Pewsey Vale School 2015-2016 Pupil Premium Spending and Impact

Our aim in deploying the Pupil Premium funding identified in the table above is to narrow the gap between outcomes for Pupil Premium eligible students and other students. Pewsey Vale is a small school with an average year-group size of around 65 students. The small year group sizes mean that it is sometimes difficult to identify patterns in outcomes between successive groups of students because their individual needs are very different and the impact of each student on % figures is very significant. The Department of Education classifies students as 'disadvantaged' when they are in receipt of Free School Meals (either now or within the last 6 years) and when they are in local authority care.

| Pewsey Vale School - Pupil P | remium fi | unding 2015-2016 | |
|--|-------------|--|---------|
| Total number of eligible AFC (Adopted From Care) | 0 | Funding per pupil is £1900 in the academic year. | £0 |
| FSM and FSM 6 | 19+34 | Funding per pupil is £935 in the academic year. | £49,555 |
| Service Children | 31 | Funding per pupil is £300 per academic year. | £9,300 |
| Total number of eligible LAC (Looked After Children) | 1 | Funding per pupil is £1900 in the academic year. This funding is not directly controlled by the school so is not included within our overall budget. | £1900 |
| Total Pupil Premium grant 201 | £58,855 | | |
| Total Pupil Premium reserve fr | £0 | | |
| Total Pupil Premium grant ava | ilable 2015 | 5-2016 | £58,855 |

Key Targets

- Narrow the attainment gap between disadvantaged and other pupils.
- Narrow the progress gap between disadvantaged students and other students in English and Maths to less than the national gap.
- Intervene to narrow gaps in outcomes between disadvantaged and other pupils in all year groups.
- Ensure that attendance for disadvantaged students is in line with attendance for other students in all year groups.

English and Maths Progress

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
|---|--------|--------|------------------|------------------|----------------|
| | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | |
| English – disadvantaged % making at least min progress | 43 | 50 | 40 | 22 (55)** | 62% |
| English – other students % making at least min progress | 62 | 68 | 64 | 58 (67)** | 68% |
| ENGLISH GAP | -19 | -18 | <mark>-24</mark> | <mark>-32</mark> | -6% |
| (national) | (-29) | (-25) | (-35) | | |
| | | | | | |

| Maths – disadvantaged % making at least min progress | 64 | 75 | 27 | 22 (33)** | 25% |
|---|------|------|------------------|------------|------|
| Maths – other students % making at least min progress | 67 | 66 | 61 | 58 (60)** | 63% |
| MATHS GAP | -3 | +9 | <mark>-34</mark> | -32 | -38% |
| (national) | (-9) | (-1) | (-44) | | |
| | | | | | |

^{*}WAG = Working At Grade

The table above shows that the progress gap between disadvantaged pupils and others narrowed significantly in English in 2016 but widened in Mathematics.

Attainment Gap

| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
|--|---------------|---------------|-----------------|
| 5A*-C inc E/M – disadvantaged Students | 25% (25%)** | 11% (23%)** | 13% |
| 5A*-C inc E/M – other Students | 42% (47%)** | 44% (56%)** | 63% |
| PVS attainment gap | -17% (-22%)** | -33% (-33%)** | -50% |
| National gap | -28% | -28% | TBC |

^{**} brackets show 'best' exam results rather than first entry

The information above shows that the attainment gap for disadvantaged students at PVS was similar to the national gap in 2015 but smaller than the national gap the year before. The within school gap widened in 2016.

Value Added Gap

| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
|--------------------------------------|-------|----------------|------|
| Value Added – disadvantaged Students | 974.4 | 950.5 | 982 |
| Value Added – other Students | 988.1 | 983.7 | 999 |
| PVS value added gap | -13.7 | -33 | -17 |
| National value added - disadvantaged | 977.6 | 976.3 | TBC |

The table above shows that PVS disadvantaged students performed similarly to those nationally in 2014 but they performed significantly below PVS and national 'other' students in 2015. The within school gap in 2016 was much smaller than the gap in 2015

Progress 8 and Attainment 8 Gap (new measures for 2016)

| | 2016 |
|---------------------------------------|-------|
| Progress 8 – disadvantaged Students | -0.39 |
| Progress 8 – other Students | +0.05 |
| Attainment 8 - disadvantaged students | 3.98 |
| Attainment 8 - other students | 5.22 |

^{** &#}x27;best' exam results rather than first entry

The table above shows that PVS disadvantaged students had an average Progress 8 score 0.59 lower than other students. Disadvantaged students' Attainment 8 score was just over one GCSE grade behind that of other students.

Spending and Impact

| Teaching, Learning and Assessment – Total spend £2,500 | | | | | |
|--|---------------|--|--------------|---|--|
| Strategy | Involving | Rationale | Cost | Impact RAG and comment | |
| Marking and feedback - PP | All teachers | EEF findings identify detailed | £0 | Improved outcomes for PP students in | |
| students' work marked first | | feedback as a low cost, high impact | | English | |
| | | strategy for closing gaps in learning. | | | |
| Seating plans used consistently in | All teachers; | Teaching staff must engage more | £200 | Many staff using this strategy to good effect | |
| every classroom to identify PP | SLT learning | closely with student data, ensuring | | - requires continued monitoring to ensure | |
| students | walks; line | that they intervene with | | consistency | |
| | management | disadvantaged students in every | | | |
| | | lesson. | | | |
| New assessment and reporting | Data manager; | Efficient measurement of student | £1,200 - | Positive parent feedback in January 2016 | |
| system focussed on quick | all teaching | progress against targets enables | proportion | survey | |
| identification of student | staff | clarity of communication with all | of support | | |
| performance against expected | | stakeholders (parents/carers, | staff salary | | |
| Progress 8 target grade | | teachers, students) | | | |
| Adjust curriculum time and recruit | English/Maths | Improve progress for all learners in | £1100 - | April 2016 – posts recruited and new | |
| additional specialist teachers in | SLs | core subject areas – quality first | contribution | timetable ready for June implementation | |
| English and Mathematics | | teaching and increased curriculum | from PP | | |
| | | time | grant | | |

| Personal Development, Behaviour and Welfare – Total spend £28,100 | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|--|--|
| Strategy | Involving | Rationale | Cost | Impact RAG and comment | |
| School Counsellor | School | Availability of 1:1 counselling for | £3500 - | 12 PP students attended sessions regularly | |
| | counsellor, | most vulnerable students - many of | proportionate | and made progress with attendance and | |
| | CPLO for | whom are PP | contribution | academic outcomes, especially KS3 | |
| | referrals | | from PP grant | | |
| Riding for the Disabled | TA's – LB | To enrich the lives of younger | £800 - | 4 PP students (KS3) were involved. This | |
| | | students by supporting a project | proportionate | has improved transition to secondary | |
| | | where they learn new skills | contribution | school and improved attendance. | |
| | | | from PP grant | | |
| ELSA (Emotional Literacy | SENCO; TA's | To improve self confidence | £1600 - | 7 PP students were involved. This has | |
| Support) for emotionally | | | proportionate | improved transition to secondary school | |
| vulnerable students | | | contribution | and helped maintain good attendance. | |
| | | | from PP grant | | |
| SULP (Social Use of Language | SENCO; TA's | To improve self confidence | £2200 - | 11 PP students were involved. This | |

| Programme) group for students | | | proportionate | improved transition to secondary school |
|---------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------------|---------------|--|
| who needed support with | | | contribution | and helped maintain good attendance. |
| transition | | | from PP grant | |
| Breakfast and Lunch clubs – The | Support staff | To improve student wellbeing, | £4000 - | Majority of PP students regularly made |
| Shak | | communication and enjoyment of | proportionate | use of the Shak and breakfast club |
| | | school. | contribution | |
| | | | from PP grant | |
| Trips and visits | All staff | To ensure PP students are included | £16,000 | 48% of PP students involved in in school |
| | running | within school trips and that their | | trips during the academic year impact on |
| | curriculum | progress is not disadvantaged | | progress in question as some were non- |
| | trips | | | curriculum |

| Outcomes for Pupils – Total spend £ | Outcomes for Pupils – Total spend £22,518 | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---------------|---|--|--|
| Strategy | Involving | Rationale | Cost | Impact RAG and comment | | |
| Homework clubs/revision | All staff; TA's | Enable PP students to access | £6000 - | 27 PP students attended after school | | |
| sessions | running | resources outside of school time | proportionate | homework/revision clubs | | |
| | homework | | contribution | | | |
| | club | | from PP grant | | | |
| GCSE Pod – online GCSE revision | All staff; | Online resource available to all | £800 - | Improved GCSE outcomes in a range of | | |
| resource | subject | students; targeted at PP in | proportionate | subjects for PP students – especially | | |
| | leaders | particular to assist with revision | contribution | English | | |
| | | | from PP grant | | | |
| Small group work (literacy and | TA's | EEF research indicates that TA's are | £6000 - | Improved outcomes for KS3 students. | | |
| numeracy booster) | | most effective within small group | proportionate | Limited effect in KS4. | | |
| | | tuition | contribution | | | |
| | | | from PP grant | | | |
| GCSE support mentoring | Senior | Support with motivation and | £2500 - | Improved GCSE outcomes | | |
| | Leadership | organisation for PP GCSE students - | proportionate | | | |
| | Team; | to enable them to make more | contribution | | | |
| | teaching staff | progress | from PP grant | | | |
| Provision of revision materials - | Bespoke | Enable students to access the | £1218 | Improved GCSE outcomes – especially | | |
| bespoke pack for every Year 11 PP | revision pack | correct revision materials for their | | English where a high proportion of this | | |
| student | provided for | core and option subjects | | was spent. | | |
| | GCSE PP | | | | | |
| | students | | | | | |
| Individual Post-16 careers advice | Support staff | Ensure that PP students receive | £6000 - | All Y11 PP students moved on into Post 16 | | |
| for PP students | | appropriate, targeted guidance on | proportionate | education or work based training settings | | |
| | | Post 16 options | contribution | | | |
| | | | of support | | | |
| | | | staff salary | | | |

| Music Tuition | Peripatetic | Ensure that PP students are entitled | £1205 | 4 PP students made use of music lessons, |
|---------------|-------------|--------------------------------------|-------|--|
| | music | to enrichment opportunities | | improving their attendance and enjoyment |
| | teachers | | | of school |

Key lessons for next academic year

- Having recruited additional teaching staff in Maths and English, there is greater focus on quality first teaching in these subjects with particular regard to Maths.
- Utilise student data even more effectively in classrooms seating plans clearly identifying disadvantaged students particularly PPD most able students.
- Ensure that there is careful monitoring and intervention of progress for PPD students in every year group.
- Continue to ensure that disadvantaged students' work is marked first and that high quality, instructive feedback is given