

## Review of Pupil Premium Funding 2015 – 2016

We fully appreciate that no single intervention provides a complete solution to the complex educational issues in any school and it is therefore important that we operate a multi-faceted approach. We feel that this offers the best opportunity for pupils to succeed. However, we do believe that one key to diminishing the difference between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students is the careful and thorough monitoring and tracking of individual pupils. This process is carried out formally after each assessment point by Senior Leaders and Subject Leaders, but is monitored constantly by the class teachers so that drops in progress are identified immediately and strategies are put in place at classroom level to support the child in removing any barriers to their progress.

### Summer 2016 GCSE results (unvalidated)

#### Context

The Pupil Premium Funding is provided to schools to close the gap between the progress of Pupil Premium Pupils (Disadvantaged) and Non Pupil Premium pupils. Historically the trend is for disadvantaged pupils to make less progress than their peers.

The cohort of 2015-2016 was 152 pupils consisting of 38 Pupil Premium pupils and 114 Non Pupil Premium pupils. On entering the average KS2 level for Pupil Premium Pupils and Non Pupil Premium pupils was 4b (with the average Precise KS2 points of 26.67 and 27.77 respectively) The Progress for Pupil Premium pupils and Non Pupil Premium pupils at KS2 was 2.58 levels and 2.89 levels. A gap of -0.31 levels. This means that on entering secondary school in Year 7 the Pupil Premium pupils on average had made one third of a level less progress.

#### Results 2016

The Headline Results were

- % pupils A\*-C in Maths and English
- % pupils achieving the E-Bacc qualification **22.4%** (A\*-C in Maths, English, Science, Geography or History and a language)
- Progress 8 **-0.24**
- Pupils achieving 5A\*- C is no longer a Headline Figure but it was **51.6%**

The levels of progress that each child makes across 8 subjects is now the main headline piece of data and is called the Progress 8 score.

The Breakdown for Pupil Premium pupils compared to Non Pupil Premium Pupils is shown below.

### English

2016 Results	Number of pupils	Average Grade	3 Levels of Progress	4 Levels of Progress	5 Levels of Progress
All Pupils		<b>C</b>	<b>66.2%</b>	<b>31.5%</b>	<b>6.2%</b>
Pupil Premium		<b>C-</b>	<b>69.7%</b>	<b>30.3%</b>	<b>3.0%</b>
Non Pupil Premium		<b>C+</b>	<b>64.9%</b>	<b>32.0%</b>	<b>7.2%</b>

The gap between Pupil Premium Pupils and Non Pupil Premium pupils in English was + 4.8% at 3 levels of progress which is good but Pupil Premium Pupils do not seem to make as much progress when we look at 4 and 5 Levels of Progress.

### Maths

2016 Results	Average Grade	3 Levels of Progress	4 Levels of Progress	5 Levels of Progress
All Pupils (152)	<b>C-</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>21.3%</b>	<b>8.1%</b>
Pupil Premium (38)	<b>D</b>	<b>39.5%</b>	<b>10.5%</b>	<b>2.6%</b>
Non Pupil Premium (124)	<b>C-</b>	<b>65.9%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>10%</b>

Pupil Premium pupils massively underperformed compared to Non Pupil Premium pupils in Maths. The gap was 26.4% at 3 levels of progress, 14.5% at 4 levels of progress and 7.4% at 5 levels of progress.

### E-Bacc

2016 Results	Pupils taking the E-Bacc	% of pupils taking the E-Bacc	Pupils achieving the E-Bacc	% achieving the E-Bacc
All Pupils	50	32.7%	35	22.9%
Pupil Premium	13	<b>34.2%</b>	9	<b>23.7%</b>

Non Pupil Premium	37	32.4%	26	22.6%
-------------------	----	-------	----	-------

The percentage of Pupil Premium pupils achieving the E-bacc is higher than that of those who are Non Pupil Premium

### Attainment 8/Progress 8

Attainment 8 is a pupil's average score for the 8 qualifying subjects. Schools are aiming to achieve a Progress 8 score of 0.00 or above. A score of 0.50 or below is a major concern.

2016 Result	Average Attainment 8 score	Average Progress 8 score
All Pupils (148)	47.80	-0.24
Pupil Premium (38)	44.12	-0.35
Non pupil Premium (110)	49.01	-0.21

As a cohort on average pupils Progress 8 score was lower than others achieving the same KS2 scores nationally. The Pupil Premium pupils are -0.14 lower on average than the Non Pupil Premium pupils.

Pupil Premium children achieved 0.49 less than Non Pupil Premium children when looking at attainment but this does not take in to account their starting points from KS2 and progress made.

### Progress across all Subjects

2016 Result	3 LOP	4 LOP	5 LOP
All Pupils (148)	62.2%	28.5%	9.1%
Pupil Premium (38)	59.5%	26.3%	5.0%
Non Pupil Premium (110)	63.1%	29.3%	10.5%

Pupil Premium pupils are not making the same amount of progress across all subjects than their Non Pupil Premium classmates.

### SEND across all subjects

2016 Results	3 LOP	4 LOP	5 LOP
All Pupils (20)	62.2%	28.5%	9.1%
Pupil Premium (4)	16%	0%	0%
Non Pupil Premium (16)	37.3%	13.6%	6.4%

SEND pupils on the whole have made far less progress than other pupils in the cohort and those pupils that are SEND and Pupil Premium have made even less progress. A gap of 46.2% at 3 levels of progress is unacceptable.

### More Able Pupils

2016 Results	3 LOP	4 LOP	5 LOP
All Pupils (27)	69.1%	41.6%	17.5%
Pupil Premium (4)	75%	40%	10%
Non Pupil Premium (16)	68.1%	41.9%	18.8%

More Able Pupil Premium pupils exceeded their Non Pupil Premium More Able counterparts at 3 levels of progress which is the minimum expected of these pupils. However, as we look at 4 and 5 levels of progress they do not match the Non Pupil Premium Pupils. They are really expected to achieve 4 or 5 levels of progress.

### Girls

2016 Results	3 LOP	4 LOP	5 LOP
All Pupils (79)	62.7%	25.9%	5.5%
Pupil Premium (23)	64.4%	28.4%	7.1%
Non Pupil Premium (56)	61.9%	24.8%	4.8%

### Boys

2016 Results	3 LOP	4 LOP	5 LOP
All Pupils (73)	61.6%	31.7%	13.4%
Pupil Premium (15)	51.1%	22.6%	1.5%
Non Pupil Premium (58)	64.3%	34.0%	16.4%

Girls who are entitled to Pupil Premium have made more progress than the Non Pupil Premium girls at 3, 4, and 5 Levels of Progress. However, boys who are eligible for Pupil Premium have not made as much progress as their Non Pupil Premium counterparts. This is a group that we will need to monitor more closely.

Table 3 - Reduction in gap between disadvantaged pupils and other pupils nationally over the last three years on headline measures

	National other pupils 2015	PP HCHS 2014	PP HCHS 2015	PP HCHS 2016	Gap with National other pupils 2014	Gap with National other pupils 2015	Gap with National other pupils 2016	diff in gap between our PP and national 'other pupils' 2015-16	diff in gap between our PP and national 'other pupils' 2014-16
<b>3+ English</b>	74	73	66	66	-1	-8	-8	0	-7
<b>4+ English</b>	34	39	22	45	5	-12	11	23	6
<b>3+ Maths</b>	72	35	25	40	-37	-47	-32	15	5
<b>4+ Maths</b>	35	8	0	11	-27	-35	-24	11	3
<b>Basics</b>	65	26	39.4	45	-39	-25.6	-20	5.6	19
<b>5EM</b>	63	22	39.4	42	-41	-23.6	-21	2.6	20
<b>Capped 8</b>	326	243	271	294	-83	-55	-32	23	51
<b>VA</b>	976	969	942	988	-7	-34	12	46	19
<b>prog 8</b>	0.12	-0.66	-0.82	-0.35	-0.78	-0.94	-0.47	0.47	0.31
<b>att 8</b>	52	34	41	44	-18	-11	-8	3	10
<b>achieving Ebacc</b>	29.2	4	6.1	28	-25.2	-23.1	-1.2	21.9	24

2015 national progress 8 for disadvantaged was

0.4

2015 national attainment 8 for disadvantaged was 0.39

2015 national progress 8 for disadvantaged was 0.4

2015 national attainment 8 for disadvantaged was 0.39

## Summary

In some subject areas and in particular progress measures there is no Gap when you look at 3 Levels of Progress. In fact in some areas those pupils who are eligible for Pupil Premium funding made greater progress than their Non Pupil Premium classmates. This includes English, Girls and the More Able Pupils (small number). However, in these areas, other than the More Able, the Pupil Premium Pupils seemed to do just enough but did not do as well when it came to 4 and 5 Levels of Progress.

In Maths, SEND and Boys the Non Pupil Premium Pupils made significantly more progress than the Pupil Premium Pupils. These are areas that need to be monitored and improved in the future.

## Review of Pupil Premium Spend

### The four key objectives:

1. Transition: to improve transition and attainment outcomes for PP\* students to ensure attainment is in line with or exceeding expected levels of progress both at transition from KS2 and Post 16
2. Literacy and Numeracy: to maintain the reading scheme intervention to improve the reading age of students whose reading age is below national average and improve levels of numeracy for PP students
3. Engagement: to improve curriculum engagement and academic achievement for PP students
4. Attendance: to implement strategies addressing the attendance gap between for PP non PP students

<b>Key Objective 1: Transition: to improve transition and attainment outcomes for PP* students to ensure attainment is in line with or exceeding expected levels of progress</b>	
<b>Action 1: Deployment of HLTAs in Maths, English and Science/ Learning Mentor</b>	
LM contracted to support intervention.	

Intervention specialist teachers employed to remove barriers to learning, engage parents and enhance academic progress, working with students who are below national expectation of attainment for Eng. /ma.					
<p><b>Rational</b> : Sutton document ‘One-to-one tutoring+5 months moderate impact’  <i>‘For pupils eligible for free school meals (FSM) with lower prior attainment, those who received tuition were more likely to achieve Level 4 at KS2 and to make two levels of progress than those who did not receive tuition.’</i>  Evaluation of the Making Good Progress Pilot (2010). DCSF Research Report RR184. PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) LLP.</p>					
<b>Dates</b>	<b>Person responsible</b>	<b>Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<b>COST</b>	<b>Success Criteria</b>	
Sept 2015	LGT/JCN & SLs of En/Ma	Tracking and monitoring data of PP cohort via data collection, student feedback.  Lesson observation schedule of intervention lessons as part of PM.	<b>Per hr rate for HLTAs</b> £31,242.56 <b>&amp; Learning Mentor</b> K.Whittaker £21592 Tutor Trust tuition for identified cohorts in year 7	A reduction in the attainment gap of PP and non non PP students in year 7 from June 2015 – June 2016 in mathematics and English levels	The Attainment gap between pupil premium pupils and non pupil premium pupils in year 7 has closed further. On entering the school PP pupils were on average 1 sub level below those non PP pupils. Whilst the use of the Learning mentor to carryout the 1 to 1 intervention has a positive impact this will be reviewed to include the Learning Mentor within the Core lessons for greater rates of progress for the pupils including the More Able
<b>Action 2: Summer School Y6</b>					

Initial funding to be bid from DfES – PP summer school funding stream £250 per student attending (JCN is applying for this fund) for approx 50 students Identified cohort of PP students invited to attend Summer school - specific focus on those in danger of not achieving nationally expected rates of progress. Students who have an insecure L4 and secure L3 at KS2 will be targeted for this week long event.					
<p><b>Rational:</b> Govt initiative to help disadvantaged students make a successful transition from primary to secondary school. Sutton Trust document - Summer schools, moderate impact for moderate cost. Reduce the traditional attainment dip between year 6 and year 7.</p> <p><i>'Summer schools boost the self esteem, aspirations and work ethic of more vulnerable children, many of whom are on Free School Meals.'</i> TES. David Linsell. 2012</p>					
Dates	Person responsible	Monitoring and Evaluation	COST	Success Criteria	
August 2015	JCN/Head of KS3/Assistant headteacher in charge of primary/secondary transition	Data analysis KS2 – first Y7 data entry	<b>£5,500</b> 5 staff x 5 hours x 5 days x £25 + hours of prep Inc. resources needed 62 hours teacher 124 hours support staff HLTA Pastoral Manager LSAs	Students who attend summer school maintain/improve KS2 level in maths and English. Gap narrowed in year 7 between PP and NPP students and between PP that attended the ss and peers (see impact of Summer School analysis)	The summer school was effective in developing the confidence of those pupils who attended. Their review of the week showed that they felt more confident about starting secondary school, their fears and anxieties had been removed and questions about the transition had been answered. They knew their way around the school and knew who the key people to go to if they needed help were. All pupil premium pupils were invited but only 23 participated. For these pupils 88% (20

					pupils) 13 pupils did make the expected progress and 56% made more than the expected progress. Those PP pupils who did not attend the summer school (29 pupils) only 72% (22 pupils) achieved expected progress and 48% (14 pupils) achieved more than the expected progress. These results can not be entirely contributed to participation in the summer school due to the work carried out with pupils throughout the year but engagement in the Summer School has had a positive effect.
<b>Action 3: Intervention school</b>					
Intervention schools (outside of school hours) to run with targeted cohorts in Year 11 and Year 8. Students would be indentified as those underachieving in Ma & Eng & Sc and would run as intensive workshops, focusing on skills needed.					
<p><b>Rational:</b> To address any attainment dip in year 8 prior to commencing year 9</p> <p>To support underachieving students in year 11 in danger of not making minimum 3LoP in core OR who may not achieve P8</p> <p>To identify students who are struggling to meet the rigorous demands of linear and Non CA subjects, with the exam skills and greater resilience needed in Year 9.</p> <p><i>'... schools boost the self esteem, aspirations and work ethic of more vulnerable children, many of whom are on Free School Meals.'</i> TES. David Linsell. 2012</p>					
<b>Dates</b>	<b>Person responsible</b>	<b>Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<b>COST</b>	<b>Success Criteria</b>	<b>Impact</b>

TBC Feb half term /Easter/whit 3 days	MBN/JCN to coordinate with SLs of EM	Data analysis Year 8 and 11 term 1 Mocks Post intervention school analysis	Staffing cost of Tutor Trust: £4,500 INHOUSE revision: £3,500	75% of cohort achieve 3LoP in GCSEs in core 75% of cohort achieve above or expected LoP at end of year 8	We were unable to effectively access the provision due to inconsistency of tutors attendance and timings of the sessions. Positive relationships between Pupils and tutors were difficult to establish.
TBC	HOY	Data analysis – off track Support for students in exam technique/planning/acting on feedback given	<b>£1,218.00</b>	Data year 10 term 1 for cohort 75% of those identified now 'on track'	The exam technique sessions etc took place after the first term at Easter. Subject Leaders of Maths and English were still familiarising themselves with the new Syllabus'
Autumn Term 2015	LGT	LGT & PP monitoring group including MBN,JCN,HOY, SLs 30 HOURS	Proportion of salaries of monitoring group £18135	PP gap narrows in Eng/Ma/Sc at KS4 and KS3	Data for 2015 – 2016 show that the Gap has closed further based on previous years data at end of KS4. Although the gap overall is closing across school there are too many Pupil Premium pupils not making the expected progress But there is still a gap Year 7 gap – the gap has not closed it has remained the same (1 sub level) Average sub levels of progress per student PP 0.54 Non PP 1.06 Year 8 gap - the gap has not closed it has remained the same (1 sub level) Average sub levels of progress per student PP 2.54 Non PP 2.82 Year 9 gap - the gap has not closed it has remained the same (1 sub level) Average sub levels of progress per student PP 4.41 Non PP 4.8

						Year 10 gap – 0. 29 Progress 8 score difference Year 11 gap – see data above
<b>Action 4:</b> Literacy & Numeracy Intervention for Year 7 and Literacy & Numeracy Intervention for year 8						
<b>Rational:</b> Sutton document stresses that improving literacy improves student outcomes overall - increases GCSE attainment and thereby life choices. Thereby reducing the attainment variation between E6 and non E6						
Dates	Person responsible	Monitoring and Evaluation	COST	Success Criteria		
June 2015	LGT/JCN SLs of EM	Data analysis KS2 –Y7 data, Y8 data AR analysis	Year 7 pupils underachieving to receive intensive reading sessions with D. Boyle £ 1,932	Students below level of functional literacy make at least 6 months progress	This took place with positive outcomes 20 pupils took part. 12/20 made more than 6 months progress, with the highest progress being 26 months improvement. Of the pupils that made more than 6 months progress most made significantly more than 6 months progress. Those that did not make the 6 months progress did not manage to access the programme effectively.	

<b>Key Objective 2: Embed the reading scheme to improve the reading age of year 7 and year 8 students whose reading age is below national average.</b>	
<b>Action 1: Y7 reading scheme</b> All students whose attainment falls below the national expectations for reading and functional literacy (RA 9 .6) are supported before and during registration time by LSAs to follow reading scheme. Cohort identified from year 6 scores and from Term 1 RA data.	

Premier league reading scheme for boys					
<p><b>Rational:</b> Sutton document stresses that improving literacy improves student outcomes overall. Thereby reducing the attainment variation between PP and non-PP. Data analysis from the National Literacy trust in 2014 showed that the programme helps to close the free school meal gap by boosting the reading progress of those who were previously struggling with their reading skills. On average, the reading progress of participating pupils was 50% higher than peers not on the programme.</p>					
Dates	Person responsible	Monitoring and Evaluation	COST	Success Criteria	Impact evidence
Starting Sept 2015	SENCO/JCN/ JBD/UKG	Reading level assessment at start of Y7 and Y8 to identify cohort. HLTA assessment upon exit from the scheme	<p>Cost of chosen schemes £5000 En, £5000 Maths</p> <p>Cost of Premier League Reading stars £2,500 for pupils with level 3 and below</p> <p>Literacy and numeracy coordinators £2000</p>	<p>Reading levels improve to enable greater access to the curriculum. Reading age (RA) expected progress. Start RA – minimum expected progress after at least 6 months progress in reading.</p>	<p>100% of pupils who completed the course gained improved reading levels. However further work needs to be done with the small group of pupils whose reading age improved but it is still below what allows them to access the curriculum</p>
<p><b>Action 2: Peer Readers</b> Y9 students identified as peer Readers, trained learning support teacher DPS and JBD to provide reading support to the under achieving students.</p>					

<p><b>Rational</b> : Sutton Trust document Peer tutoring/peer-assisted learning, +6 months, High impact for low cost. Parental involvement, +3 months, moderate impact for moderate costs.</p> <p><i>'All effective partnership schemes provide poorer readers with substantially increased time for reading, supported by a more skilled reader who has received structured training and receives ongoing support. Focused training for the tutors is essential, so that they know what to do when a reader falters or makes an error' What works for students with literacy difficulties? The effectiveness of intervention schemes. Third edition. DCSF. By G, Brooks. (2007)</i></p> <p><i>'Training parents to teach specific reading skills to their children – a particularly effective approach that can be more than twice as effective as encouraging parents to listen to their children read.'</i>(Institute of Education – Review of Best Practice in Parental Engagement: Practitioners Summary, 2011)</p>					
<b>Dates</b>	<b>Person responsible</b>	<b>Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<b>COST</b>	<b>Success Criteria</b>	
Sept 2015	MBN/JBD/D PS	Reading level assessment at start of Y7 to identify cohort. Assessment upon exit from the scheme.	£400 for resources (inc purchase of Peer readers School badges) Training of Peer Readers £400.00 rewards	<b>Success Criteria:</b> Year 9 Peer readers successfully trained. Training and commitment rewarded by the implementation of rewards for peer readers,, recognising leadership and wider contribution to the school. (tba) Y7 students reading age improves.	100% of selected year 7 pupils were successfully trained and developed positive relationships with targeted Year 7 pupils. This resulted in Year 7 pupils approaching reading activities more positively.

				Parents attend 'how to support your child's reading' workshops. (tba)	
<p><b>Action 3:</b> Letterbox Club focuses on improving the educational outlook of looked after, and other vulnerable children who need additional support aged 5-13, by providing them with a parcel of books, maths activities and stationery items once every month for six months.</p> <p><a href="http://www.letterboxclub.org.uk">www.letterboxclub.org.uk</a></p> <p>"children failing to achieve basic levels of literacy and numeracy." – David Laws MP 2013</p>					
<b>Dates</b>	<b>Person responsible</b>	<b>Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<b>COST</b>	<b>Success Criteria</b>	
May 2015 – October 2015	LGT	LGT/JCN– Data Transition from 7 – 8 and 8 - 9	£145 per pupil approx 12= £2,175	Vulnerable students enrolled on the Letterbox programme Improved reading /numeracy levels and increased interest	Pupil voice demonstrated that these pupils responded positively to the scheme and were eager to collect their packs each month.
<p><b>Action 4: Literacy and numeracy</b> Ensure that all PP pupil's entitlement is met through additional support in English and Maths and priority inclusion into extra-curricular enrichment events</p> <p><b>Rational:</b> Sutton Trust Research indicates that short and frequent one to one tuition sessions can add +5months</p>					
<b>Dates</b>	<b>Person responsible</b>	<b>Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<b>COST</b>	<b>Success Criteria</b>	

Sept 2015	JBD/UKG/JCN	<p>Reading and numeracy level assessments at start of Y7 and 8 to identify cohort. HLTA assessment upon exit from the scheme</p> <p>Monitor attainment and offer other specific academic and emotional support as appropriate to include one to one tuition specifically for LAC</p> <p>Pastoral support</p> <p>Enrichment beyond the curriculum</p>	<p>£1000 additional resources</p> <p>£36.00 per hour for Randstad tuition for LAC Total=£8,424</p> <p>£15,000 one to one and small group support</p> <p>£ 372.00 Virtual School meeting time</p> <p>£748.00 Pastoral support for PEPs</p>	Pupils including LAC make progress in line with their peers	<p>LAC children (5pupils) worked consistently with a 1 to 1 tutor to raise their attainment and improve their attitudes to learning.</p> <p>Observation of these pupils in the session by the tutors and feedback from subject teachers showed a positive impact on attitudes to learning and progress.</p> <p>Feedback from LAC meetings state that parents are pleased with children's progress and are working in positive partnership with school.</p> <p>All 5 pupils are working at their expected level</p>

Key Objective 3: to improve curriculum engagement and academic achievement for PP pupils	
--	--

<b>Action 1:</b> Implement an academic subsidy to enable PP students to fully access the curriculum and reduce attainment gap.					
<p><b>Rational:</b> Sutton document ‘the <i>choices that schools make in allocating the money will be vital so that the funding can help raise pupils’ attainment and aspirations.</i>’</p> <p>All Subject Leaders and Heads of Year may make a bid for this fund .Examples of spending may include revision guides, resources for technology, staffing for PP workshops etc, all of which must have a direct impact curriculum attainment.</p>					
<b>Dates</b>	<b>Person responsible</b>	<b>Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<b>COST</b>	<b>Success Criteria</b>	
Sept 2015	LGT, SLs/HOY	Progress of students provided with support to be monitored to ensure value for money. Departments to justify spend in academic terms. Impact reports to be provided following each academic review	£20,000	Attainment gap between PP and non PP reduces. PP students make progress in line with expectations.	Details can be found in the Pupil Premium Impact Proforma. In a number of departments Pupil Premium funding was spent well e.g English. For other Departments the impact was not successful and a different approach needs to be used in these areas to ensure best used of funds.
<b>Action 2:</b> Implement an engagement subsidy to enable PP students to fully access the extra-curricular and financially dependent curriculum activities and reduce attainment gap, support					

those students who do not have breakfast and support students with home-based learning by supporting staff to enable after school access.					
<b>Rational:</b> National College Research cites effective embedded reward policies as being a contributory factor to improving attainment and engagement.					
<b>Sept 2015</b>	<b>LGT</b>	Attendance register of Extra curricula and enrichment activities  Breakfast club  <b>Register Peri lessons</b>	PP attendance of extended curriculum and enrichment activities.  Ensure breakfast available for any LAC/PP in need to ensure an effective start to the school day  (approx £3k).  Support PP students in peripatetic lessons (£2,500)	PP cohort attendance of extracurricular and extended curriculum activities not inhibited by financial constraints	PP pupils have been supported to attend a number of extra curricular and enrichment activities for example: Retreats, Castleton Field trip, Alton towers, London theatre trip, food tech ingredients and Take Part in the Arts theatre trips and French Trip. Feedback from staff and pupils has shown that the experience was positive and engagement has improved.

		<p><b>Educational visits to universities and 6<sup>th</sup> form colleges</b></p> <p><b>Incentives such as theatre productions, trips, rewards</b></p>	<p>To support all vulnerable/disadvantaged students (£2,500) allocated to improve aspirations of all disadvantaged and pupil premium pupils and encouraging A'Level and further study participation (£4,900) including cost of transport Purchase incentives including tickets for Prom and reward trips.</p>		<p>Although the breakfast club was successful for some pupils there are barriers resulting in this initiative not having the desired impact. These include pupils relying on buses to get to school and reduced attendance during winter months and dark mornings.</p>
<p><b>Action 3:</b> Research into how developing leadership, leadership skills and developing Lead Learners can impact on progress and attainment of the most vulnerable</p>					
<p><b>Rational:</b> 'teaching metacognition and self-regulating strategies tends to be particularly effective with lower achieving pupils as well as older students' +8 months impact (Sutton Trust Toolkit 2014)</p>					
<p><b>Autumn 2015 onwards</b></p>	<p><b>LGT/MBN</b></p>	<p>Data for cohort selected Trial of initiative with key group in Year 10</p>	<p>INSET - £1,200 Cohort Training and Staffing £3500</p>	<p>Expectation: students participating in trial who experience 75 hours or more</p>	<p>This did not take place</p>

				achieve 1 of more GCSE A* -C than their peers.”	
<b>Action 4</b>	<b>MBN</b>	Alternative pathways	£10,000 LSA support £ 26,000		66% of the pupils benefitted positively in terms of fixed day exclusions following the intervention. None of these pupils have had any fixed term exclusions since.

<b>Key Objective 4: Attendance: to implement strategies addressing the attendance gap between PP and non PP students</b>	
<b>Action:</b> Embed strategies to promote good attendance of PP students and reduce the attendance gap between PP and Non PP students	
<p><b>Rational:</b> <i>‘the choices that schools make in allocating the money will be vital so that the funding can help raise pupils’ attainment and aspirations.’</i></p> <p>For example, at secondary level PP pupils are three times more likely than their peers to be classed as 'persistently absent' – i.e., to miss more than one in five school days across the year. Similarly, PP pupils are three times more likely to receive two or more fixed-period exclusions across the year.</p>	
Intervention for targeting attendance Pastoral Managers MSN/JJN – to help target hard to reach parents	

Weekly target of PP attendance cohort					
Rewards – for cohort for improved attendance, extended to. Two tiers approach alongside Non PP rewards and incentives for att. Rewards to maintain PP att. Incentives to address poor pp att.					
<b>Dates</b>	<b>Person responsible</b>	<b>Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<b>COST</b>	<b>Success Criteria</b>	
<b>Sept 2015</b>	<b>LGT/MSN/JJ N/all HOY</b>	Fortnightly meetings Tracking and monitoring of progress in Eng/ma of students receiving academic mentoring. Pastoral Managers and HOY intervention to promote attendance	Fortnightly £2,232	Attendance gap between PP and non PP reduces. PP student cohort in each year group attains 96% att average	This gap has reduced and Pupil Premium pupils whilst the attendance for the whole school has improved. 2014 – 2015 gap was 3.2 2015-2016 gap was 2.3 Lates after the register has closed has nearly half compared to the previous year 2.34% 2014-2015 1.35% 2015-2016 This can be contributed to the work that the Pastoral managers
	<b>LGT/MSN/JJ N/all HOY</b>	Monitor rewards for all attendance with specific focus on PP students	<b>Part of HOY and Pastoral Managers salaries.</b>	Attendance gap between PP and non PP reduces. PP student cohort in each year group attains 96% att average	

					have done with these pupils.
Autumn Term 2014	LGT/MSN/JJ N		Rewards £1000x 5=£5000		

Proposed Total Spend of: £187,169.56

Out of: £197,286.00

**Outline plan 2015 - 2016**

Action	Cost
Assign Learning Mentor to support PP	21591
Summer school Year 6	5500
HLTAs (part of salaries)	31,242.56
Part salaries of monitoring and evaluating team including tracking attendance	23,517
In-house revision in holidays and Tutor trust	8000
Reading schemes (To be decided which ones)	5000
Maths scheme	5000
Letterbox Club	2175
Premier League Reading Stars	2500
HWK club 4 days and breakfast club	3000
Peer readers training and rewards	800
One to one for LAC by Randstad	8424
Numeracy and Literacy Coordinators (part salaries)	2000
Attendance	5000
Virtual school meeting time and pastoral support for PEPs	1120
Rewards	5000
Enrichment and Aspirations	13000

Academic subsidy	20000
Alternative pathways including courses and LSA support	36000
<b>Total</b>	<b>187,169.56</b>

**Note: approximately £10,000 has been kept in reserve in case any unforeseen issues arise during the year.**