0 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= -0.1				Not DPP to DPP Gap= 1.2 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= -0.1				Not DPP to DPP Gap= 1.6 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= 0.1				Not DPP to DPP Gap= -0.5 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= -0.1				Not DPP to DPP Gap= 0.0 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= 0.2				Not DPP to DPP Gap= 0.1 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= 0.1			
Year Six	18.9 (31)	19.0 (13)	19.9 (8)	17.5 (4)	19.0 (31)	18.2 (13)	20.0 (8)	15.3 (4)	19.5 (31)	18.8 (13)	20.0 (8)	16.9 (4)	3.6 (31)	4.5 (13)	3.6 (8)	5.9 (4)	3.6 (31)	4.0 (13)	3.9 (8)	4.1 (4)	3.7 (31)	4.0 (13)	4.0 (8)	3.9 (4)
	Not DPP to DPP Gap= -0.1 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= -0.1				Not DPP to DPP Gap= 0.8 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= -1.0				Not DPP to DPP Gap= 0.7 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= -0.5				Not DPP to DPP Gap= -0.9 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= 0.0				Not DPP to DPP Gap= -0.4 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= -0.3				Not DPP to DPP Gap= -0.3 Not DPP to DPP not SEND Gap= -0.3			
DPP Ahead of Non DPP				No Gap				Gap between 0.0 and 0.9				Gap over 1.0												

Conclusion: The gap between DPP and Non DPP is small in attainment in Years 1,2 and 6. In Y3,4,5 the gap is disappears when adjusted for SEND. In terms of progress the gap in small in all subject areas and year groups. When adjusted for SEND in many areas DPP do better than not DPP.

For reference a gap of 0.5 is equivalent to 6 weeks.