

Pupil Premium 16-17 strategic plan for expenditure received

Pupil Premium impact review of expenditure 15-16



Pupil Premium strategic plan for expenditure in the academic year 2016-17

Ark William Parker Academy has a Pupil Premium Grant allocation of £219, 725 for the coming academic year (in contrast to £244,035 in 15-16). This funding is given with a specific remit of diminishing any differences between disadvantaged students and those who are not disadvantaged. Schools should seek to lessen their in-school differences and also to ensure that their disadvantaged students perform better than non-disadvantaged other students nationally.

Based upon the internal end of year data for Year 10 moving in to Year 11, the summer 2016 results and the 2015 RAISE Online (2016 RAISE not available until November/December), the following is evident:

<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Historic data (RAISE 2015)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher absence by FSM students (10.1/5.7) • Higher persistent absenteeism by FSM students (19.5/5.9) • Higher FTEs for FSM students (26.67/5.59) • CAPS lower than other students (245.1/307.6) – attainment significantly lower – 1.5 grades • EBACC lower (7/13) • Progress measure lower for disadvantaged students (952.5/984.5) • VA in English, Maths, Science and Humanities lower for disadvantaged students internally than for others internally • EP for disadvantaged students lower than others internally in English entering at NC levels 2,4b and 5c • EP for disadvantaged students lower than others internally in Maths entering at NC levels 2, 4c, 4b, 4a
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Historic data (summer 2016 results)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disadvantaged students on average had less eligible subjects counted in the progress 8 measure than non-disadvantaged students did • The match of English and Maths was lower for disadvantaged students than those not in receipt of Pupil Premium funding • There are differences that need diminishing for disadvantaged students in progress for both Maths and English • Therefore, the percentage of students attaining target grades in English and Maths is lower for disadvantaged students • There are also differences in other English Baccalaureate subjects • Progress 8 shows an adverse difference of 0.9 for disadvantaged students • The average grade gained by disadvantaged students was considerably lower than that for non-disadvantaged students
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Current data (Yr 10 summer 2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entries for disadvantaged students currently remain slightly lower than for non-disadvantaged students • The match of English and Maths for disadvantaged students currently remains lower than for non-disadvantaged students • Progress in English is currently lower for disadvantaged students • Progress 8 is currently estimated to be lower for disadvantaged students, based upon end of year 10 actual exam results

Main barriers faced by eligible pupils

The exact barriers for the 2016 cohort cannot be fully known as the senior leaders of the Academy are newly appointed. However, what we know for 2017 is that:

- Some students have low levels of literacy which impedes their learning and their confidence
- Students need to have a clear aspiration for the future that explains to them why they need to do well in their exams
- Some students struggle to attend regularly and conduct themselves in a way that benefits learning

The Academy already provides literacy support for students with poor literacy levels and through its Careers Event in December 2016 is launching its work to really inspire students to think about next steps after their education is complete.

Mid-year review

Our mid-year review showed that a significant cohort of disadvantaged students are performing poorly in exams because there are barriers that exist for them in accessing the exam environment. This is leading to underachievement in internal tests sat under exam conditions. Some students are also reluctant to write, despite being able to verbally engage with learning presented.

The use of funding has also been reviewed in the light of expenditure to date, to ensure that all of this funding is redirected and used with the aim of improving outcomes for disadvantaged students.

Purchase area	Estimated cost
English and Maths intervention tutors (graduates) – full time	75,000
Holiday, weekend and after school – intervention from current staff	5,000
Expert instructors in to prep for papers in foundation subjects where no network lead available and expert identified and known	10,000
Residential or staycation revision weekends for key EBACC subjects if staff willing to run.	5,000
Purchase of revision guides for all students in all subjects	£25 per head? £3500
Production and distribution of packs of exam questions for Maths for all students to work through	£2,000
Cost of printing exam papers for regular mock practice through the year – percentage of	£1,000
Use of external consultants to support outcomes for students in English and Maths – with a particular focus on students who are fearful or unwilling to engage with the exam environment – which will lead to underachievement; aim of building resilience and overcoming the barriers they face to working meaningfully in the exam context.	£11,200
Use of external consultants to support disadvantaged students in meeting nationally expected standards by the end of year 7 – who arrived below this standard.	£8,600
MADE training bought in to support students in knowing the value of their exams, how to revise and study independently	£11,000
Use of external consultants to support intensive revision days just prior to exams in English and Maths	£10,000
Contribution to the work of Ark network leads for which the academy pays on an annual basis - in core subjects	£10,000
Reallocation of use of key staff who had been running BRIDGE provision in the Academy who will now focus solely on disadvantaged students – with regards to attendance, exclusion-related issues and behaviour and academic performance x 2 staff	£69,900

Estimated total expenditure	222,200
-----------------------------	----------------

The impact of this is reviewed regularly through the year – both through qualitative information and through analysing the data at key data input points. Further, individual subject trackers are used to see how students are doing at a micro level. We adapt our support and our plans for further work in the light of this evaluation. The final impact will be reviewed in August 2017 when we examine the summer outcomes and decide which actions had the most impact, which are worth repeating and which need to be rethought.

Pupil Premium impact review of expenditure 2015-16

The new Senior VP and Regional Director/Executive Principal for Ark William Parker have been advised that funds of £244,035 in 2015-16 were spent as follows:

Item	Intended Impact Area	Amount allocated
Literacy HLTA	Small group work 7-9 to close the gap for progress in English	29,000
Additional English teacher	Reduce class sizes and thereby support closing the gap	32,000
TLR for Literacy	To build an academy-wide approach to literacy that would support disadvantaged students	4,267
Numeracy HLTA	Small group numeracy intervention work	29,000
Additional Maths teacher	Reduce class sizes and thereby support closing the gap	32,000
TLR for Numeracy	To support Maths intervention and development of Maths Mastery	4,267
Homework Club	Support for students in safe environment to complete homework	12,000
Home School Liaison Officer	Reduce exclusions and improve attendance for most vulnerable – in order to close gaps	45,000
Attendance Officer	Support attendance below 90%	9,207
Behaviour Support Officer	Working with students at risk of exclusion – to maintain disadvantaged students in mainstream education	13,901
Alternative curriculum	Construction and mechanics tutors for at risk students	54,461
welfare	Welfare fund, ESBAS, rewards for students	15,000
Villiers Park trip	Gifted and talented – for most able vulnerable students – aim is university admission	3,500
Staff training	Teaching staff to use data to support specific groups for improvement – CPD – leading to improved performance	5,000
Total		288,603

Impact of this expenditure

Despite a positive monitoring visit outcome, 2015-16 was an unsettled year for Ark William Parker. Whilst the above strategic expenditure should have been of value in diminishing differences between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students, it has not had this impact during 2015-16. This does not necessarily mean that the strategies were wholly inaccurate or inappropriate in and of themselves.

Attendance reported for the year 15-16 currently looks like:

	Pupil Premium	
	Yes	No
Year 7	91.3	95.00
Year 8	91.0	95.3
Year 9	89.9	94.7

Year 10	90.9	94.3
Year 11	83.1	83.1
Combined years 7-11	89.24	92.48

Attendance for disadvantaged pupils has remained in line with 2015 reported data from the 2015 RAISE.

With regard to academic outcomes, it is clear that:

- Progress was weak in the previous year for all students
- It was particularly weak for disadvantaged students

There is work to be done with all students in terms of improving progress from entry to exit and this needs to take the form of a universal entitlement. In addition, there needs to be targeted work done with disadvantaged students so that they make progress at a faster rate still than that needed for non-disadvantaged students.

Whilst there are few comparative measures between 2015 and 2016, in 2015 disadvantaged students were not sig- for progress against national in either English or Maths. Whilst disadvantaged students were sig- in 2015 for value added, the difference was diminishing and was considerably improved on 2014; value added had also improved more for disadvantaged students in 2015 than for non-disadvantaged students – all suggesting that the Academy was heading in the right direction, albeit with much work to be done, and that this progress was temporarily derailed in 2016 due to the circumstances of the year.

Subjects where there is **little or no difference in progress against target grades for disadvantaged students** compared to non-disadvantaged students in the 2016 summer results:

- Physics
- Hospitality
- Chemistry
- Biology
- Art

Whilst there was still a gap, in Business Studies, 60% of disadvantaged students exceeded their target grade with 80% hitting or exceeding it.

Upon further investigation, more able (upon entry) disadvantaged students have performed better in some of the subjects they have taken than the less able disadvantaged students. Their progress in English is -8% for three levels of progress on non-disadvantaged students and is +2% for four levels of progress. From the above list, it would be expected that RAISE will show a similar picture for Triple Science when it is published.

Whilst Progress 8 for these students is still at -1.1, this is partly due to curriculum choices made, meaning that students did not fill all eight baskets for the Progress 8 calculations.

It can be seen that priorities for the use of funds in the year 2016-17 are focused around English and Maths, EBACC subjects, and intensive support for those who most need it. Detailed tracking is being put in place as a universal offer, as is curriculum review and tight monitoring of progress.

This is aligned with the immediate review of curriculum for any disadvantaged student who is not currently taking eight robust subjects to ensure that the provision made for them is aspirational and appropriate and is not limiting next steps for any of these young people.