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Data:

On the premise that starting points for PP students and non PP students are different – I have analysed the gap in terms of the target gap and the actual gap in this first round of data.

**Table 1: Y7**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 5 x 9 - 5 | 5 x 9 - 4 | Attainment 8 |
| Target | - 10 | -5 | -3.21 |
| Autumn | - 16 | - 6 | -5.88 |

Those PP students below target are deliberately targeted for interventions in the English TIPs. Discuss with TLs the deliberate targeting of y7 PP students following their data entry via LMM, although standard progress is broadly as expected. 100 Club Progress also to be reviewed. 2 resilience improving workshops are being run this term to improve self-esteem and to engage students in smart thinking. The feedback from the study skills workshop run for all Y7 pp students in September had very positive feedback. These workshops target identified learning barriers. 14/20 students chosen are PP students.

**Table 2: Y8**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 5 x 9 - 5 | 5 x 9 - 4 | Attainment 8 |
| Target | - 9 | +1 | -1.82 |
| Autumn | - 9 | - 8 | -5.82 |

The attainment gap in this year group is affected by the bottom set English and Humanities group, where access has been an issue. The group is deliberately small to increase contact time, and the SENCO is working with staff involved to endure high quality differentiation. Mr Taylor will do a deliberate piece of work with CHU, OWE and HSR over the next 3 weeks and we will monitor the impact of this work in the next data capture. The pastoral team are also running a five week project called the Good Man project – designed by the Youth Council to motivate and engage boys who demonstrate poor motivation through their behaviour. 5/10 are PP students who are underachieving and who have high behaviour points.

**Table 3: Y9**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 5 x 9 - 5 | 5 x 9 - 4 | Attainment 8 |
| Target | -29 | -30 | -11.65 |
| Autumn | -20 | -30 | -12.00 |

In Year 9 students are achieving as expected, with PP students achieving good rather than standard passes, progressing a bit better than expected. Good practice is seen in the TIPs of English and social sciences where underachieving students have been particularly targeted for interventions.

There is a particular, small cohort of y9 boys, who are both PP and SEN for whom an alternative curriculum is being sought as these students move into KS4. This is because accessibility of the curriculum for these boys is currently very difficult. Entry level qualifications are currently being explored and will be utilised to support the needs of those students, even though they do not meet accountability qualifications.

**Year 10 data** – will be available after the mock exams in March.

**Table 4: Y11**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | No of Students |  | Attainment 8 | Progress 8 | %9-5 in both En&Ma | %9-4 in both En&Ma |
| Pupil Premium | 20 | Targets | 52.25 | 1.44 | 75% | 80% |
| 20 | Autumn | 44.25 | 0.59 | 30% | 60% |
| 20 | Mock results | 31.85 | -0.59 | 15% | 20% |
| 20 | Spring | 43.33 | 0.51 | 30% | 55% |
| Non-Pupil Premium | 94 | Targets | 60.95 | 1.43 | 91% | 95% |
| 94 | Autumn | 54.66 | 0.72 | 65% | 86% |
| 94 | Mock results | 44.06 | -0.38 | 24% | 52% |
| 94 | Spring | 54.12 | 0.66 | 62% | 85% |
| Pupil Premium Gap | - | Target | -8.70 | 0.01 | -16% | -15% |
| - | Autumn | -10.41 | -0.13 | -35% | -26% |
| - | Mock results | -12.21 | -0.22 | -9% | -32% |
| - | Spring | -10.79 | -0.15 | -32% | -30% |

Whilst the gap seems pronounced, this is a very small cohort and each individual’s achievement counts as a whole 5 point. We are not happy with the current outcomes, but targets for attainment are not far off, and the P8 figures show the same pattern as for non Pp students. This year – all PP y11 students have had an individual mentor. Many Y11 PP students (11/20) have had 1 to 1 tuition sessions in either English or Maths or both. Subject TIPs show deliberate targeting of PP students in BE, English, Art and MFL.

**Y12 and Y13**

There are 15 students in Y12 designated as disadvantaged and 9 students in Y13 designated as disadvantaged. There are a number of interventions that support all students in the 6th form such as additional wellbeing support from Julie and her team, usually resulting in an assessment being completed and an intervention such as access to WAVES or external support being added. 6/12 students supported in WAVES are designated disadvantaged. In addition, there are whole school 6th form interventions that inevitably include disadvantaged students, such as use of Period 5 privilege of being able to leave early if they have not got a lesson, which many of our 6th form take to add to part time work – essential for those who are disadvantaged students – however, departments can take this privilege away of students need additional one to one support. In addition we run a Sixth Form bursary available for low income students.

The impact of this work shows that there is no real difference in the APS scores achieved between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students – the average grade is a C no matter which of these two groups a student is, but there is a significant gap in the value added scores for A level students rather than Btec students, with non-disadvantaged students are scoring 0.13 and disadvantaged students are scoring -0.28. This does not take into account BTEC subjects, where there is less pronounced gap. However, 15/24 students are identified are taking full level 3 Btecs, 3/24 are taking a mix of single certificate Btec and a levels, leaving 6/24 taking A levels only. Hence the significance of the gap in value added is extremely small.

**Table 5: Attendance**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | Aut term 2017 | Aut term 2017 (with outliers removed) |
| Wh Sch | 95.3% | 95.4% | 95.1% | 95.1% |
| PP | 92.4% | 93.2% | 91.5% | 94.2% |

PP attendance has taken a dip this year. However, the bottom two PP attenders in each year group have a narrative behind them that explains the issues.

**Table 6: case study narrative of two attendance PP outliers in each year group:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Year group | Case studies – outliers  Attendance data | Narrative |
| 7 | CM – 75%  JZ – 79% | Medical PNI – multiple medical appointments each week. Life expectancy is below 18 years.  Sudden family bereavement. Outside agency support. |
| 8 | HBS – 75%  BE – 84% | CP background due to parents ‘tug of war’ and emotional impact. MECES referral.  Family bereavement. Unauthorised holiday taken. PN issued. |
| 9 | HT – 62%  GW – 85% | Multiple SC referrals for neglect. DV background in family – Mum moved to Chelmsford but wants him to stay here for nurture. Multiple home visits to address all issues.  Family bereavement. Family home eviction. |
| 10 | SS – 66%  AL – 40% | Family eviction – difficulties in getting to school. Mum’s illness – both physical and mental health issues.  LAC (section 20) on roll for one half term – changed placement three times – kept running back to Haringey to Mum. Eventually removed by H SC for re-accommodation assessment in Haringey. |
| 11 | JS – 38%  FF – 68% | Long term school refuser due to sudden bereavement and subsequent refusal to engage with any outside agencies – although Mum did and Mum has been consistently supportive. FS involved. PNs issued.  Medical issue – diagnosis and evidence supplied – long term sick. (Spinal nerve damage). |

When these students are removed – PP attendance continues to be an upward trajectory across three years.

**Behaviour:**

We have very few FTE – 14 in total in 2016 – 2017. However, of those 12 of the students were PP. We also had 1 permanent exclusion – and again this was a PP student. This year we have extended the consequences that fall between an individual teacher’s jurisdiction and a whole school viewpoint. The Behaviour and Standards team and SLT run additional detention times after school, called 3 – 4, the Headteacher and Deputies run a Friday after school Headteacher’s Detention, which is about reflection and students taking responsibility for re – setting themselves on their school journey and we have increased the scope of our wellbeing interventions designed to have an impact on behaviour. These are whole school policies and not just aimed at PP. For example, 4/8 students currently accessing the Vocational Centre during curriculum time are PP and of those, all are responding well to practical learning and ¾ have shown a positive impact on their behaviour statistics. A 5th PP student will be joining the cohort shortly, and this is to help cement the progress he has already made in improving his behaviour, through the intense mentoring provided by the VC.

In the autumn term of 2017 – 2018, the impact shows that PP students tend to accumulate more behaviour points as a group, but this is because 3/4 of the students with the most behaviour points are PP. As outliers, if they are taken out of the statistics, then there is a much more even spread of behaviour points between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students. In addition, whilst we have had a rise in the number of students FTE in the Autumn Term 2017 – 2018, there has been a drop in the percentage of PP students FTE with 3/ 10 students being PP and no recidivism. There have been no permanent exclusions in this year to date.

Jenny Comerford, January 2018