

Pupil Premium Report 2015 – 2016

Introduction

Schools receive funding to support students that have been entitled to free school meals any time in the previous six academic years (FSM6), students who have been looked after by the local authority continuously for more than six months (LAC), or students whose parents/carers have been service personnel any time in the previous three academic years. With the exception of the children of military personnel, students eligible for Pupil Premium funding are referred to as “disadvantaged” students. In 2015-16 the number of students eligible for pupil premium funding was as follows;

Year Group	Number of Students	% of cohort
7	76	45%
8	70	42%
9	58	42%
10	62	39%
11	62	37%
Total	328	41%

The funding received within the 2015-16 financial year totalled £308,635. The college’s intention was to use this funding to tackle those barriers which prevent disadvantaged students from achieving as well as their peers.

Overall impact of the strategy

	Progress 8		Attainment 8	
	2015	2016	2015	2016
College disadvantaged students	-0.7	-0.4	34.9	36.7
National not disadvantaged students	0	0	51.4	52.5
Difference	-0.7	-0.4	-16.5	-15.8

- Disadvantaged students made better progress in 2016 than in 2015
- The difference between the progress of disadvantaged students in the college and the national average for not disadvantaged students decreased
- Disadvantaged students scored more attainment points in 2016, despite having prior attainment on entry than the 2015 cohort
- The difference between the attainment of disadvantaged students in the college and the national average for not disadvantaged students decreased

The college’s strategy

The strategy to improve the achievement of disadvantaged students is divided in to six strands

- Strand One: Raising progress and attainment

- Strand Two: Improving attendance
- Strand Three: Building foundations
- Strand Four: Curriculum
- Strand Five: Providing additional support for the most able
- Strand Six: Inclusion and emotional support

The impact of each strand

Strand One: Raising progress and attainment

Expenditure: £163,210

Rationale: In 2015 the attainment and progress of disadvantaged students was below the national average achieved by their peers. While gaps in attainment and progress were slightly smaller than the national average, the college aspires for these to be narrowed further.

Aims: For disadvantaged students to attain and make progress in line with national averages and for the gap with non-disadvantaged students nationally to narrow.

Strategy 1a: Small group intervention: Groups of a maximum of 10 disadvantaged students taught by qualified teachers and HLTAs in English, maths and science.

Impact:

For English and science we measured effectiveness of the intervention through classroom assessment data.

English

Year	Number of students	Average sub-level /grade change*
7	4	+3
8	18	+1.8
9	9	+0.4
10	21	+0.6
11	33	+0.3

*Year 7 and 8 sub-level measurements, Year 9, 10 and 11 grade change

As can be seen from the table, all students in the intervention groups made significant gains across the year. These gains were above or in line with college expectations. The Year 10 figure was affected by the low attendance of three students in the cohort.

Science

Year	Number of students	Average sub-level/grade change
7	4	+3.8
8	2	+5

9	7	+3.1
10	4	+0.7
11	8	+0.6

*Year 7 and 8 sub-level measurements, Year 9, 10 and 11 grade change

Again, good progress can be seen in all groups. KS4 was particularly pleasing as both groups on average gained over half a grade each.

Maths

In assessing the gains made by students who received maths intervention, it was decided to trial a different method of tracking. Groups of students were identified with specific weaknesses eg. 'Solving equations'. They were then pre-tested and post-tested on those specific skills. Students used a GCSE paper taken in September 2015. The students were then re-tested with questions on the paper in relation to the intervention topic they had received.

Average percentage gain of GCSE marks by those students when re-tested:

Year	Number of students in group	Average % of marks gained
7	16	13.2%
8	8	16.4%
9	7	14.6%
10	4	12.8%
11	10	16.8%

These results show good progress by all. A gain of 13% on a GCSE paper represents an increase of a full grade.

Actions for 2016-17

- Students with attendance or behaviour problems have been excluded from the group and will be intervened with in a different way.
- All students will be subject specific pre and post tested in strict exam conditions to show effectiveness of the intervention
- The focus of the intervention groups will be narrower eg. 'solving equations' as opposed to 'algebra'
- The maximum intervention group size will be five students
- Students will be removed from a variety of non-core subjects on a rota basis as opposed to just core PE
- The intervention blocks will be shorter (9 weeks)
- Y7/8 intervention students will do 2 hours per fortnight. Y9/10/11 students will do 4 hours per fortnight
- Students will not be allowed to take part in two consecutive intervention blocks. This will reduce the impact on non-core subjects

Strategy 1b: Pupil Premium hour: Teachers were allocated a protected hour per fortnight of planning, preparation and assessment on their timetable. They used this time to plan specifically for the progress of disadvantaged students. For example:

- Planning specific activities to support disadvantaged students
- Monitoring and tracking
- Contact with other staff eg. Tutor, other teachers to share good practice
- Contact with disadvantaged students or home

Impact

An end of year qualitative survey was undertaken by staff which highlighted the strategies used in this hour as having most impact:

- Planning specific activities to support disadvantaged students
- Monitoring and tracking
- Contact with other staff eg. Tutor, other teachers to share good practice

Actions for 2016-17

- This year, staff will focus on three students per class. These will be known as Priority Students and will be required to be disadvantaged.
- Staff will log specific priority students interventions on SHARK (our in-college database) and they will be reviewed after every assessment point (four times per year)
- Staff will choose their interventions from a list made up of successful interventions from 2015-16
- Their first intervention is chosen for them and is in line with the whole college drive on marking and feedback – extra feedback in exercise books for all three students. This will be done in orange ink to stand out from the normal green marking done for all students.

Strategy 1c: CPD on intervention strategies. Teachers were given time on INSET days in order to research various successfully proven strategies for use with disadvantaged students within the classroom. Opportunities were then given for staff to trial these and feedback to colleagues.

Impact

Staff trialled new disadvantaged-specific strategies within the classroom and those with most impact were as follows:

1. Extra 1-1 help during lessons
2. Extra questioning of disadvantaged students to make sure understanding is consolidated
3. Differentiated work to boost confidence and engage

Strategy 1d: Careers advisor: The appointment of a 0.2 FTE careers advisor for disadvantaged students.

Impact

In 2015 3.57% of Y11 leavers were classed as NEET. 2.8% of non-disadvantaged students vs 3.2% of disadvantaged students. This gap has narrowed from 2014/15. This represents 5 students, 2 of whom are disadvantaged. One disadvantaged student is NEET as a result of a certified medical condition. The second disadvantaged student now has an agreed start date for training in place.

Action for 2016-17

- The careers advisor will continue to prioritise disadvantaged students for post-16 advice.

Strategy 1e: RAP group: 33 Year 11 disadvantaged students identified at the end of year 10 as having a negative Progress 8 score and a need for intervention. Students in the RAP group a staff mentor for the year, attended 1 x additional hour of after college revisions and completed 1 x additional hour of extra homework per week. Small incentives were used to encourage participation and motivation.

All RAP students were surveyed at the end of the year and the results were summarised in the annual RAP evaluation document. The findings are reflected in future actions highlighted below.

Impact

Of the 33 students who were part of the group, 16 improved their progress 8 score during the year. The 2014/15 cohort were measured in terms of attainment (5 A*-C incl. E+M) so this does not allow for direct comparisons to be made.

Actions for 2016-17

- This year's group is smaller (27 students).
- Students with attendance or behaviour problems have not been included in the group and will be intervened with in a different way.
- This year's group have a wider range of ability.
- There are four assessment points this year as opposed to three last year – this should give mentors more up to date and accurate data to work with.
- Staff have been encouraged to hold more regular meetings which we know has a positive correlation with students making better progress.
- Students will be made more responsible for collecting extra tasks and completing them.

Strand Two: Improving attendance

Expenditure: £1,000

Rationale: In 2015 the attendance of disadvantaged students decreased in the previous year. The gap between their attendance and that of other students in the college widened and the gap to national average was 3.2%. If outcomes of disadvantaged students are to improve it is necessary to first improve their attendance to college.

Aims: For disadvantaged students at Springwell to attend in line with the national average for their group and for the in college attendance gap to narrower to below the national gap.

Strategy 2a: EWO: Appointment of 0.4 in-house Educational Attendance Officer with a focus on disadvantaged attendance.

Impact

Group	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Trend
Disadvantaged	92.9	92.6	93.5	94.4	↑
Other	-	-	95.8	96.8	↑
CLA	96.2	87.8	93.7	99.1	↑

Term 6	Springwell	National
Attendance	95.6	94.8
Absence	4.4	5.2
FSM Gap*	2.6	3.2

- The attendance of disadvantaged students increased by 0.7% in 12 months
- The difference between the attendance of advantaged and disadvantaged students reduced from 5.2 (2014/15) to 2.4 (2015/16)
- The in college difference of 2.4 is now smaller than the national difference of 3.1

Action for 2016-17

A dedicated day (0.2) of EWO time for disadvantaged students will continue this year.

Strand Three: Building foundations

Expenditure: £33,900

Rationale: Students join the college with under developed literacy skills. Reading ages are on average one whole year below chronological age and prior attainment in writing is significantly below national average. In order for students to achieve well at GCSE it is necessary first to ensure that their reading and writing skills recover quickly towards the level of their peers nationally.

Aims: To stop and ultimately reverse the widening of the gap in reading ages between disadvantaged and other students.

Strategy 3a: Lexia Reading Scheme: The purchase of the Lexia Scheme and associated licences allows students to develop and improve their phonological awareness and comprehension skills. 46 classes took part in the Lexia scheme this year. The scheme has been extended to allow for use at home.

The Lexia reading tests identified Year 7 and 8 LPA students whose reading ages remained static or fallen to be targeted by, and receive additional TA support for extra Lexia time in tutor time once per week. TAs have their own Lexia accounts and have been provided with training on Lexia use. Parents/carers have been informed of Lexia use through the college newsletter.

Impact

- 46 students, 25 of whom were disadvantaged, accessed Lexia Reading.
- The average usage for Year 7 students over the whole year was approximately 10 hours.
- The average usage for Year 8 students over the whole year was, on average, 10.5 hours.
- The progression of the four sets has recently been assessed and the following was found:

Levels of progression

	0	1	2	3	4
8X3	4	14	4	1	1
8Y3	4	15	2	1	0
9X3	0	5	7	10	1
9Y3	1	8	6	3	2
	9	32	19	15	4

This data shows that 48% of Lexia students have made at least 2 levels of progress. 24% have made 3 or 4 levels of progress.

Actions for 2016-17

- KS3 students in English lessons need at least 1 hour of Lexia per week. Y7/8 bottom sets only (LPA students). This is roughly 50 students. The one hour will be made up of 40 minutes of classroom study and 20 minutes of homework. The expectation is that every 'Lexia' student uses Lexia for a minimum of 60 minutes per week. This is known as their 'minimum usage target'.
- Lexia data will be reviewed at each PC (Progress check) point. A Lexia report will be written based on this data. This report will be made available to English staff, SLT and Governors. The report will highlight:
 - Progress of all Lexia students – hours of usage, Lexia levels fully completed, Lexia levels attained, with a breakdown.

Strategy 3b: Accelerated Reader: The Accelerated Reader program is an IT based program that tests reading and comprehension. Students select books on their reading level, read independently, and take an independent comprehension test on the computer. Each book is worth a certain number of points based on its length and reading level. The AR programme is in place for all KS3 students. However, it is particularly important for disadvantaged students as this encouragement of reading is not something that you might expect them to receive at home.

Impact

The tables below show the decimal gaps between actual ages and reading ages for Year 7 and Year 8 students involved in the Accelerated Reader scheme:

Year 7

	Term 1	Term 2	Term 3	Term 4	Term 5	Term 6
All	-1.00	-1.12	-1.17	-1.17	-1.07	-1.26
Disadvantaged	-1.01	-1.13	-1.17	-1.19	-1.03	-1.29
Other	-1.01	-1.12	-1.18	-1.17	-1.08	-1.23

Gap	0	-0.01	+0.01	-0.02	+0.05	-0.06
-----	---	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

The table shows a widening of the reading age to actual age throughout the year for all groups. The progress of disadvantaged students was broadly in line with 'All students' and 'other students'. The gap remains insignificantly small throughout the year suggesting that disadvantaged students are now making progress in reading at the same rate as other students.

Year 8

	Term 1	Term 2	Term 3	Term 4	Term 5	Term 6
All	-1.85	-1.82	-1.69	-1.87	-1.84	-1.70
Disadvantaged	-1.86	-1.83	-1.71	-1.89	-1.85	-1.73
Other	-1.84	-1.81	-1.70	-1.86	-1.84	-1.71
Gap	-0.02	-0.02	-0.01	-0.03	-0.01	-0.02

Year 8 shows a more positive picture. Again, disadvantaged students are broadly in line with other students. This information will become more accurate this year as each student's data has more test results in the system. The gap remains the same, almost zero.

Actions for 2016-17

KS3 students in English (not bottom sets) will have one AR lesson per week. They will be assessed through termly Star Tests. These tests produce a reading age in years and months. An AR report will be written after every PC. The report will highlight for disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students:

- Progress of all AR students using a moving 3-point average
- Improvement from the last PC
- Actions taken as a result

AR students also take 'Book quizzes' after reading each book but these will not be reported on. However, this data may well be used to reward students. The report will focus on reading ages. However, data shows us that the more fiction students read the greater improvements are seen in their literacy skill level and comprehension. Therefore students must be actively encouraged to read as many books as possible which are the correct ZPD (Zone of Proximal Development)

Strand Four: Curriculum

Expenditure: £29,500

Rationale: The majority of disadvantaged students can access the same broad and balanced curriculum followed by other students. For a small number, an alternative provision can improve their confidence and self-esteem and as a consequence improve their outcomes in both their alternative provision and their core curriculum.

Aims: For all students on alternative provision to complete their Key Stage 4 courses and make progress in their core subjects in line with national average given their starting points.

Strategy 4a: Alternative Provision: 7 students were involved in alternative provision (1 x Y10, 6 x Y11) on Motor Vehicle and Senior Jigsaw courses of which 5 (71%) were disadvantaged. All successfully completed their courses.

Impact: All student successfully completed their courses and achieved accreditation.

Actions for 2016-17:

Both courses will be used this year to give individual disadvantaged students access to an alternative provision course that will be of benefit to them in their post-16 choices.

Those students applying for alternative provision will be considered by the AHT attainment in order to consider their curriculum offer.

Strand Five: Providing additional support for the Most Able

Expenditure: £11,250

Rationale: Higher than average levels of deprivation in the local area (4th highest quintile) coupled with the de-industrialisation of this former coalfield area has led to low aspirations for some students. Some of our most able disadvantaged students do not currently progress to Level 3 study and on to university. Fewer still enter employment in “the professions”.

Aims: To raise the aspirations of this group of students so that more aspire to continue in education and enter employment in the professions. In the short term this group of students will make progress at least in line with their peers nationally.

Strategy 5a: Aspirational workplace visits: This included the new initiative of ‘Careers Café’ where students were invited to speak in small groups, to a professional from a local employer, that they were interested in post-16. Industries that came into college to speak to students included Engineering, Law and Marketing. Disadvantaged students were approached as a priority and home was contacted to encourage participation. Disadvantaged students were involved in the ‘Made in Chesterfield’ initiative and five disadvantaged students attended a day at MSE Hillier – a large local manufacturing firm. They were praised by the guide there who described them as “keen and enthusiastic”.

In college visits

In college speakers eg. Barclays Lifeskills held specific sessions for disadvantaged students. They were received very well by students.

University visits

This year the college took Year 9, 10 and 11 students to visit various universities including Cambridge University, Sheffield University, Sheffield Hallam University and Derby University. Again, disadvantaged students were approached firstly and contact home was made. 55% of students that visited Universities were disadvantaged.

Impact

Those interviewed afterwards described the Barclay's life skills sessions as "inspirational".

95% of those Y11 disadvantaged students who attended visits to Universities went on to study 'A' Level or level 3 courses post 16. "encouraging". Several disadvantaged students said that the sessions made them realise that there are "lots of opportunities out there" and that "..... there's a career out there for everyone".

Actions for 2016-17

Aspirational workplace visits to continue

Careers Cafés were not attended by as many students as hoped. However, these will continue this year in conjunction with our participation in the D2N2 initiative. The visits will be greater in number and will be more focused on the aspirations of our disadvantaged students.

In college visits

We will be taking advantage of Barclays Lifeskills before it's cessation in November 2016. We are currently looking for alternative providers.

University visits

These will continue and we will encourage disadvantaged students to attend our visits to red brick universities.

Strand Six: Inclusion and emotional support

Expenditure: £59,525

Rationale: In 2014-15 disadvantaged students were more likely to be excluded or internally secluded. In many such cases, this has been a barrier to their achievement. The Behaviour Improvement Centre works with such students to help them to reflect on their behaviour. Learning Mentors work with students with emotional difficulties. By tackling these barriers to learning it is expected that these students will achieve improved outcomes.

Aims: To reduce the number of "repeat offences" and for all students supported in this way to make improved progress.

Strategy 6a: Behaviour Improvement Centre: The BIC serves as an internal seclusion unit that replaces the need for fixed term external exclusions. National data shows that more disadvantaged students than non-disadvantaged students receive exclusions nationally. The BIC aims to sanction students whilst also undertaking reflective activities and restorative work. There is some level of outreach work for disaffected students when time allows.

Impact

In 2014/15 35% of disadvantaged students received an internal seclusion (BIC) compared to 10% of non disadvantaged students – a 25% gap. This represents 428 days of disadvantaged BIC.

In 2015/16 25% of disadvantaged students received an internal exclusion (BIC) compared to 9% of Non- disadvantaged students so 16% gap. This represents 326 days of BIC for disadvantaged students.

This provision has therefore secured;

- A reduction in the difference between BIC sanctions received by disadvantaged and other students by 9%
- A reduction in BIC sanctions for disadvantaged students from 35% to 25% 2014/15 to 2015/16
- A 24% reduction in number of days between the two years for disadvantaged students
- A smaller reduction (20%) in number of days between the two years for non-disadvantaged students

Actions for 2016-17

The college will continue to part fund BIC staff in order to include and support our disadvantaged students. Data will monitored throughout the year to make sure that the disadvantaged to not disadvantaged difference is being reduced further.

For a more detailed breakdown of expenditure please refer to the pupil premium plan, 2015-16.