

Pupil Premium Expenditure Review

2017-2018



Saint Edmund Arrowsmith
CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL

6. Review of expenditure

Previous Academic Year

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>Diminish the progress gap between PP students and non PP students.</p>	<p>Continue to promote and implement strategies identified and trailed by the PP champions. Including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Live Marking • Crib Sheets • Reward cards <p>Individual Pupil Premium Plans (IPPP's) in place for most vulnerable PP students. Staff CPD on providing appropriate strategies to overcome identified barriers.</p> <p>INSET buy back sessions on Collaborative Learning</p> <p>All subjects have a section in their department meetings, where focussed discussions on strategies, success they have had with PP students.</p> <p>Utilisation of Subject Interventionists.</p>	<p>Yr 11: DP's P8 -1.04 A8 33.23</p> <p>The desired outcome was not met in any of the years. No year group had 100% achieving their meg in English or Maths.</p> <p>There were some good performances of DP's in terminal exams. Two subjects had the DP's out-performing the non DP's in attainment and progress. These two were English and Art.</p> <p>Assessment Three Data July 2018</p>	<p>Quality First Teaching (QFT) is fundamental in improving the progress of DP's. Teachers and departments that had stronger progress and attainment of DP's demonstrate QFT as integral to their way of working.</p> <p>The most successful teachers underpin all their lessons with Assessment for Learning (AfL) strategies. They model responses and ensure that students know exactly what their next steps are and how to achieve them.</p> <p>Throughout the CPD calendar work was done on improving questioning and collaborative learning. This will continue to be built on and an additional emphasis on differentiation and AfL will be part of this CPD programme.</p> <p>Communication skills is one of the priorities for 2018/2019. This will cover oracy, writing and reading skills.</p> <p>The use of the Interventionist had mixed success and lacked a clear and distinct focus.</p>	<p>RE, Science, Ebacc and Open interventionist cost (40%) £47,000</p> <p>Progress Leader TLRs (40%) £11,820</p> <p>Pupil Premium Champions (40% of TLR) £4550</p> <p>Transport for Able Student Trips £1,500</p> <p>4Matrix and SISRA costs (40%) £800</p> <p>Total = £65,670</p>

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
-----------------	--------------------------	--	--	------

<p>Improved literacy results for pupils in years 7-9. Pupils selected for intervention: Yrs 7 and 8: entered below 85 KS2 SAT. Yrs 9: Below level 4 in English</p> <p>PP students with specific educational needs. At risk of not making at least expected progress in English by the end of Y9</p> <p>Improved literacy results: Years 10 and 11</p> <p>Improved literacy results: All years</p>	<p>Indirect Dyslexia Programme – Breakfast Club.</p> <p>Accelerated Reader – Group Support, Accelerated Learning (AL) and English Lessons.</p> <p>Drop Everything and Read (DEAR) programme</p> <p>Small group withdrawal delivered by subject specialist Interventionist</p> <p>Specialist English Interventionist</p>	<p>Assessment 3 Data 2018</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1041 128 1626 348"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">English EoY</th> <th>Above Target</th> <th>On Target</th> <th>Below Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Year 7</td> <td>PP</td> <td>74.4</td> <td>7.7</td> <td>17.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 8</td> <td>PP</td> <td>62.5</td> <td>11.3</td> <td>26.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 9</td> <td>PP</td> <td>75.4</td> <td>2.9</td> <td>21.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 10</td> <td>PP</td> <td>68.8</td> <td>7.8</td> <td>23.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 11</td> <td>PP</td> <td>12.5</td> <td>21.9</td> <td>65.6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Literacy Years 7 – 9 Breakfast Club: 6 student attended regularly above 90% - Reading Ages of these students increased by an average of 10 months and Spelling Ages by an average of over 6 months.</p> <p>35 students in Years 7 and 8 were supported by accelerated reader. (17 Year 7 and 18 Year 8). 11 of these students graduated before the end of year (7 Yr7's and 4 Yr8's). Some of these stayed with the programme after parental requests. Of the 35 students 17 students improved their chronological reading age by the end of the year. Majority of PP pupils met or were within one sublevel of their EoY target in English (70/78, 72/80, 57/68). The most significant impact coming in years 7 and 8 with year 9 progressing at a slightly slower rate.</p> <p>Yr10: 59/77 students on or above their target EAP by the end of year 10, with a further three 1 sub level below.</p> <p>Yr11: English P8 for DP's was: -0.59 compared to All at -0.63 28 students had a positive P8 score for English 36/64 secured a Standard Pass(4) or above in Eng Lang 26/64 secured a Strong Pass(5) or above in Eng Lang 37/59 secured a Standard Pass(4) or above in Eng Lit 23/59 secured a Strong Pass(5) or above in Eng Lit</p>	English EoY		Above Target	On Target	Below Target	Year 7	PP	74.4	7.7	17.9	Year 8	PP	62.5	11.3	26.3	Year 9	PP	75.4	2.9	21.7	Year 10	PP	68.8	7.8	23.4	Year 11	PP	12.5	21.9	65.6	<p>Data from the breakfast club has shown that students who attended showed an improved progress in their reading and spelling. Although IDL was used at breakfast club this resource wasn't utilised as well during AL and English support. Progress data shows that this may have been a lost opportunity and therefore needs to be used more for 2018/2019</p> <p>AR data suggest that we still have not yet managed to utilise the Accelerated Reader programme. Star test show a mixed picture and the test post February half term indicated that reading had not continued over this period with a significant number of the cohort regressing. A follow-up test four weeks later showed that students were back on track. On reflection AR is not given the emphasis and value that it requires. Star reading ages across the years do not improve and the general feeling is whilst the entry data for students indicate they can read, they do not except when in class.</p> <p>AR requires a complete restructure with the emphasis on improving reading across abilities. Intervention action plans need to be produced and enacted.</p>	<p>Funding for Accelerated Reading £1,800</p> <p>TLR cost for Literacy co-ordinator (40%) £2,275</p> <p>Continued funding for IDL, purchase of books to support DEAR and part funding for English interventionist (40%) £11,750</p> <p>Breakfast club food and drink £1,000</p> <p>PP post cards £250</p> <p>Total = £17,075</p>
English EoY		Above Target	On Target	Below Target																														
Year 7	PP	74.4	7.7	17.9																														
Year 8	PP	62.5	11.3	26.3																														
Year 9	PP	75.4	2.9	21.7																														
Year 10	PP	68.8	7.8	23.4																														
Year 11	PP	12.5	21.9	65.6																														

i. 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
-----------------	--------------------------	--	--	------

Improved numeracy results: Years 7-9	Maths Interventionist	Assessment 3 Data 2018	It is necessary to have a full review of the maths assessment strategy to ensure that targeted interventions can take place with the correct students. The significant drop off after year 8 supports this requirement.	TLR cost for Numeracy co-ordinator (40%) £2,275																												
	Breakfast Club	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Maths EoY</th> <th>Above Target</th> <th>On Target</th> <th>Below Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Year 7</td> <td>PP</td> <td>80.8</td> <td>4.1</td> <td>15.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 8</td> <td>PP</td> <td>65.0</td> <td>6.3</td> <td>28.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 9</td> <td>PP</td> <td>10.3</td> <td>10.3</td> <td>79.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 10</td> <td>PP</td> <td>19.7</td> <td>10.5</td> <td>69.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 11</td> <td>PP</td> <td>3.1</td> <td>1.6</td> <td>95.3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Maths EoY		Above Target	On Target	Below Target	Year 7	PP	80.8	4.1	15.1	Year 8	PP	65.0	6.3	28.7	Year 9	PP	10.3	10.3	79.4	Year 10	PP	19.7	10.5	69.7	Year 11	PP	3.1
Maths EoY		Above Target	On Target	Below Target																												
Year 7	PP	80.8	4.1	15.1																												
Year 8	PP	65.0	6.3	28.7																												
Year 9	PP	10.3	10.3	79.4																												
Year 10	PP	19.7	10.5	69.7																												
Year 11	PP	3.1	1.6	95.3																												
Improved numeracy results: Years 10 and 11	Form time numeracy programme	<p>Numeracy Yr7-9 Analysis suggests that progress data for PP students involved with Breakfast Club and Form time numeracy show that in Yr 7: 68/78 where within 1 sub level of their EAP. Yr 8: 67/80 where within 1 sub level of their EAP. Yr 9: 25/68 where within 1 sub level of their EAP.</p> <p>Of the six students who attended Breakfast club 5/6 exceeded their EAP grade. A large majority met or exceeded their target the significant impact coming in years 7 and 8 with a significant drop off in Yr 9.</p> <p>Yr10: 23/77 students on or above their target EAP by the end of year 10, with a further six 1 sub level below.</p> <p>Yr11: Maths P8 for DP's was: -1.28 compared to All at -0.98 7 students had a positive P8 score for GCSE maths 24/64 secured a Standard Pass(4) or above in Maths 10/64 secured a Strong Pass(5) or above in Maths</p>	Breakfast club data shows that this focused approach works and is sustained throughout the year.	Total = £14,025																												
Improved numeracy results: All years	Small group withdrawal delivered by subject specialist teachers / teaching assistant	Specialist Maths Interventionist			Although we utilise the use of online maths revision resources such as Hegarty and myMaths, these are not personalised and do not reflect the individual needs of students and therefore still require input from the teacher to ensure students complete tasks. A more personalised online maths would be of great advantage.																											

i. Other approaches

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>Increased attendance and punctuality rates for all disadvantaged students.</p>	<p>Attendance Manager and Clerk employed to monitor pupils and follow up PA.</p> <p>Specific time allocated to the monitoring of PP pupils.</p> <p>Attendance panels.</p>	<p>Overall attendance for pupils eligible for PP in 17/18 was 87.64% (87% 16/17), compared to 94.41% non PP (94.32% 16/17). Therefore, the gap between the attendance of PP pupils and non PP was 6.77%, which is a reduction from 7.32% in 16/17.</p> <p>The attendance of PP boys improved by 1.29% (88.27% 17/18, 86.98% 16/17) and by 0.05% for PP girls (87.01% 17/18, 86.96% 16/17).</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="649 331 1169 743"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">2017/18</th> <th colspan="2">2016/17</th> </tr> <tr> <th>no.</th> <th>%</th> <th>no.</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>227</td> <td>84.24</td> <td>273</td> <td>85.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>419</td> <td>86.61</td> <td>475</td> <td>87</td> </tr> <tr> <td>208</td> <td>87.52</td> <td>228</td> <td>86.98</td> </tr> <tr> <td>211</td> <td>86.08</td> <td>247</td> <td>86.96</td> </tr> <tr> <td>533</td> <td>93.89</td> <td>569</td> <td>94.32</td> </tr> <tr> <td>278</td> <td>93.84</td> <td>300</td> <td>93.96</td> </tr> <tr> <td>255</td> <td>93.94</td> <td>269</td> <td>94.72</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12</td> <td>84.12</td> <td>11</td> <td>83</td> </tr> <tr> <td>75</td> <td>78.3</td> <td>68</td> <td>79</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2017/18		2016/17		no.	%	no.	%	227	84.24	273	85.7	419	86.61	475	87	208	87.52	228	86.98	211	86.08	247	86.96	533	93.89	569	94.32	278	93.84	300	93.96	255	93.94	269	94.72	12	84.12	11	83	75	78.3	68	79	<p>Whilst the data indicates that attendance rates for disadvantaged pupils improved marginally, systems for the tracking and monitoring of attendance, along with subsequent interventions and strategic initiatives, have been strengthened and the attendance team have a clear strategic plan for improving the attendance of disadvantaged pupils (PP Review Nov 2018). We will continue with this approach and continue to sustain the push on attendance, as cumulative attendance data for 18/19 is showing an improvement in the attendance rates of disadvantaged pupils (currently 92.6% - cumulative figure as of 26.11.18 compared to 91.16% at this point in 17/18). There is also a need to provide increased opportunities for CPD in this area.</p>	<p>Attendance Manager 40% of salary £14,170 Attendance Clerk 40% of salary £11,750 Lesson Monitor Licence £1,200 LA SLA for Attendance (40% of cost) £4,800</p> <p>Total = £31,920</p>
2017/18		2016/17																																														
no.	%	no.	%																																													
227	84.24	273	85.7																																													
419	86.61	475	87																																													
208	87.52	228	86.98																																													
211	86.08	247	86.96																																													
533	93.89	569	94.32																																													
278	93.84	300	93.96																																													
255	93.94	269	94.72																																													
12	84.12	11	83																																													
75	78.3	68	79																																													
<p>Reduce the number of fixed term exclusions for disadvantaged pupils.</p>	<p>Development of the inclusion unit to support and guide vulnerable and at risk students.</p> <p>Offering support via the specialist staff to reduce FTE and also help them to make better and more informed choices.</p>	<p>The number of incidents which resulted in a fixed term exclusion for disadvantaged pupils decreased from 210 incidents (344.5 days lost to FTE) in 16/17 to 115 incidents in 17/18. In 16/17 the percentage of FTE which were issued to disadvantaged pupils was 66.87% of all FTE. This reduced to 52.99% in 17/18.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="649 1335 1222 1509"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>16/17</th> <th>17/18</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Total incidents</td> <td>314</td> <td>217</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Days</td> <td>508.5</td> <td>373.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PP incidents</td> <td>210</td> <td>115</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PP days</td> <td>344.5</td> <td>-</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>In 16/17 the percentage of all behaviour referrals to the internal remove room amongst pupils eligible for Pupil Premium funding was 55.84%. This reduced marginally to 55.05% in 17/18.</p>		16/17	17/18	Total incidents	314	217	Days	508.5	373.5	PP incidents	210	115	PP days	344.5	-	<p>Reducing the number of FTE for disadvantaged pupils will continue to be a key objective of our PP strategy and we will continue with elements of this approach, such as using PP funding for Pastoral Managers to support the behaviour of disadvantaged pupils. However, much of our Alternative Learning Provision has been brought on site and a key approach moving forwards needs to be to review and develop the Personalised Learning Centre to ensure that it offers robust support for disadvantaged pupils at risk of fixed term or permanent exclusion.</p>	<p>Inclusion team salaries (40%) £37,700 Alternative Learning Provision costs £40,000 Inclusion resources £2,000 Progress Manager salaries x5 (25%) £36,700</p> <p>Total = £116,400</p>																													
	16/17	17/18																																														
Total incidents	314	217																																														
Days	508.5	373.5																																														
PP incidents	210	115																																														
PP days	344.5	-																																														

<p>All KS4 pupils have identified clear progression routes post 16. These are in line with prior attainment expectations and aspirational.</p>	<p>Careers advice and guidance – support sessions regularly provided, including 1-2-1 interviews. Assertive mentoring – identified pupils based on progress and attitude. Termly calendar of activities. Alternative provision.</p>	<p>Initial snapshot NEET figures for 17/18 indicate that 1.69% of pupils are NEET. Of those who are NEET, none are disadvantaged pupils.</p> <p>Destination tracking data indicates that 48.61% of pupils progressed to a Level 3 qualification/s, 27.77% to L2, 12.50% to L1, 0.69% to Entry Level and 10.41% progressed onto Apprenticeships.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="647 296 1080 617"> <tr> <td>Level 3</td> <td>70</td> <td>48.61%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Level 2</td> <td>40</td> <td>27.77%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Level 1</td> <td>18</td> <td>12.50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Entry Level</td> <td>1</td> <td>0.69%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Apprenticeships</td> <td>15</td> <td>10.41%</td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td>144</td> <td> </td> </tr> </table>	Level 3	70	48.61%	Level 2	40	27.77%	Level 1	18	12.50%				Entry Level	1	0.69%	Apprenticeships	15	10.41%		144		<p>We will continue with this approach, utilising the skills and expertise of ACL (CEIAG co-ordinator) to ensure that disadvantaged pupils have identified clear progression routes which are in line with prior attainment expectations and are aspirational. CEIAG provision will also be reviewed with good practice in other schools looked at to inform our practice.</p>	<p>CEIAG Co-ordinator cost (40%) £6000. Total = £6000</p>
Level 3	70	48.61%																							
Level 2	40	27.77%																							
Level 1	18	12.50%																							
Entry Level	1	0.69%																							
Apprenticeships	15	10.41%																							
	144																								
<p>Increased engagement with parents, leading to pupils having increased rates of progress and higher attendance.</p>	<p>Parents' Information Evenings. Monitoring of attendance at Parents' Evenings. Attempts made to arrange alternative visits with absent parents.</p>	<p>The attendance of parents of pupils eligible for Pupil Premium funding was not effectively monitored and tracked across the academic year.</p> <p>Year 11 Progress Clinics for DPs not making expected progress held by the PL for Year 11 showed improved attendance over the course of the academic year, from 60% attendance of identified parents to 100% in the third round of meetings.</p>	<p>The attendance of PP parents at key meetings, information evenings and parents evenings needs to be more effectively tracked and monitored. A more personalised parental engagement approach is needed, utilising a toolkit of strategies focused on the key elements of communication, family learning support and opportunities, support and training for parents, involvement in decision making and involvement in the life of the school.</p>	<p>Text and letters to parents £10,000 Total = £10,000</p>																					