**Pupil Premium update report for Standards and Performance Committee**

May 2018

**What are our overall strategies for improving attainment? (Matched against Sutton Trust – best strategies for narrowing the gap)**

**Quality Teaching First. Always.** : What happens in the classroom makes the biggest difference: improving teaching quality generally leads to greater improvements at lower cost than structural changes. Our Performance Management systems, Team Improvement Plans and CPD has been utilised to help individuals have time to reflect on their teaching and to employ up to date and relevant techniques in the classroom. The impact of our new systems in these areas, should show an impact in raised attainment across all students.

**High EXPECTATIONS:** We have never confused eligibility for the Pupil Premium with low ability and we have focused on all pupils achieving at the highest levels as shown by the data sets.

**Effective FEEDBACK:** we arefocused on giving pupils, clear, constructive feedback about their work and how to improve.

**Always Reflecting. Always Changing:** use achievement data to frequently check whether interventions were working and made adjustments when needed.

**Get Everyone Involved:** we have a designated senior leader to oversee Pupil Premium and we involve governors in the decision-making and evaluation process. We ensure all class and subject leaders know which pupils are eligible for Pupil Premium so they can take responsibility for accelerating their progress.

**What are our barriers for PP attainment? And what do we do to mitigate those issues?**

1. Wide range of attainment starting points (on average clustered at the lower ability end – hence the starting target gap in each year group) – therefore, quality teaching across the range and particular emphasis on the transition points to give students support as they come into the school and as they get into Y11. This is required initially to set high expectations, and then provide intensive support as resilience to extreme stress factors are less likely to be prevalent in disadvantaged students. This is based on Sutton Trust Research, and on our own findings that exam stress is much more noticeable in our disadvantaged students than our non-disadvantaged students.
2. Some of our PP students have no KS2 data making them ineligible for P8 data, although their attainment 8 data is counted.
3. Lower rates of attendance – careful tracking of PA PP students – making the Interventions team aware of the issue and ensuring carefully constructed interventions to remove the barriers to attendance are constructed and reviewed regularly. This is evidenced by the detailed case studies provided to governors in the attendance data for this committee.
4. Lower parental engagement. Try very hard to do whatever we can to engage with hard to reach parents e.g. home visits etc. Again, this is evidenced by the detailed case studies provided to governors in the attendance data for this committee.
5. More likely to have CP issues in their background. To share issues via our safeguarding Board so that we are aware when opportunities for further support arise. And again, this is evidenced by the detailed case studies provided to governors in the attendance data for this committee.

The data here shows that the national gaps across all types of school (including those designated outstanding) are:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **National gap** | **Our current y11 gap SPRING** | **Our current y10 gap SPRING** |
| Attainment 8 | -11.0 | -11 | -7.37 |
| Progress 8 | -0.3 | -0.15 | -0.15 |
| A\* – C Eng. and Ma. | -33.9 | -33 (Good passes); -34 (standard pass) | -28 (Gp), -22 (st P) |

**Data:**

As for January, 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 round of data.

**Table 1: Y7**

Pupil Premium students (13% of year group) have improved projections across all measures, however as non-pupil premium students have matched this trend the PP Gap has increased incrementally, and the gap has also widened, although this is incremental rather than a large deterioration.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 5 x 9 - 5 | 5 x 9 - 4 | Attainment 8 |
| Target | - 10 | -5 | -3.21 |
| Autumn | - 16 | - 6 | -5.88 |
| Spring | -19 | -7 | -6.68 |

The Team Improvement Plans (TIPs) show how some departments are targeting individual students, and many of them are either Pp students or more able students, some of whom are also PP. For example, the English TIP details the improvements made by targeting students via the 100 club, the majority of whom are PP students. The next stage of our work as SLT will be to work through line management to ensure that this individual targeting of students is replicated in everyone’s TIP across the range of students, as this is our preferred tool for checking and recording our general strategies as a school for closing the gap.

**Table 2: Y8**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 5 x 9 - 5 | 5 x 9 - 4 | Attainment 8 |
| Target | - 9 | +1 | -1.82 |
| Autumn | - 9 | - 8 | -5.82 |
| Spring | -13 | -5 | -5.65 |

Projections for PP are still below target (though have improved slightly since autumn for standard pass and attainment 8). Around the time of the autumn report we were running two pieces of work – firstly targeting the bottom sets in English and Humanities, and secondly targeting 5 male PP students from that group with the Goodman group – the objective of which was to help students make better choices about behaviour for example, as this was highlighted as an issue in our last report.. The same 5 students were the focus of interventions from departments across the board following the autumn data.

In terms of impact of these initiatives,it is hard to isolate the variables. However, there has been an improvement in behaviour of most of the individuals involved, since the Goodman project. For example, one key student AP had 37 behaviour points in the autumn term and accrued 12 behaviour point in the spring term. In the new data set, analysis shows none of those PP students requiring whole curriculum interventions for attainment, 3/5 still being identified as having poor attitude to learning across the curriculum (and 1 further newly named PP student in this data) and 3 newly identified PP students as struggling with PREP and finally 3/5 of the previously identified students continuing to struggle with maintaining satisfactory attendance. This shows the variety of issues identified.

The two autumn projects have possibly been more impactful in Humanities rather than English. There have been specific issues in the English class for these students, with some teacher absence that has impacted on their progress. However, the techniques being used to raise confidence of our average students (for example ensuring feedback is clearly and acted upon) is clearly serving the ‘average student’ whether PP or non PP very well. As with all data sets, the key will be for departments to focus on the 3 PP students, who have shown little improvement since the autumn term, and then on the 3 newly identified PP students in the Spring term, understand the barriers to their achievement and putting in department led interventions to try and raise their attainment. Again, this is clear steer for SLT line management and our learning walks, and our records in the department TIPs.

A cautionary note is that of those 6 targeted students for the Spring term: 5/6 have long term Child Protection issues in their backgrounds and much of the support in school is about meeting their basic needs rather than being able to target them for aspirational work (consider Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs).

**Table 3: Y9**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 5 x 9 - 5 | 5 x 9 - 4 | Attainment 8 |
| Target | -29 | -30 | -11.65 |
| Autumn | -20 | -30 | -12.00 |
| Spring | -15 | -35 | -12.30 |

Whilst Pupil Premium overall continues to show a gap, this gap is significantly diminishing in English, although English have been more successful with the lower ability students and Maths have been marginally more successful with the ‘average’ prior attainment students. In preparation for their alternative timetables in KS4, 4 PP students, who are also SEN have been receiving 5 additional learning support lessons per fortnight. Arguably the work in these sessions better supports their progress in English than any other subject, because the work is English based. Next year all four students will have a totally bespoke timetable, albeit in school, to mitigate clear access issues that have been prevalent since entry to the school.

**Table 4: Year 10**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 5 x 9 – 5 +En/Ma | 5 x 9 – 4 + En/Ma | Attainment 8 | Progress 8 |
| Target | -8 | -5 | -5.10 | 0 |
| Spring | -28 | -22 | -7.34 | -0.15 |

PP students have a positive P8 but the gap between them and the non PP is -0.15 for progress and a 0.7 grades for attainment (although the target gap was already 0.5 of a grade). This year group have an abnormally high number of CP profiles and poor attendance profiles. Of the 30 PP students, 18 have CP profiles and of those 3 have the most serious CP profiles in the school. The support for these students is extremely high aimed at positive mindsets, high interaction with parents and key targeted support for them as individuals. However, the SEND profile of the PP group is small – only 3/30 students identified as having learning needs, and therefore, providing we can keep our most severely disadvantaged (due to outside circumstances) in school, we should see positive improvement over time, and especially as individual departments target these students through interventions.

**Table 5: Y11**

**In this table, we have reported the actual attainment data as well as the data against targets.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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% |
|  | Autumn | 44.25 | 0.59 | 30% | 60% |
|  | Mock results | 31.85 | -0.59 | 15% | 20% |
|  | Spring | 43.33 | 0.51 | 30% | 55% |
|  |  | Summer | 41.8% | 0.35 | 35% | 35% |
| Non-Pupil Premium | 94 | Targets | 60.95 | 1.43 | 91% | 95% |
|  | Autumn | 54.66 | 0.72 | 65% | 86% |
|  | Mock results | 44.06 | -0.38 | 24% | 52% |
|  | Spring | 54.12 | 0.66 | 62% | 85% |
|  |  | Summer | 51.8 | 0.50 | 61% | 61% |
| 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% |
|  |  | Summer | -11 | -0.15 | -33% | -34% |
| National Gap |  |  | -11 | -0.3 | -32 | x |
| Our expected gap |  |  | -11 | -1.15 | -30 | x |

Summer analysis: PP have a positive P8 but the gap between them and the non PP is -0.15 for progress and a 1.1 grades for attainment (although the target gap was already 0.9 of a grade). 14/20 students have received key one to one tuition in English and /or Maths. The vast majority of these students have made progress in their Math and /or English from when they started, but remain below target grade.

Of those students who have received one to one tuition the average data across all 14 students reads:

**Table 5a**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **One to one tuition in:** | **Starting point grade** | **Current grade** | **Target grade** |
| English | 2.8 | 3.7 | 4.8 |
| Maths | 1.8 | 2.8 | 4.7 |

**Y12 and Y13**

This is the same report as autumn as there is no significant movement in the 6th form grades for disadvantaged students as compared to non-disadvantaged students.

**Table 6: Attendance**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | Aut term 2017 | Aut term 2017 (with outliers removed) | Spring term 18 | Spring term 18 with outliers removed. |
| Wh Sch | 95.3% | 95.4% | 95.1% |  | 94.9% |  |
| PP | 92.4% | 93.2% | 91.5% | 94.2% | 91% | 94.8% |

Like, whole school attendance, PP attendance has taken a dip this year mainly due to two significant and prolonged flu/cold outbreaks in the winter, which have been more impactful this year than previous years. However, without the outliers as case studied in the autumn report, PP are on a par with the rest of the school in terms of attendance. (Also see case studies in the Attendance report – the majority of whom are PP students.)

Strategy – target Y 8 PP students who are PA, offering a cash incentive for improved attendance to both student and family:

**Table 6a**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTENDANCE CHALLENGE** | |  | |  | |  | | | |  |
| **5th March - 27th April 2018** | |  |  | |  | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | |  | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |  | | |
| **Student** | YR | ATT @ 5/3/18 | 6 Wk Att % | ATT @ 27/4/18 | | IMPACT | | |
| **HB** | 8 | 54.8% | 89.6% | 62.8% | | 8.0% | | |
| **HS** | 8 | 69.2% | 72.4% | 69.7% | | 0.5% | | |
| **LF** | 8 | 74.0% | 79.3% | 75.0% | | 1.0% | | |
| **RB** | 8 | 82.6% | 95.1% | 86.8% | | 4.2% | | |
| **OL** | 8 | 82.6% | 96.5% | 85.6% | | 3.0% | | |
| **TJ** | 8 | 81.2% | 91.3% | 84.4% | | 3.2% | | |
| **SS** | 8 | 83.1% | 77.5% | 82.9% | | 0.2% | | |
| **BE** | 8 | 83.6% | 91.3% | 85.3% | | 1.6% | | |
| **RM** | 8 | 83.6% | 63.7% | 79.1% | | 4.5% | | |

Vouchers issued to those two who manged attendance above 95% target for the time period of the trial.

**Impact:**

Average attendance of students group at start of trial - 77.1%

Average attendance of students group at end of trial – 79%

Cost - £120.00

**Behaviour:**

**Spring term behaviour statistics in relation to PP: 17.9% of our students in Y7 – 11 are designated as PP (March 2018)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of consequence** | **Number of times PP students have accessed the consequence** | **% number of times a PP student has accessed the consequence.** |
| 3 – 4 detentions | 14/47 | 29.7% |
| Headteacher’s detention | 14/40 | 35% |
| Blue Room isolation | 52/116 | 44.8% |

Although the data shows that there are higher numbers of PP students accessing higher level consequences than Non PP students, PP students are not MORE likely to access a consequence. This is a change from previous figures, which showed PP students more likely to access consequences. PP students are no longer more likely to be recidivists that non PP students. This shows a clear impact of the support practices employed by the pastoral team when working with disadvantaged young people.

Jenny Comerford, January 2018