

The Pingle School Pupil Premium Strategy Statement

1. Summary information					
School					
Academic Year	2016/17	Total PP budget	£276,000	Date of most recent PP Review	n/a
Total number of students	1038	Number of students eligible for PP	312	Date for next internal review of this strategy	January 2017

2.	3. Current attainment		
	<i>All students eligible for PP (Pingle)</i>	<i>Students eligible for PP (without LSB and full time alternative provision)</i>	<i>Students not eligible for PP (national average)</i>
% achieving 5A* - C incl. EM (2015/16 only)	20%	25.6%	64.7%
% achieving expected progress in English / Maths (2015/16 only)	42% / 32%	52.6% / 42.1%	75.8% / 73.4%
Progress 8 score average (from 2016/17)	-0.96	-0.62	0.12
Attainment 8 score average (from 2016/17)	32.45	39.87	52

4. Barriers to future attainment	
In-school barriers	
A.	Average lower attainment on entry for students eligible for PP than for other students, which prevents them from making good progress though out KS3 and 4.
B.	Average lower reading ages of students eligible for PP in key stage 3, which prevents students from making progress across all subjects
C.	Engagement and attitude to learning in KS3 and 4 are more problematic on average for PP students and are having a detrimental effect on their academic progress and that of their peers.
External barriers	
D.	Attendance during 2015-16 for students eligible for PP was 91.2% (whereas students not eligible for PP attended 95.3%). This reduces their school hours and causes them to fall behind.

5. Outcomes		
	<i>Desired outcomes</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>
A.	More students eligible for PP to make expected progress at the end of year in both maths and English	Students eligible for PP in each year of KS3 & 4 make similar progress to similar prior attaining non PP students within their year group, in English and maths. This will be evidenced in data collection points each term and in end of year data.
B.	Improved reading ages for students eligible for PP in KS3, especially y7	Students eligible for PP identified as having low reading ability from standardised score below 95 or dyslexia screener, who are then retested using single word reading test. Students then scoring 90 or below are placed on corrective reading, those between 90 & 95 have inference or comprehension training based on personalised need. Students to have a standardised score above 95 on retesting. Monitored by the Intervention Co-ordinator.
C.	Improved attitude to learning and engagement in lessons for students eligible for PP.	A reduction in behaviour points, call outs, detentions and exclusions for students eligible for PP, together with a closing of the gap in attitude to learning grades when compared to non PP students.
D.	Increased attendance rates for students eligible for PP.	The gap between PP student attendance and non PP student attendance closes, together with a reduction in the percentage of students eligible for PP who are classified as persistent absentees, when compared to school data from 2015-16.

6. Planned expenditure	
Academic year	2016/17

The three headings below enable schools to demonstrate how they are using the Pupil Premium to improve classroom pedagogy, provide targeted support and support whole school strategies.

i. Quality of teaching for all					
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
A. More students eligible for PP to make expected progress at the end of year in both Maths and English.	CPD on 'Let's Think in English', focussing on cognitive acceleration. KS3 classes to have one discrete lesson per fortnight.	We want to offer high quality teaching to all these students to drive up results. The programme was selected on advice from Local Authority Consultant and delivered by Kings College London. Results from case studies look promising and this type of cognitive approach was ranked 2 nd most effective by Hattie (2012).	Improved engagement, motivation and attitude to learning evidenced from learning walks, student voice and lesson observations, as well monitoring of English assessment data. Reviewed at Leadership Team meetings and English line management meetings.	Head of English	January 2017, June 2017

<p>A. More students eligible for PP to make expected progress at the end of year in both maths and English.</p>	<p>Purchase of specific learning packages for focussed need. EdLounge system to provide quality learning experiences for students unable to access a usual school timetable. GSCE POD to provide revision materials for students at KS4.</p>	<p>There is a whole school drive to promote independent learning and encourage students to take responsibility for their learning outside the classroom. Both of these packages provide strong evidence from other schools that they can do this. EdLounge is a BETT award finalist for 2017; research at other local schools provides a strong correlation between outstanding student progress 8 performance and use of GCSE POD. Both are in their first trial year.</p>	<p>Student surveys to evaluate usefulness and effectiveness of both packages in promoting learning, analysis of student usage logs, comparison data on usage and progress to show effectiveness. Reviewed at intervention meetings and Leadership Team meetings.</p>	<p>Assistant Head with responsibility for PP, Intervention Co-ordinator</p>	<p>January 2017, June 2017</p>
<p>A. More students eligible for PP to make expected progress at the end of year in both maths and English.</p>	<p>Review of setting in Year 7. This scheme will give priority to students eligible for PP within decisions about setting. This will take place in the setting review in November and will affect all teaching groups across Year 7. Students eligible for PP will have setting decisions influenced by CAT scores as well as KS2 results and internal assessment.</p>	<p>We want to ensure that underperformance for Pupil Premium students is not compounded when they reach Year 7. The hypothesis is that they may have already been underachieving or subject to low aspirations. As a result, their performance at KS1 and KS2 will not truly reflect their ability. Therefore, setting based on prior performance will make matters worse. <i>Waldfoegel and Washbrook 2010</i> using data from the Millennium Cohort Survey found: "children from disadvantaged backgrounds were already up to a year behind more privileged children educationally by the age of 3."</p>	<p>Review of setting to take place in consultation with English and maths departments November 2016. Regular monitoring via departmental meetings, analysis of high, middle and low prior attainers progress at Year 7 data collection intervals. Review of scheme at Leadership team.</p>	<p>Deputy Head (curriculum)</p>	<p>June 2017</p>

<p>A. More students eligible for PP to make expected progress at the end of year in both maths and English.</p> <p>B. Improved reading ages for students eligible for PP in KS3, especially Year 7.</p>	<p>Employment of a skilled primary school teacher with experience of staff training within the local authority to deliver a combined curriculum group to vulnerable disadvantaged students in Year 7. This will have increased levels of care and support, with an added focus on literacy. Group is taught for 14 hours per fortnight, reducing the number of teachers and rooms students will experience to provide transition from primary school.</p>	<p>The EEF Toolkit suggests that targeted interventions matched to specific students with particular needs or emotional issues can be effective, especially for students of secondary age.</p>	<p>Liaison with primary schools, SENCO, maths and English departments to ensure correct students are targeted; lesson observations; work scrutiny and learning walk data. Monitoring via data collection intervals for Year 7.</p>	<p>SENCO, Assistant Head with responsibility for PP.</p>	<p>June 2017</p>
---	---	--	--	--	------------------

Total budgeted cost £31,595

ii. Targeted support

Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
<p>A. More students eligible for PP to make expected progress at the end of year in both maths and English.</p>	<p>Use of Teaching Assistants to deliver small group English intervention to students identified on specific weaknesses in KS4 and Year 9 in order to allow them to make progress.</p>	<p>Small group interventions with qualified and experienced staff have proven to be effective. EEF toolkit suggests that targeted interventions by TAs can be effective, with the correct focus and resources.</p>	<p>Short term interventions based on specific need from the data and areas of weakness provided by the English teachers. Regular review of engagement and progress to ensure effective use of student and staff time, resources and value for money. Student voice surveys. Regular review at intervention meetings and Leadership Team meetings.</p>	<p>Assistant Head with responsibility for PP, Intervention Co-ordinator</p>	<p>December 2016</p>

<p>A. More students eligible for PP to make expected progress at the end of year in both maths and English.</p>	<p>Use of qualified, highly experienced Maths teachers to deliver small group intervention focussed on identified specific weaknesses to KS4 and y9 students in order to allow them to make appropriate progress.</p>	<p>Small group interventions with qualified and experienced teaching staff have proven to be effective. EEF toolkit suggests that targeted interventions by highly qualified teachers can be very effective.</p>	<p>Short term interventions based on specific need from the data and areas of weakness provided by the maths teachers. Regular review of engagement and progress to ensure effective use of student and staff time, resources and value for money. Student voice surveys. Regular review at intervention meetings and Leadership Team meetings.</p>	<p>Assistant Head with responsibility for PP, Intervention co-ordinator</p>	<p>December 2016, April 2017, June 2017</p>
<p>B. Improved reading ages for students eligible for PP in KS3, especially Year 7.</p> <p>A. More students eligible for PP to make expected progress at the end of year in both maths and English.</p>	<p>Use of a teacher / TA team to deliver reading interventions, followed by comprehension interventions and inference training through to Year 9.</p>	<p>Some students need targeted reading recovery and then subsequent literacy support in order to catch up and access their curriculum. This is a programme which has been independently evaluated and shown to be effective within this school and others.</p>	<p>Short term interventions based on specific need from the data and areas of weakness provided by in school data and independent testing. Regular review of engagement and progress to ensure effective use of student and staff time, resources and value for money. Student voice surveys. Regular retesting of reading levels and skills to show progress. Regular review at intervention meetings and Leadership Team meetings.</p>	<p>Assistant Head with responsibility for PP, Intervention co-ordinator</p>	<p>December 2016, April 2017, June 2017</p>
<p>A. More students eligible for PP to make expected progress at the end of year in both maths and English</p>	<p>Provision of a TLR for a teacher to provide peer tutoring and mentoring programmes, co-ordinating KS4 and KS5 students to support the progress, attainment and removal of barriers for younger students</p>	<p>EEF toolkit suggests that peer support can be a very effective form of accelerating progress, both in terms of cost and more importantly the amount of student progress made.</p>	<p>Liaison with Heads of Year, SENCO and intervention coordinator to identify correct students for intervention and the correct students to lead the intervention. Regular meetings to review intervention with students, analysis of student progress and engagement at data intervals. Regular review at intervention meetings and Leadership team meetings.</p>	<p>Assistant Head with responsibility for PP, Intervention co-ordinator</p>	<p>December 2016, April 2017, June 2017</p>
Total budgeted cost					£75,373

Other approaches					
Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
D. Increased attendance rates for students eligible for PP.	Pupil Premium attendance coordinator employed to improve the attendance of all students eligible for PP, via application of the school attendance systems, liaison with Multi Agency Team, and analysis of data. Employment of a HLTA post to support the work of the co-ordinator, focussing on home visits, the reintegration of persistent absentee students into lessons and provision of home tuition arrangements. Provision of a teacher to support the SENCO with improving the attendance of SEND students in receipt of Pupil Premium.	Attainment for children cannot be improved if they are not actually attending school. NFER briefing for school leaders identifies addressing attendance as a key step. The gap between PP and non PP student attendance is not massive, but is not yet closed. PP persistent absence remains a barrier to learning and progress.	Regular meetings of those involved in attendance process; increased engagement with the MAT team to ensure consistency. Personalised support for individual students with attendance issues. Regular feedback to parents via letters and bulletins increased home visits. Monitoring via Leadership Team meetings and regular meetings with LA advisor.	Assistant Head with responsibility for PP	December 2016, April 2017, June 2017
C. Engagement of students eligible for PP improves.	Partial funding for members of the Student and Parent Services team, to remove barriers to engagement of students eligible for Pupil Premium. This includes the Head of Students and Parent Services, together with 3 Family Support Workers.	The EEF Toolkit suggests that targeted interventions matched to specific students with particular needs or behavioural issues can be effective, especially for students of secondary age.	Data from low level disruption such as behaviour points, call outs and referrals, as well as sanctions such as detentions and exclusions is reviewed daily, weekly, monthly and then compared with previous years by Deputy and Assistant Heads, SENCO and Head of Student and Parent Services. Each FSW keeps a written and electronic reporting book detailing all students they come into contact with daily along with outcomes and actions. Problems are identified and steps implemented to resolve any issues faced by students, all in an effort to increase their wellbeing and in turn enable them to reach their full potential.	Assistant Head responsible for behaviour	December 2016, April 2017, June 2017
Total budgeted cost					£95,395

7. Additional detail

Pupil Premium budgets and to view the Pupil Premium policy please visit the Pupil Premium page on The Pingle School website:
<http://www.pingle.derbyshire.sch.uk/school/information/pupilpremium/>