

Pupil premium strategy statement and evaluation – Solway Community School

1. Summary information					
School	Solway Community School – update as at July 2017 – Summer 2 Data Point (excluding Y11 results)				
Academic Year	2016-17	Total PP budget	£58,060	Date of most recent PP Review	Aug 2017
Total number of pupils	155	Number of pupils eligible for PP	55	Date for next internal review of this strategy	N/A

2. Current attainment							
	Pupils eligible for PP 2016 results – 2012 cohort	Pupils eligible for PP Autumn 1 whole school	Pupils eligible for PP Spring 1 whole school	Pupils eligible for PP Spring 2 whole school	Pupils eligible for PP Summer 1 whole school	Pupils eligible for PP Summer 2 whole school	Pupils not eligible for PP (national average 2015-16)
Number of students in cohort	11 (8)	55	56	56	56	53 (41 without Y11)	
Progress 8 score average	-1.39 (-0.66)	0.02	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.00 (0.26)	0.12
Attainment 8 score average	25.1 (30.8)	45.5	43.8	43.1	43.2	44.49 (48.7)	52

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)	
In-school barriers <i>(issues to be addressed in school, such as poor literacy skills)</i>	
A.	Behaviour and aspirations of groups of boys, particularly a small group of Y10 boys (some of whom are eligible for PP) is having a detrimental effect on their academic progress and that of their peers – half a grade difference in attainment between boys and girls
B.	High prior attainment PP students are making good progress compared to other groups, but at the end of Summer 2, 2016 were achieving marginally below expected progress (-0.14, compared to -0.05 for non-PP group).
C.	Specific individuals have specific needs, such as poor literacy skills
External barriers <i>(issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)</i>	
D.	Low aspirations and lack of higher status jobs in the area.

4. Desired outcomes (desired outcomes and how they will be measured)		Success criteria
A.	Better behaviour and academic success for all boys	Improved P8 scores for boys across the board. Boys who are eligible for PP make more progress by the end of the year than 'other' pupils.
B.	Good progress made by High Prior Attainers, particularly PP students	Pupils eligible for PP who are identified as high attaining from KS2 levels / raw scores make at least as much progress as other pupils identified as high attaining, across KS3 and KS4, so that they achieve a positive P8 score at the end of each year, and attain greater than their expected attainment score across all their chosen subjects. Were they are not, interventions are put in place by SLT to enable them to thrive.
C.	Specific individuals have specific needs, such as poor literacy skills	Improved skills and knowledge in identified areas, evidenced by assessment and progress visible in books
D.	Higher aspirations for all	More students go on to higher / further education than in the past

5. 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?
B. Improved educational attainment by HPA	Mastery Learning and extension of knowledge and skill via IQ lesson	Identified via EEF as good practice in enabling students to improve their progress	Evaluation of IQ lessons take place on a half termly basis, with evidence based success criteria. Interventions are assessed by SLT on a half termly basis.	Headteacher	Half termly – first review end Autumn 1 At Aut 1 5 of 14 students green. Average P8 0.10 At Sp 1 9 of 14 HPA PP students were green. Average P8 0.16 At Su 1, 9 of 14 HPA PP were still green. Average P8 0.2 As at Su 2, excluding Y11, average P8 up to 0.14, 7 of 11 green

B. Improved educational attainment by HPA and all groups	Metacognition and self-regulation, Problem Solving and Independent Learning via Independent Study lessons	Identified via EEF as good practice in enabling students to improve their progress. Trialling of this approach last year proved to improve students' ability in dialogic marking and metacognition throughout the year, evidenced in lesson folders, marks awarded and as reported by other teachers within school.	Evaluation of evidence and progress on a half termly basis by SLT	SLT	Half termly – first review end Autumn 1 At Aut 1 5 of 14 students green. Average P8 0.10 At Sp 1 9 of 14 HPA PP students were green. Average P8 0.16 At Su 1, 9 of 14 HPA PP were still green. Average P8 0.2 As at Su 2, excluding Y11, average P8 up to 0.14, 7 of 11 green
B. Improved educational attainment by HPA and all groups	Higher Order Questioning in lessons and Dialogic Marking; raised expectations of teaching and learning across the school	Identified via EEF as good practice in enabling PP and other students to improve their progress	Dialogic marking evaluated via work scrutinies. HOQ visible in lessons and checked and evaluated by SLT Lesson plans show differentiation and challenge	SLT	Formal LOs and WS Training Inset Sept. Refresher Dec. HOQ observed in lessons Aut 2. At Aut 1 5 of 14 students green. Average P8 0.10 At Sp 1 9 of 14 HPA PP students were green. Average P8 0.16 At Su 1, 9 of 14 HPA PP were still green. Average P8 0.2 As at Su 2, excluding Y11, average P8 up to 0.14, 7 of 11 green
Total budgeted cost					£36,600

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?
C Individual interventions as identified raising performance	Various, including specific small group work with SLT after school	As evidenced in case studies for each individual; identified across faculties, sharing good practice	Tracked and monitored by HoF / SLT via WS, LOs to ensure interventions are having an impact	HoF/SLT	<p>Spring 1 = 13 of 51 PP red.</p> <p>Summer 1 = 10 of 51 PP red.</p> <p>Average P8 score of green pupils = 0.825, up from 0.675 in Autumn 1</p> <p>Summer 2 (excluding Y11) = average P8 score 0.29, average score of 'green' P8 pupils 0.85.</p> <p>22 of 41 pupils are Green</p>
Total budgeted cost					£2,000
iii. 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?
A. Better behaviour and academic success for all boys	TD & MH tasked with focusing on raising boys' achievement – leading all staff in Inset in December. Zero tolerance of poor behaviour	Data identified this area as an issue. Research base of lower boys attainment clear. Specific behaviour of Y10 boys hindering performance.	Monitoring by HoF, SLT Isolation record	TD (all staff)	Summer 2
Total budgeted cost					£20,000

6. Review of expenditure				
2016-17		Please see our existing analysis on our website for details of previous spends and outcomes.		
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
B. Improved educational attainment by HPA	Mastery Learning and extension of knowledge and skill via IQ lesson	<p>Overall, HPA PP students have improved from an average score of 0.17 to 0.24 over the year (excluding one outlier). Non PP HPA students have made better progress (0.13 of a grade) but end the year on the same score as our PP cohort. The majority have moved significantly upwards over the year – those who have moved have made almost 0.2 grades of progress and are well above their target grades.</p> <p>For year 11 alone, our internal data showed that PP students made 0.1 grade progress over the year, whereas non PP scores fell by -0.23.</p> <p>In specific subjects offering IQ interventions, for example Science, HPA Y11 PP students made on average 2 grades progress whereas non PP students made 1.</p> <p>However, on analysis of the GCSE results, it is clear that despite PP students on the whole doing better than non-PP students, our HPA students did not perform well.</p>	<p>This approach seems to have worked with improvements in P8 score evidence for the vast majority of both PP and non-PP HPA students.</p> <p>Next year we will continue with this approach and make further improvements to the way in which IQ is run, particularly focusing on key skills at KS3.</p>	£12570

<p>B. Improved educational attainment by HPA and all groups</p>	<p>Metacognition and self-regulation, Problem Solving and Independent Learning via Independent Study lessons</p>	<p>KS3 only. Between Autumn and Summer: Y7 movement of PP students average 1.14 grade, 'others' movement 1.15 Y8 movement of PP students average 1.06 of a grade, 'others' movement 0.90 Y9 movement of PP students average 1.2. 'others' movement 1.13 PP students are on average improving more in terms of marks awarded for pieces of work than non-PP students, except in Y7 where the difference is extremely marginal (0.01 of a grade). Anecdotal evidence of better reading of questions, more ability to work by themselves, more aware of processes of learning.</p>	<p>This approach is making a difference across KS3, with evidence that PP and non-PP students are both making excellent progress in this lesson.</p>	<p>£4983</p>
<p>B. Improved educational attainment by HPA and all groups</p>	<p>Higher Order Questioning in lessons and Dialogic Marking; raised expectations of teaching and learning across the school</p>	<p>This again was focussed primarily on KS3. Improvement in average group P8 score in KS3 from 0.40 to 0.49 (PP HPA) vs 0.04 to 0.23 (Non PP HPA) – PP are doing better overall compared to non-PP throughout the year although non-PP are improving faster.</p>	<p>KS3 students have benefited from the focus on HOQ and Dialogic Marking and have made progress and continue, as a group, to be doing better than non-PP students. There continues the issue of small cohort sizes which means one student makes a huge difference.</p>	<p>£15713</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
C Individual interventions as identified raising performance	Various, including specific small group work with SLT after school	All students who require them have been targeted with personalised interventions. We have seen an improvement in P8 score by whole school PP students (excluding Y11) from 0.16 vs non PP 0.24 in Autumn 1, to 0.25 vs 0.36 in Spring 2 and 0.26 vs 0.32 in Summer 2. The difference has reduced from 0.08 to 0.06 over the year. Our internal progress data for Year 11 students shows P8 scores for PP students dropped slightly from -0.09 to -0.21 over the year – and increased the gap slightly by 0.05 of a grade. When we look at actual GCSE results (P8 scores based on 2017 shadow data) we see that PP students did better than non-PP students, however both groups did not perform well enough.	Y11 student interventions are too late – individual interventions and hard work by teachers during year 11 has not really made a significant difference; despite P8 scores being better for PP students the whole cohort underperformed. However, for younger students this approach seems to have worked well, with a small reduction in the difference between PP and non PP students. Case studies are available for individual students who have benefited from specific individual interventions.	£3928

iii. 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
A. Better behaviour and academic success for all boys	TD & MH tasked with focusing on raising boys' achievement – leading all staff in Inset in December. Zero tolerance of poor behaviour	Boys overall (including non PP, excluding year 11) have made more progress over the year than girls, improving by 0.14 of a grade overall, compared to 0.06 improvement by the girls. The gap between boys and girls as a whole is now 0.22 of a grade, down from 0.3 at the start of the year. PP boys are within 0.02 of a grade of PP girls, down from 0.05 at the start of the year.	Focusing on boys' achievement has clearly worked in terms of P8 scores for years 7-10 – they have closed the gap to the girls overall, and when comparing PP boys to PP girls the story is even more positive. This approach will continue to be a focus to improve scores further and narrow the attainment gap between girls and boys overall, as well as within the PP cohort, by raising	£21413

		<p>Overall, boys are closing the gap to girls, and PP boys are closing the gap more successfully than the cohort as a whole: PP boys (excl Y11) have improved from 0.16 in Spring 1 to 0.38 at Summer 2 – an improvement of 0.22. PP girls improved their score by 0.03 of a grade over the same timescale.</p> <p>In terms of GCSE results, our PP gap is positive – PP students have done better than non-PP students. However, PP boys have not done as well as PP girls in GCSE in terms of both P8 and A* to C – therefore more work must be done to improve boys attainment.</p>	<p>achievement by a focus on academic success and behaviour.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

TOTAL ACTUAL COST	£61284
--------------------------	---------------

