

Pupil premium Strategy Impact Review – September 2018

A. Review of Impact and Expenditure				
Previous Academic Year			2017-18	
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
<p>A: Increased attainment in Maths for disadvantaged students, particularly underachievers in current year 11.</p> <p>Currently there are 6 students in Maths and 2 students in English below a 4. There are 16 in Maths and 10 in English below a Grade 5.</p> <p>9 PP students in English are more than 2 grades of target. 11 students in Maths.</p>	Splitting the year group (7 form entry) teaching of Maths into 8 teaching groups.	<p><u>Low Impact</u> <i>P8 Maths rose from 0.0 to +0.10 ('Good' judgement), however gap to English remains significant, especially at 5+ threshold.</i></p>	<p><i>Approach will continue, but with greater oversight quality of teaching and learning across the Maths department.</i></p>	£60,000

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
A: Increased attainment in Maths for the disadvantaged students who are 2 more grades below their target grade in year 11. P8 score for Disadv students in excess of +0.5	1:1 / small group Maths lessons, additional to timetabled lesson. DTT approach for all students. SMART resources specific to student needs eg Pixl App in Maths. Each student below 4 and 5 threshold on a specific plan in Maths.	<u>Low Impact</u> <i>P8 Maths rose from 0.0 to +0.10 ('Good' judgement), however gap to English remains significant, especially at 5+ threshold.</i>	<i>Maths PP intervention to continue but with greater oversight and strategic planning and implementation. Groups need to be selective and targeted. Gaps in understanding to be analysed and used to inform constant review of intervention programme.</i>	(see below)
A: Increased attainment in foundation subjects disadvantaged students who are 2 or more grades below their target grade in year 11. P8 score in Ebacc element of +0.5. P8 score in Open slots +0.4	Strategy group management.	<u>High Impact</u> <i>Overall success, as overall P8 for PP students rose from +0.31 to +0.64.</i> <i>P8 in Ebacc is +1.03</i> <i>P8 in Open Slots + 0.25</i>	<i>Maintain strategy group to oversee all aspects of PP work.</i>	(see below)
B: Staff to have thorough knowledge of who disadvantaged students are and their targets/strategies for specific support and improvement.	Strategy Group. CPD and sharing of Priorities. Monitoring Seating Plans Learning walks. Disadv strategy group to ensure that we meet the needs of all 41 PP students in year 11. Students will be interviewed, and prioritised for intervention / careers advice. Disadv students have full resources and support in place to enable effective revision.	<u>Medium Impact</u> <i>More CPD needed on sharing PP foci with wider staff.</i> <i>Student interview process brought about success with certain students but requires more precision and implementation.</i> <i>Improved revision outcomes achieved, as evidenced by overall P8 rise.</i>	<i>PP Coordinator and Strategy Group need greater visibility to staff.</i> <i>Holistic approach needed to intervene on behalf of individual PP students.</i> <i>Knowledge of PP students must be a priority for all staff.</i>	(see below)

<p>A: Reading intervention prioritised in year 7 and year 8 will improve reading skills; student's reading mileage and their attitude towards reading.</p>	<p>1:1 intervention of students identified by SENCO / English department.</p>	<p><u>High Impact</u> <i>Summer exam results for English: Year 8 PP & SEN students 83% at or above target. Year 7 PP & SEN students 90% at or above target.</i></p>	<p><i>Will continue, with continued oversight and constant review by PP Strategy Group.</i></p>	<p>(see below)</p>
Total budgeted cost				<p>£75,000</p>

<p>iii. Other approaches</p>				
<p>Desired outcome</p>	<p>Chosen action / approach</p>	<p>Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.</p>	<p>Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)</p>	<p>Cost</p>
<p>C: Increased participation and engagement in school life. Extra-curricular activities eg. Sporting, music/ drama, debating, cultural trips in Year 10 and 11 Aspirations. Staff to ensure that PP students are offered and taking up the same opportunities as non PP students.</p>	<p>PP co-ordinator to work through the Pastoral team school structure. School effectiveness group contribution from PP co-ordinator. Tutors, HOY along with other staff who are organising extra-curricular events will ensure that the number of PP participating equates to the number of pp in the school (17.6%).</p>	<p><u>Low Impact</u> <i>Serviam Passport data shows that PP students did not meet this target.</i></p>	<p><i>Tutors need greater understanding of this aspect of their role. Serviam Passport data to be closely monitored by Tutors, Strategy Team and HOYs.</i></p>	
Total budgeted cost				<p>£44,880</p>