

Trust-Wide Pupil Premium Strategy

Rationale

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 our academies and is clearly identifiable. Our academies are best placed to assess what additional provision should be made for the individual pupils within their responsibility. However, we will always work with and support them in ensuring the most effective use is made for the benefit of the pupils. 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 (CLA) and those who have parents in the armed services.

Our academies and the Trust as a whole will be held accountable for how they have used the additional funding to support pupils. Our academies will all publish online information about how they have used the Pupil Premium and the impact it has had.

Within the Diocese of Salisbury Academy Trust, we have high aspirations and ambitions for our children and we believe that no child should be left behind. We strongly believe that it is not about where you come from but your passion and thirst for knowledge, and your dedication and commitment to learning that make the difference between success and failure. We are determined to ensure that our children are given every chance to realise their full potential. As a Trust, we receive a significant amount of Pupil Premium funding. Whilst we largely delegate this funding to our academies, we recognise our responsibilities for the full amount and are committed to working with our academies collaboratively, to ensure that our pupils gain the maximum benefit from this funding, working together to achieve this wherever possible.

When making decisions about using Pupil Premium funding, our academies consider the context of the academy and the subsequent challenges faced. Common barriers for our children are considered, such as the level of support at home, poor attendance, weak language and communication skills, lack of confidence and more frequent behaviour difficulties. The challenges are varied and there is no 'one size fits all'.

Our commitment as a Trust is to grow and develop academies where the needs of pupils eligible for Pupil Premium funding are fully met. We will do this by seeking to develop a PP first culture and practice in our academies to deliver our nine strategic priorities.

Please note that any costings are simply a guide as to where money will be spent. PP grants are fully devolved to academies but general costings have been drawn from their individual strategies to give an indication here as to where funding will be directed.

1. Summary information					
Academic Year	2017-18	Total PP budget	£771,000	Date of most recent PP Review	22.5.17
Total number of pupils	2238	Number of pupils eligible for PP	518 (Oct 17)	Date for next internal review of this strategy	January 2018

2. Current attainment and progress		
Pupils eligible for PP are below ARE in all three areas, with the lowest attainment being in writing	ARE for all pupils eligible for PP -1.8 writing -1.2 reading -1.5 maths	ARE for all pupils not eligible for PP -0.3 writing 0 reading -0.2 maths
Pupils not eligible for PP are closer to ARE in all three areas with reading attainment being in line with expected (1051 not PP in Trust in July 2017)		
	Points progress for all pupils eligible for PP	Points progress for all pupils not eligible for PP
Progress in reading Sept 16 – July 17	2.9	3.2
Progress in writing Sept 16 – July 17	3.0	3.2
Progress in maths Sept 16 – July 17	2.8	3.1

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP including high ability)	
Trust-wide barriers	
A.	Staff at every level recognising their responsibility for raising the achievement of pupils eligible for PP
B.	Quality First Teaching that meets the needs of pupils eligible for PP, needs to be of a good standard in all academies
C.	The need for more examples of strong practice to be shared across the Trust with pupils eligible for PP achieving better than expected
External barriers	
D.	Attendance of pupils eligible for PP needs to be higher

4. Outcomes		
	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>
A.	Pupils eligible for PP make good or better progress. (Strategic Aim 1c) Outcomes will be measured during the data captures in terms 2,4,6, across the Trust, against expectation of 4 points progress in a year.	Groups at risk of underachieving, are progressing at least in line with other children nationally and achievement gaps are narrowing. Attainment and progress of children eligible for PP is in line with other pupils nationally.
B.	Standards in Reading, Writing and Mathematics improve so that year-on-year more pupils achieve and exceed age-related expectations, and progress exceeds that made by pupils with similar starting points. (Strategic Aim 1a)	Outcomes and progress at Foundation Stage, Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 are above national levels on aggregate across the Trust and in each academy within 2 years of joining the Trust. Outcomes in Y1 phonics are above national levels across the

	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>
	Measured against national expectations and SPTO tracking data.	Trust and in each academy within 2 years of joining the Trust.
C.	High quality teaching and learning of a rich and broad curriculum in each academy. (Strategic Aim 1b) This will be measured through evaluation at Academy Improvement Meetings 3 times per year.	All teaching is good or better in each academy within 2 years of joining the Trust. 100% of teaching is good with 30% outstanding across the Trust.

5. The Trust Strategy 2017-18

1) Rationale and responsibility

Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead
Everyone at every level grasps the moral imperative of having high expectations of pupils eligible for PP and understands how their role contributes to helping pupils eligible for PP achieve better outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hub Improvement Leads (HILs) to be Headteachers of two 'virtual academies' for all pupils eligible for PP in the Trust – Compass Academy in the North and Orbit Academy in the South • Appraisal of all leaders and staff to include improving the performance of pupils eligible for PP • PP teams to be set up in each academy with members who articulate a compelling vision, act as dynamic and resolute champions, who refuse to allow themselves to be deflected from the core business of doing what it takes to raise achievement for pupils eligible for PP • Appointment processes for future leaders in the Trust will expect candidates to demonstrate a deep knowledge and understanding of school improvement work, firmly rooted in accountability along with the moral courage to challenge underachievement in whatever form it may take 	<p>“Supporting the attainment of disadvantaged pupils: articulating success and good practice.” NFER, November 2015</p> <p>“Disadvantaged pupils – a concerted effort?” Ofsted SW region March 2016</p> <p>Conversations with staff during visits to academies show that not all staff have understood their responsibility for helping pupils eligible for PP to achieve better. In the academies where this responsibility is evident it permeates into teaching practice in classrooms.</p>	HILs will report on virtual academy progress to the Trust Standards Committee. Mid-year and end of year appraisal meetings will review progress towards targets.	<p>HILs</p> <p>CEO AID HTs</p> <p>CEO</p>
			Total guide funding	£50,000

2) Rigorous self-evaluation

Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead
<p>Searching systematic self-evaluation of both the effectiveness of the Trust's support and challenge for academies and the effectiveness of each academy's provision</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ofsted reports to be analysed to identify any common strengths and areas for development to be addressed at Trust wide level • All academy PP strategies will be scrutinised, reviewed and approved by the Trust at the start of each academic year • Academies to complete a mid-year self-review of their PP funding strategy aided by using the Effective PP Review Guide (Jon Dunford and the Teaching School Council) https://www.tscouncil.org.uk/resources/guide-to-effective-pupil-premium-review/ • All academies with less than a good Ofsted judgement to have an external PP review within a year of joining the Trust • Trust staff to be trained to carry out PP reviews • Recommendations from external PP reviews to be circulated to all academies to evaluate their PP provision against them • HT peer to peer review meetings, 3 times a year to include PP focus • AID to review progress on actions decided upon by each academy at the PP conference 2017 	<p>“Supporting the attainment of disadvantaged pupils: articulating success and good practice.” NFER, November 2015</p> <p>In 2016-17 LGBs were not aware of the mid-year reviews and the use of PP funding was not evaluated until the end of year in some academies.</p> <p>The rigour of external PP reviews in the Trust has significantly added to academies' self-evaluation.</p>	<p>The Trust Board Standards Committee are well informed about performance of PP pupils and hold AID and CEO to account at its meetings, three times a year.</p> <p>AIM meetings monitor progress on PP review actions.</p> <p>AID to attend peer review meetings in first year to ensure challenge and rigour.</p>	<p>AID</p> <p>HTs</p> <p>CEO</p> <p>HTs</p> <p>AID</p> <p>AID</p> <p>AID</p> <p>HTs</p> <p>AID</p>
			Total guide funding	£70,000

3) Individualised approach

Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead
<p>A Trust wide understanding that there is no such thing as a typical child eligible for PP, so that individual barriers to learning are identified which lead to chosen strategies which enable pupils to overcome them</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaders to reinforce this message at every level • Virtual academy HTs to evaluate how well barriers are being identified for the pupils in their academies and to support academies in matching strategies to barriers • Expand the shared use of funding beyond the Weymouth Bay hub, which pools PPG to buy in Educational Psychology, Behaviour, Attendance and Speech and Language support • Effective transfer of information for pupils eligible for PP at points of transfer so pupils eligible for PP have their needs identified quickly 	<p>“Unknown Children – destined for disadvantage” Ofsted July 2016</p> <p>“Disadvantaged pupils – a concerted effort?” Ofsted SW region March 2016</p> <p>“An Updated Practical Guide to the Pupil Premium” Marc Rowland, National Education Trust,</p> <p>“Supporting the attainment of disadvantaged pupils: articulating success and good practice.” NFER, November 2015</p> <p>Weymouth Bay hub has benefited from pooling funding to purchase the resources needed but otherwise unavailable.</p> <p>Only 2 of the 12 academies have nurseries and all academies receive pupils from many pre-schools. Academies with effective transfer arrangements adapt the curriculum from an early point using information gathered. All academies send pupils to a range of secondary schools and need effective systems.</p>	<p>AID evaluation of LGB meeting minutes.</p> <p>HILs and Senior HTs to look for shared need across academies and signpost opportunities to collectively buy in services.</p> <p>HTs to monitor transition arrangements.</p>	<p>CofGs HTs HILs</p> <p>Senior HTs</p> <p>HTs teachers</p>
Total guide funding				£296,000

4) Quality First Teaching				
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead
Ruthless focus by all leaders on improving the quality of teaching to 100% good and 30% outstanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bespoke 1:1 support from HILs in academies alongside teachers not yet evaluated as consistently good Analysis of each academy's PP strategies and use of PPG funding to assess the impact on the development of Quality First Teaching See Teaching Learning and Assessment (TLA) Trust strategy for 2017-19 to ensure QFT for all children 	<p>SLE work within the Trust showed improved performance for individual teachers working 1:1 with more elements of good teaching evident</p> <p>EEF teaching strategies</p> <p>"Disadvantaged pupils – a concerted effort?" Ofsted SW region March 2016</p> <p>"Supporting the attainment of disadvantaged pupils: articulating success and good practice." NFER, November 2015</p>	<p>AID to evaluate impact of HIL work in AIMS</p> <p>CEO reviews PPG strategies in Sept.</p> <p>HIL to submit 3 reports on TLA strategy to Standards Committee for its evaluation.</p>	<p>HILs</p> <p>CEO</p> <p>HILs</p>
Total guide funding				£100,000

5) Quality First 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
Additional resources are effectively deployed to ensure Quality First Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HILs visits are used to develop the role of Learning Assistants Appraisal for all Learning Assistants is in place Learning Assistants are filmed in their various roles, for example: leading groups during Maths No Problem sessions, and this is shared with other academies Middle leaders' course led by the HILs to use two pieces of research to focus on effective deployment and CPD needs for Learning Assistants in each academy <p>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/our-work/projects/maximising-the-impact-of-teaching-assistants/</p>	<p>The Deployment and Impact of School Staff (DISS) project</p> <p>EEF Teaching and Learning Toolkit</p> <p>"Supporting the attainment of disadvantaged pupils: articulating success and good practice." NFER, November 2015</p>	<p>AID to monitor HIL support visit forms</p> <p>HILs to help HTs set PM targets.</p> <p>HILs to report to AID after each middle leaders' course.</p>	<p>HILs</p> <p>All HTs</p> <p>HT Dunbury</p> <p>Middle leaders</p>

Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead
	http://maximisingtas.co.uk/research/the-diss-project.php	Excellent examples of practice in the Trust show how the deployment of Learning Assistants can improve the ability of teachers to meet the needs of children eligible for PP.		
Total guide funding				£100,000

6) Assessment and Tracking

Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead
<p>The tracking of the progress of pupils eligible for PP will lead to swift action and intervention if learning slows or stalls.</p> <p>The Trust to be very well informed about the performance of pupils eligible for PP, including those who are more able.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPTO CPD for schools new to the Trust to quickly provide accurate and reliable data • Introduction of standardised assessment across Trust in term 6 to make constructive comparisons between schools and year groups • ART form used to set targets for disadvantaged in EYFS, Y1 phonics, KS1 and KS2 for expected, exceeding in EYFS, greater depth in KS1 and higher standard in KS2 • Data reports to be provided for the Board three times a year including information about pupils eligible for PP and more able pupils eligible for PP • Academy leaders understand that expected progress is not good progress and all pupils eligible for PP should be making at least good progress 	<p>“Divergent pathways: the disadvantage gap, accountability and the pupil premium.” Education Policy Institute, July 2016</p> <p>“Supporting the attainment of disadvantaged pupils: articulating success and good practice.” NFER, November 2015</p> <p>Setting of targets on ART helped LGBs hold academies to account and expectations were raised in academies in 16-17 when progress discussions took place regarding expected and good progress. In 16-17 there was a better awareness of most able pupils eligible for PP but target</p>	<p>Moderation of assessments in Trust moderation meetings</p> <p>Data captures at the end of terms 2,4,6 analysed.</p> <p>AID to evaluate progress of pupils eligible for PP at AIMs.</p> <p>Governors to ask challenging questions that hold leaders to account.</p>	<p>HILs</p> <p>AID</p> <p>AID HTs</p> <p>AID</p> <p>HTs CofGs</p>

8) Joint Practice Development and dissemination of good practice

Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead
<p>Academy leaders and staff are able to share and disseminate innovative practice, discuss latest research, share raising attainment strategies and identify how to impact in different settings.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3rd annual PP conference, July 2018, to include high calibre presenters and leading research organisations is attended by all academies, including LGB members, and continues to attract other interested schools • Network meetings between TLAT and Bath & Wells MATs' directors of achievement and improvement • Network meetings twice a year across the Trust, open to other interested schools • Website page dedicated to PP for staff looking for guidance or support around PP, hosting links to valuable resources • Two Trust Talk for Writing training days • Trust annual INSET day on Maths 	<p>“Disadvantaged pupils – a concerted effort?” Ofsted SW region March 2016</p> <p>The amount of good practice within the Trust is growing but it is essential to add to this by learning from best practice beyond the Trust.</p> <p>Good practice shared at the 2017 PP conference has been introduced in other academies and has improved the quality of teaching.</p>	<p>Evaluation from conference and training days.</p> <p>Clear communication of good practice across the Trust.</p> <p>All external trainers given clear direction on content required.</p>	<p>HILs AID</p> <p>AID</p> <p>HILs BSM</p> <p>AID AID</p>
			Total guide funding	£10,000

9) Attendance

Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead
<p>The attendance of pupils eligible for PP is in line with the national average and higher levels of parent/carer engagement are secured.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targets for pupils eligible for PP attendance set on ART at start of year and academy strategies used to improve attendance • All academies to implement strategies to support pupils eligible for PP to catch up with learning missed due to absence • PP bulletin to be circulated twice a year disseminating good practice and ideas from 2016 PP conference on parental engagement • Behaviour training to develop expertise in effectively managing higher level need pupils 	<p>Janet Goodall, Bath University Sonia Blandford – Achievement for All, June 2016 “Disadvantaged pupils – a concerted effort?” Ofsted SW region March 2016 “The Pupil Premium, How schools are spending the funding successfully to maximise achievement” Ofsted 2013</p> <p>Book scrutiny shows gaps in learning due to absence. Academies in the Trust which have developed their management of higher level need pupils have reduced the risk of exclusions and the need to use reduced timetables.</p>	<p>Attendance monitored by AID at ART resubmissions in terms 2,4,6 .</p> <p>Book scrutiny by HTs to show catch up of missed learning.</p> <p>Monitoring of reduced timetables, exclusions and management of behaviour incidents through ARTs.</p>	<p>AID HTs HTs AID MV HT</p>
			Total guide funding	£20,000

6. Review of expenditure

Previous Academic Year

£546,000

Strategic Aim	Chosen action/approach	Estimated impact:	Lessons learned	Total guide funding
<p>Quality First Teaching</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amazing Teacher programme delivered to support improvement of good teaching overall. • DSAT INSET day on writing from Somerset Literacy Network. • SLE 1:1 support for teachers at Southbroom St James. • Personal Support Plans. 	<p>Inadequate teaching has been eradicated from the Trust. There has been an increase in the amount of good teaching but it is not yet 100%. INSET raised awareness of the importance of reading to support writing outcomes and increased staff confidence and enthusiasm for teaching English. Expectations for year groups were raised from scrutiny of the curriculum and sharing of practice. Personal support plans have raised the quality of teaching in the majority of cases with teachers feeling more confident in their performance.</p>	<p>SLE approach was the most effective and will be adapted for HIL work in next year.</p>	<p>Quality of Teaching</p> <p style="text-align: right;">£226,000</p>

Strategic Aim	Chosen action/approach	Estimated impact:	Lessons learned	Total guide funding
Joint Practice Development and dissemination of good practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2nd annual PP conference with keynote speakers: Janet Goodall, Bath University, “Evidence Based Research, the impact of interventions in narrowing the gap” Stephen Fraser, Education Endowment Foundation, “Using EEF resources to focus on equity,” 4 DSAT academy presentations on effective PP strategies. 	<p>All DSAT schools attended with JPD messages across the Trust. 19 other schools attended enabling good practice from beyond DSAT to be shared. ‘Got It groups’ profiled at PP conference by Dunbury is now a strategy effectively in use in other academies. The academy strategies for 17-18 show better use of research and the key messages from the conference are integrated into more of the academies’ approaches.</p>	<p>Good quality speakers are essential, alongside sharing good practice from within and beyond DSAT.</p>	<p>Targeted Support</p> <p>£270,000</p>
Rigorous self-evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • External PP reviews commissioned for St Bartholomew’s, Marden Vale, Southbroom St James, Beaminster St Mary’s. • Recommendations from PP reviews shared across the Trust in the monthly bulletin. 	<p>Academy leaders have a clear view of the strengths and areas for improvement. Mixed impact as only some academies have used the self-evaluations checklist.</p>	<p>Selection of PP reviewer impacts on quality of review. Academy HTs need to be fully involved in the review and not delegate to a PP champion. Meetings of CofGs and HTs need to raise profile of self-evaluation checklist.</p>	<p>Other approaches</p> <p>£50,000</p>

7. Data

This chart is based on all 12 schools now in the Trust – 5 of these academies only joined the Trust in the second half of the year, 3 after July. Much of the data is therefore not attributable to the Trust.

Free School Meals	2015/2016	2016/2017	FSM Change since 2015/2016	Trust	Trust Change since 2015/16
RWM EXS Combined	38.5%	27.3%	down 11.1%	44.5	up 3.9
RWM GDS	9%	2%	down 7.3%	4.9	up 2.1%
Writing Progress Score	-3.1	-3.56	down 0.46	-2.54	down by 0.71
Reading Progress Score	-0.63	-2.24	down 1.60	-0.89	down by 0.78
Maths Progress Score	-2.69	-2.2	up 0.49	-1.78	down by 0.04
Reading Scaled Score	101.36	98.07	down 3.29	102.31	up by 0.63
Maths Scaled Score	99.51	98.28	down 1.24	101.3	up by 0.47

This chart shows the difference between ARE and actual attainment for different groups of children.

	Subjects Combined	Writing	Reading	Mathematics
WHOLE CLUSTER ADMIN [1504 children]	-0.6	-0.8	-0.4	-0.6
Boys [791 children]	-0.8	-1.1	-0.6	-0.6
Girls [713 children]	-0.3	-0.3	-0.1	-0.6
Pupil Premium [453 children]	-1.7	-1.9	-1.4	-1.7
NOT Pupil Premium [1093 children]	-0.2	-0.3	0.0	-0.2
Service Children [63 children]	-0.4	-0.6	-0.3	-0.4
NOT Service Children [1441 children]	-0.6	-0.8	-0.4	-0.6

Progress of Groups to July 2017

	Subjects Combined	Writing	Reading	Mathematics
WHOLE CLUSTER ADMIN [1504 children]	+3.1	+3.1	+3.2	+3.0
Pupil Premium [453 children]	+2.9	+2.9	+3.0	+2.8
NOT Pupil Premium [1093 children]	+3.2	+3.2	+3.2	+3.1
Service Children [63 children]	+3.0	+3.0	+3.0	+2.9
NOT Service Children [1441 children]	+3.1	+3.1	+3.2	+3.0

Progress of Pupil Premium to July 2017

PP Writing

Group	Baseline: End of Year Final 2015/2016				End point: End of Year Final 2016/2017				Progress	Expected Progress	Progress Comp	Progress Comp
	Assessment	ARE	ARE Comp	ARE Comp	Assessment	ARE	ARE Comp	ARE Comp				
ALL CHILDREN [1504 100.0%]	15.1	16	-0.9	-	17.7	18.5	-0.8	-	+3.1	+3.0	+0.1	+
Pupil Premium and Service Children [453 30.1%]	15.6	17.3	-1.7	-	18.2	19.9	-1.8	-	+2.9	+3.0	-0.1	-
NOT Pupil Premium and Service Children [1051 69.9%]	14.9	15.4	-0.5	-	17.6	17.9	-0.3	-	+3.2	+3.0	+0.2	+
Pupil Premium [411 27.3%]	15.5	17.3	-1.8	-	18	20	-1.9	-	+2.9	+3.0	-0.1	-
NOT Pupil Premium [1093 72.7%]	15	15.4	-0.5	-	17.6	18	-0.3	-	+3.2	+3.0	+0.2	+
Service Children [63 4.2%]	16.4	17	-0.6	-	19.4	19.9	-0.6	-	+3.0	+3.0	0.0	+
NOT Service Children [1441 95.8%]	15.1	15.9	-0.9	-	17.7	18.4	-0.8	-	+3.1	+3.0	+0.1	+
PP SEN [171 11.4%]	12.8	16.4	-3.6	--	15	19.2	-4.2	--	+2.3	+3.0	-0.7	-
PP NOT SEN [240 16.0%]	17.5	18	-0.5	-	20.1	20.5	-0.3	-	+3.2	+3.0	+0.2	+
NOT PP SEN [192 12.8%]	13.2	15.8	-2.6	-	15.9	18.5	-2.6	-	+2.9	+3.0	-0.1	-
NOT PP NOT SEN [901 59.9%]	15.3	15.4	0.0	=	18	17.8	+0.2	+	+3.3	+3.0	+0.3	+

PP Reading

Group	Baseline: End of Year Final 2015/2016				End point: End of Year Final 2016/2017				Progress	Expected Progress	Progress Comp	Progress Comp
	Assessment	ARE	ARE Comp	ARE Comp	Assessment	ARE	ARE Comp	ARE Comp				
ALL CHILDREN [1504 100.0%]	15.5	16	-0.5	-	18.2	18.5	-0.4	-	+3.1	+3.0	+0.1	+
Pupil Premium and Service Children [453 30.1%]	16	17.3	-1.3	-	18.8	20	-1.2	-	+3.0	+3.0	0.0	=
NOT Pupil Premium and Service Children [1051 69.9%]	15.2	15.4	-0.1	=	17.9	17.9	0.0	=	+3.2	+3.0	+0.2	+
Pupil Premium [411 27.3%]	15.9	17.3	-1.4	-	18.6	20	-1.4	-	+3.0	+3.0	0.0	=
NOT Pupil Premium [1093 72.7%]	15.3	15.5	-0.1	=	18	18	0.0	=	+3.2	+3.0	+0.2	+
Service Children [63 4.2%]	16.8	17	-0.3	-	19.6	19.9	-0.3	-	+3.0	+3.0	0.0	=
NOT Service Children [1441 95.8%]	15.4	15.9	-0.5	-	18.1	18.5	-0.4	-	+3.1	+3.0	+0.1	+
FSM [222 14.8%]	14.3	16.1	-1.7	-	17.2	18.8	-1.6	-	+3.0	+3.0	0.0	+
NOT FSM [1282 85.2%]	15.7	16	-0.3	-	18.3	18.5	-0.2	=	+3.2	+3.0	+0.2	+
PP SEN [171 11.4%]	13.3	16.4	-3.1	--	16.1	19.3	-3.2	--	+2.7	+3.0	-0.3	-
PP NOT SEN [240 16.0%]	17.7	18	-0.3	-	20.4	20.5	-0.1	=	+3.2	+3.0	+0.2	+
NOT PP SEN [192 12.8%]	13.8	15.8	-2.0	-	16.6	18.6	-2.0	-	+2.9	+3.0	-0.1	-
NOT PP NOT SEN [901 59.9%]	15.6	15.4	+0.3	+	18.3	17.8	+0.4	+	+3.3	+3.0	+0.3	+

PP Maths

Group	Baseline: End of Year Final 2015/2016				End point: End of Year Final 2016/2017				Progress	Expected Progress	Progress Comp	Progress Comp
	Assessment	ARE	ARE Comp	ARE Comp	Assessment	ARE	ARE Comp	ARE Comp				
ALL CHILDREN [1504 100.0%]	15.4	16	-0.6	-	17.9	18.5	-0.6	-	+3.0	+3.0	0.0	=
Pupil Premium and Service Children [453 30.1%]	15.8	17.3	-1.4	-	18.4	19.9	-1.5	-	+2.8	+3.0	-0.2	-
NOT Pupil Premium and Service Children [1051 69.9%]	15.1	15.4	-0.2	-	17.7	17.9	-0.2	-	+3.1	+3.0	+0.1	+
Pupil Premium [411 27.3%]	15.7	17.3	-1.6	-	18.2	20	-1.7	-	+2.8	+3.0	-0.2	-
NOT Pupil Premium [1093 72.7%]	15.2	15.4	-0.2	-	17.8	18	-0.2	-	+3.1	+3.0	+0.1	+
Service Children [63 4.2%]	16.8	17	-0.3	-	19.5	19.9	-0.4	-	+2.9	+3.0	-0.1	-
NOT Service Children [1441 95.8%]	15.3	15.9	-0.6	-	17.8	18.4	-0.6	-	+3.0	+3.0	0.0	=
PP SEN [171 11.4%]	13.3	16.4	-3.1	--	15.7	19.2	-3.6	--	+2.4	+3.0	-0.6	-
PP NOT SEN [240 16.0%]	17.5	18	-0.5	-	20	20.5	-0.4	-	+3.1	+3.0	+0.1	+
NOT PP SEN [192 12.8%]	13.8	15.8	-2.0	-	16.4	18.6	-2.1	-	+2.7	+3.0	-0.3	-
NOT PP NOT SEN [901 59.9%]	15.5	15.4	+0.1	=	18.1	17.8	+0.2	+	+3.1	+3.0	+0.1	+

Pupil Premium Making Expected Progress Across the Year to July 2017 (by academy)

Group:	Subjects Combined		Writing					Reading					Mathematics																
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n													
Group: PUPILPREMIUM:YES (411 children)	56.4%	224/397	43.6%	173/397	35.1%	140/399	64.9%	259/399	34.1%	134/393	65.9%	259/393	37.3%	148/397	62.7%	249/397													
					35.1%	140/399	32.3%	129/399	32.6%	130/399	34.1%	134/393	29.8%	117/393	36.1%	142/393	37.3%	148/397	31.0%	123/397	31.7%	126/397							
					7.3%	29/399	27.8%	111/399	32.3%	129/399	28.8%	115/399	3.8%	15/399	5.6%	22/393	28.5%	112/393	29.8%	117/393	30.0%	118/393	6.1%	24/393	7.3%	29/397	30.0%	119/397	31.0%
Group: BEA Beaminster St Mary's Academy (36 children)	54.3%	19/35	45.7%	16/35	22.9%	8/35	77.1%	27/35	34.3%	12/35	65.7%	23/35	45.7%	16/35	54.3%	19/35													
					22.9%	8/35	45.7%	16/35	31.4%	11/35	34.3%	12/35	17.1%	6/35	48.6%	17/35	45.7%	16/35	14.3%	5/35	40.0%	14/35							
					0.0%	0/35	22.9%	8/35	45.7%	16/35	31.4%	11/35	0.0%	0/35	2.9%	1/35	31.4%	11/35	17.1%	6/35	40.0%	14/35	8.6%	3/35	0.0%	0/35	45.7%	16/35	14.3%
Group: DUN Dunbury C of E Academy (12 children)	16.7%	2/12	83.3%	10/12	16.7%	2/12	83.3%	10/12	8.3%	1/12	91.7%	11/12	8.3%	1/12	91.7%	11/12													
					16.7%	2/12	25.0%	3/12	58.3%	7/12	8.3%	1/12	50.0%	6/12	41.7%	5/12	8.3%	1/12	33.3%	4/12	58.3%	7/12							
					0.0%	0/12	16.7%	2/12	25.0%	3/12	50.0%	6/12	8.3%	1/12	0.0%	0/12	8.3%	1/12	50.0%	6/12	33.3%	4/12	8.3%	1/12	0.0%	0/12	8.3%	1/12	33.3%
Group: MAR Marden Vale CE Academy (125 children)	61.2%	71/116	38.8%	45/116	39.0%	46/118	61.0%	72/118	37.7%	43/114	62.3%	71/114	43.1%	50/116	56.9%	66/116													
					39.0%	46/118	18.6%	22/118	42.4%	50/118	37.7%	43/114	25.4%	29/114	36.8%	42/114	43.1%	50/116	31.0%	36/116	25.0%	30/116							
					8.5%	10/118	30.5%	36/118	18.6%	22/118	39.0%	46/118	3.4%	4/118	9.6%	11/114	28.1%	32/114	25.4%	29/114	28.1%	32/114	8.8%	10/114	12.1%	14/116	31.0%	36/116	31.0%
Group: SHR Shrewton CE Primary School (12 children)	83.3%	10/12	16.7%	2/12	83.3%	10/12	16.7%	2/12	58.3%	7/12	41.7%	5/12	50.0%	6/12	50.0%	6/12													
					83.3%	10/12	8.3%	1/12	8.3%	1/12	58.3%	7/12	41.7%	5/12	0.0%	0/12	50.0%	6/12	33.3%	4/12	16.7%	2/12							
					16.7%	2/12	66.7%	8/12	8.3%	1/12	8.3%	1/12	0.0%	0/12	8.3%	1/12	50.0%	6/12	41.7%	5/12	0.0%	0/12	8.3%	1/12	41.7%	5/12	33.3%	4/12	16.7%
Group: SOU Southbrook St James Academy (85 children)	81.2%	69/85	18.8%	16/85	56.5%	48/85	43.5%	37/85	45.8%	38/83	54.2%	45/83	48.2%	41/85	51.8%	44/85													
					56.5%	48/85	25.9%	22/85	17.6%	15/85	45.8%	38/83	28.9%	24/83	25.3%	21/83	48.2%	41/85	34.1%	29/85	17.6%	15/85							
					11.8%	10/85	44.7%	38/85	25.9%	22/85	15.3%	13/85	2.4%	2/85	4.8%	4/83	41.0%	34/83	28.9%	24/83	19.3%	16/83	6.0%	5/83	9.4%	8/85	38.8%	33/85	34.1%

		Subjects Combined		Writing			Reading			Mathematics							
Group: STB St Bartholomew's Primary Academy (75 children)	31.5% 23/73	68.5% 50/73	13.7%	86.3%		19.2%	80.8%		24.7%	75.3%							
			10/73	63/73		14/73	59/73		18/73	55/73							
			13.7%	49.3%	37.0%	19.2%	34.2%	46.6%	24.7%	34.2%	41.1%						
			10/73	36/73	27/73	14/73	25/73	34/73	18/73	25/73	30/73						
			4.1%	9.6%	49.3%	28.8%	8.2%	2.7%	16.4%	34.2%	45.2%	1.4%	4.1%	20.5%	34.2%	39.7%	1.4%
			3/73	7/73	36/73	21/73	6/73	2/73	12/73	25/73	33/73	1/73	3/73	15/73	25/73	29/73	1/73
		Subjects Combined		Writing			Reading			Mathematics							
Group: TRE Trent Young's CE School (4 children)	50.0% 2/4	50.0% 2/4	25.0%	75.0%		25.0%	75.0%		50.0%	50.0%							
			1/4	3/4		1/4	3/4		2/4	2/4							
			25.0%	75.0%	0.0%	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%						
			1/4	3/4	0/4	1/4	1/4	2/4	2/4	2/4	0/4	2/4	0/4	2/4	0/4	0.0%	
			25.0%	0.0%	75.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
			1/4	0/4	3/4	0/4	0/4	1/4	0/4	1/4	2/4	0/4	1/4	0/4	2/4	0/4	0/4
		Subjects Combined		Writing			Reading			Mathematics							
Group: TRI The Trinity CE Primary Academy (49 children)	41.7% 20/48	58.3% 28/48	22.9%	77.1%		25.0%	75.0%		20.8%	79.2%							
			11/48	37/48		12/48	36/48		10/48	38/48							
			22.9%	39.6%	37.5%	25.0%	39.6%	35.4%	20.8%	31.3%	47.9%						
			11/48	19/48	18/48	12/48	19/48	17/48	10/48	15/48	23/48						
			4.2%	18.8%	39.6%	33.3%	4.2%	0.0%	25.0%	39.6%	29.2%	6.3%	2.1%	18.8%	31.3%	43.8%	4.2%
			2/48	9/48	19/48	16/48	2/48	0/48	12/48	19/48	14/48	3/48	1/48	9/48	15/48	21/48	2/48
		Subjects Combined		Writing			Reading			Mathematics							
Group: WHI Whitesheet C of E Primary Academy (13 children)	66.7% 8/12	33.3% 4/12	33.3%	66.7%		50.0%	50.0%		33.3%	66.7%							
			4/12	8/12		6/12	6/12		4/12	8/12							
			33.3%	58.3%	8.3%	50.0%	16.7%	33.3%	33.3%	41.7%	25.0%						
			4/12	7/12	1/12	6/12	2/12	4/12	4/12	5/12	3/12						
			8.3%	25.0%	58.3%	8.3%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	16.7%	25.0%	8.3%	8.3%	25.0%	41.7%	25.0%	0.0%
			1/12	3/12	7/12	1/12	0/12	2/12	4/12	2/12	3/12	1/12	1/12	3/12	5/12	3/12	0/12

- The progress of pupils eligible for PP is strongest in Dunbury, St Bartholomew's and The Trinity, with the pupils eligible for PP at Dunbury making slightly better progress than their peers, who are not eligible for PP, in all three subjects.
- Marden Vale and Southbroom St James have large numbers of pupils eligible for PP and as these are not making expected progress this has impacted on the overall Trust percentage.