

Pupil premium spending review (including year 7 catch-up funding): 2017 – 2018

Addressing barriers to learning for pupil premium students			
<p>Barrier 1 – disadvantaged students have on average lower prior attainment on entry to the school than other students (average key stage 2 points score of 25 as opposed to 28 for other students)</p> <p>Goal 1 - Improve outcomes and progress for disadvantaged students, eliminating the gap through KS3 so that disadvantaged students achieve expected progress at least in line with their peers by KS4.</p>			
Focus of spending	Rationale	How we will measure impact	Impact
<p>Continue our successful development of quality first teaching.</p> <p>Focus on: questioning, marking and feedback, growing independence, curiosity and resilience and objectives-led teaching.</p> <p>Supported by CPD, monitoring and tracking and regular, tightly focused analysis of the progress of groups and sub-groups.</p>	<p>The most powerful impact on students' progress is the quality of teaching and learning, in particular: quality of feedback; quality of questioning and quality of objectives led teaching.</p>	<p>We will measure qualitatively through learning walks, work scrutiny and formal lesson observation. Data seating plans enable us to identify pupil premium students and give specific feedback on their responses and teachers' provision to meet their needs.</p> <p>In years 7 to 9 we will measure quantitatively through tracking the relative proportions of students achieving security in the taught curriculum, aiming to equalise those proportions.</p> <p>In years 10 and 11 we will measure quantitatively through tracking primarily the gap in progress 8 scores, but also the gap in achievement in English and maths, in each</p>	<p><i>Learning walk data from 2017-18 identified 82% of lessons green and 18% of lessons Amber re learning during the last academic year. No lessons were rated 'red'</i></p> <p><i>Supporting data seating plans enable staff to identify and target key students during lessons through assessment and questioning</i></p> <p><i>In Year 7 the Term 6 progress checks identified 36% of students as having achieved security in English verses 44% of non-pupil premium students, 21% of students achieved security Maths verses 33% non-pupil premium students.</i></p> <p><i>In Year 8 the Term 6 progress checks identified 47% of students as having achieved security in English verses 39% of non-pupil premium</i></p>

		<p>case seeking to narrow those gaps and eliminate differences.</p>	<p>students, 18% of students achieved security Maths verses 25% non-pupil premium students.</p> <p><i>In Year 9 the Term 6 progress checks identified 50% of students as having achieved security in English the same as non-pupil premium students and 29% of students achieved security in Maths verses 23% non-pupil premium students.</i></p> <p><i>Internal predictions following the Year 10 progress checks predict a relative Progress score of -0.33 for disadvantaged students verses a score of 0.033 non-pupil premium.</i></p> <p><i>The Progress 8 score for disadvantaged students in Year 11 was -0.34 compared to -0.11 for other students.</i></p> <p><i>Fitzharrys P8 for disadvantaged students was the 8th highest in Oxfordshire. The gap between disadvantaged and others was the second lowest.</i></p>
<p><i>Funding specific teaching interventions (for example to address gaps in literacy, maths)</i></p>	<p>We know that a significant group of disadvantaged students have barriers to learning in literacy and numeracy. More focused small-group and one to one teaching will help them to overcome these barriers, as well as targeted revision schools at Easter and half-term.</p>	<p><i>We will measure impact through intervention specific assessment (for instance reading tests). We would expect these to show progress.</i></p> <p><i>For years 10 and 11 we will measure impact through tracking English and maths progress scores, expecting students to achieve in line with expectations.</i></p>	<p><i>Support offered by SEN team to key students which made considerable differences to student's coursework completion.</i></p> <p><i>Regular raising achievement meetings enabled support to be implemented for key underperforming students. 1:1 tuition and Easter/Half Term study sessions offered along with '4 in a day' and '5 in a day' activities. Strategies boosted progress although still not in line with expectations</i></p>
<p><i>Maintaining class size at around 25, particularly in years 7 to 9</i></p>	<p>Smaller class sizes by themselves have no impact on achievement and</p>	<p>We will measure impact through systematic work scrutiny, which reports separately on feedback given to pupil premium students.</p>	<p><i>Work scrutiny's undertaken as part of lesson observations enabled dialog between colleagues to flourish with the profile of</i></p>

	progress, but they enable us to increase expectations of the quality of marking and feedback.	We will expect to see our core certainties in place at an exemplary level for disadvantaged students : books are marked first, feedback is specific and constructive, evidence of student's interaction with the feedback and impact on progress.	<i>disadvantaged students being raised via this process. Increased completion of triple impact assessment tasks observed with the quality and frequency of work broadly in line with other students.</i>
	TOTAL	£42,000	

Barrier 2 – disadvantaged students have on average lower attendance than other students (92.8% compared with 95.4%)			
Goal 2 – eliminate difference in attendance through specific additional support and intervention for disadvantaged students with the ambition that disadvantaged attendance will be within a percentage point of 'other' students.			
Focus of spending	Rationale	How we will measure impact	Impact
Funding a proportion of the salary of student well-being managers' salaries. Our SWMs support attendance and engagement in numerous ways, including: removing barriers to learning; addressing social, emotional and friendship issues; engaging directly with parents and carers; following up after parents evening; providing TLC, advice and guidance; study and homework support.	We know that disadvantaged students will need extra support, intervention and monitoring to achieve attendance in line with the average of other students. Attendance has improved year on year at Fitzharrys. Our systematic approach, incentives and interventions support our ambitions for our disadvantaged students.	Quantitatively, through tracking the average attendance of pupil premium students compared with other students. We expect the attendance of pupil premium students to be within a percentage point of other students.	<i>Strategies developed to support monitoring and intervention. Attendance KPI used to track attendance and target follow up. KPI records headline figures achieved, however disadvantaged attendance lower than non-disadvantage students although small student numbers mean data can be impacted by small student numbers. Some clear overlap with SEN students, another focus area and some complicated individual support cases with students waiting for OCC SEN placements and wider external support.</i>
	TOTAL	£21000	

Barrier 3 – disadvantaged students have on average lower homework completion rates than other students			
Goal 3 – provide support and opportunities to ensure that homework completion rates rise to meet the norm.			
Focus of spending	Rationale	How we will measure impact	Impact
Funding staffing to support personal study completion both in lunch and after school	<i>We know that disadvantaged students may need to be provided with a good work environment and closer support in order to complete homework</i>	Quantitatively through monitoring rates of after school catch-ups give for not completing homework – we expect these to reduce in line with the rates for other students.	<i>Monitoring of personal study shows that lower sets (which have proportionately more disadvantaged students) had increased rates of personal study set (though still not in line with the average for the school)</i>
Implement new approach to personal study with regular learning and reinforcement homework and follow up testing. This will not rely on internet access or technology. While this does not have a cost it will support stronger monitoring and reinforcement, enabling us to direct our interventions and support.	Homework that relies upon additional resources, parental support, parents' own prior education and access to computers can place disadvantaged students at a further disadvantage. Regular reinforcement builds study habits and resilience.	Qualitatively over the course of our regular teaching and assessment.	<i>Learning homework's a focus of staff CPD and development, 'teach meet' focus enables good practice to be shared and developed. Supporting engagement strategies developed leading to increased consistency with student participation and completion. School approach to 'catch up' sessions enables non-completion to be followed up.</i>
TOTAL		£9000	

Barrier 4 – families of disadvantaged students have, on average, lower engagement with the school through, for example, parents’ consultations.

Goal 4 – measurably improve parental engagement with an impact on attendance, behaviour and outcomes indicated elsewhere in the plan.

Focus of spending	Rationale	How we will measure impact	Impact
Improving parental engagement through provision of on-line access to behaviour, homework and progress information and through providing alternative feedback from parents’ consultations	<i>We know that families of some disadvantaged students sometimes find it more difficult to engage with the school. Sometimes on-line tools provide a less threatening way in.</i>	<i>Quantitatively through monitoring regular log-ons to My Child At School (expecting log-ons to match those of the families of other students) and through tracking attendance at parents’ consultations and feedback provided (aiming for 100% of disadvantaged families receiving parents’ consultation feedback.</i>	<i>Log-ons for the parents of disadvantaged students are approximately 12% below the log-ons of the parents of other students. Feedback is gathered and collated for all students who don’t attend parents evening by SWMs and then fed back to parents separately to ensure 100% coverage after each parents teacher consultation evening.</i>
TOTAL		£5000	

Barrier 5 – disadvantaged students are, on average, slightly more likely to be involved in recordable behaviour incidents than other students

Goal 5 – continue to work with students and families to eliminate the differences at all levels so that **behaviour sanctions and exclusion are at least in line with ‘other’ students.**

Focus of spending	Rationale	How we will measure impact	Impact
<p>Part-fund the salary of a student well-being manager to monitor incidents and provide coaching and support to improve emotional resilience.</p> <p>Deliberate policy of avoiding external fixed term exclusion for disadvantaged students so they are not missing learning time and we can provide the support and reparation to keep them on track.</p>	<p><i>We know that some disadvantaged students find self-regulation and sustaining long-term goals more difficult.</i></p>	<p>Quantitatively through monitoring the proportions of behaviour incidents recorded for disadvantaged students compared to other students. We expect the gap to close for each student.</p> <p>For outlier students we will use In year Fair Access Panel (IYFAP) resources to provide additional support and intervention.</p>	<p><i>Behaviour monitoring and tracking including the development of SWM teams has helped to reduce behaviour incidents in school. Headline figures for FTE have fallen when compared to the previous academic year on our internal RAISE analysis. The headline figure is also lower than the last known national average.</i></p> <p><i>The use of internal isolation as an alternative to FTE has been successful and helped wherever possible keep students in school. IYFAP discussions, follow up funding and alternative student support has successfully helped to engage key students who were at risk of either fixed term exclusions or permanent exclusion.</i></p>
TOTAL		£5000	

Year 7 catch-up funding			
Focus of spending	Rationale	How we will measure impact	Impact
<p><i>Funding specific interventions – both small group and one to one literacy and numeracy programmes, and a specific intervention group for those with the lowest scaled scores.</i></p>	<p><i>A number of students have arrived from primary school who are significantly below the expected standard. They will require re-teaching of elements of the primary school curriculum.</i></p>	<p><i>We will measure the proportions of these students achieving security in year 7 topics in English and maths, aiming for 60% to achieve security.</i></p>	<p><i>In Year 7 the Term 6 progress checks identified 36% of students as having achieved security in English verses 44% of non-pupil premium students, 21% of students achieved security Maths verses 33% non-pupil premium students.</i></p>
TOTAL		£7000	

Total pupil premium grant spending planned	£89,000
Total PPG funding	£81,980

