

Pupil Premium Grant – Spending Review & Impact 2015/16

St Thomas More Catholic School's Pupil Premium Profile 2015/16			
Total number of pupils in the school*	1473	Service Premium	£900
Number of PP-eligible pupils*	475	Additional payment from 2014/15	£914
Amount per pupil:	£935	Total Budget Available	£445,939
Total pupil premium budget:	£444,125	Total Budget Allocated	£445,457

* Based on data held internally in SIMS as at Sept 2015

Evidence of school performance	
<p>Key statements from Ofsted report(s) relating to the performance of disadvantaged pupils:</p> <p><i>Most recent inspection: February 2016</i></p> <p><i>Overall effectiveness: GOOD</i></p> <p><i>Leadership & Management: GOOD</i></p> <p><i>Quality of teaching, learning and assessment: GOOD</i></p> <p><i>Personal development, behaviour and welfare: GOOD</i></p> <p><i>Outcomes for pupils: REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT</i></p> <p><i>16 to 19 study programmes :GOOD</i></p>	<p><i>Historically, the most-able pupils, pupils who are disadvantaged and those who have special educational needs or disability have not made the progress they should have by Year 11.</i></p> <p><i>Raise achievement for pupils in Years 7 to 11 so that they all make rapid progress, particularly the most able, disadvantaged pupils, and pupils who have special educational needs or disability.</i></p> <p><i>The support given to disadvantaged pupils is now effective in increasing their rates of progress and the gap in achievement between these pupils and others is closing for those in school now....because clear targets and priorities are identified by the school.</i></p>
<p>Summary of school's performance data:</p>	<p><i>Performance of disadvantaged pupils is below that of other students in Y11 unvalidated external examination analysis. Performance has remained the same when compared against 2015 shadow measures for the new accountability measures with the exception of performance in Maths which has declined significantly.</i></p> <p><i>Compared to national figures disadvantaged students perform better in English and the Open basket and are significantly under in Maths and the EBacc bucket</i></p>

Performance of disadvantaged pupils – (Y11 External Examination Data)

	School 2015/16~	National 2015*	School 2014/15#
Progress 8	-0.39	-0.40	-0.40
Progress 8 English	-0.10	-0.34	-0.42
Progress 8 Maths	-0.68	-0.34	-0.36
Progress 8 EBacc	-0.73	-0.49	-0.74
Progress 8 Open	-0.05	-0.41	-0.07
Attainment 8	43.2	39.0	41.3
Basics (% A*-C in Eng & Maths)	37.8	38.0	48.4
EBacc (%)	9.2	11.0	10.8

~Unvalidated performance data 2016

*Data taken from DfE statistical first release - Revised

#Data taken from shadow data for the school released in May 2016

1. Review of expenditure				
Previous Academic Year		2015/16		
i. Quality of teaching for all				
Desired outcome / SIP	Approach identified in the PP Budget	Impact:	Lessons learned / Recommendations	Cost
Increased attainment of PP students specifically in Eng / Maths / Science	<p>Enrichment of In class support –, TA support</p> <p>Focussed support in Y11 classes – Small group withdrawal</p> <p>EEF Toolkit Teaching Assistants- +1 (Low impact for high cost)</p>	<p>Unvalidated examination results show that for Y11 the Progress 8 score of PP students in English is -0.10 compared to 0.11 non PP a gap of 0.21. In Maths PP students score -0.68 compared to non PP students at -0.34 a gap of 0.34</p> <p>Science APS for PP students is 34.4 and non PP is 39.1 a gap of -4.7.</p> <p>Gaps are still evident in attainment and progress between PP and non PP students in English, Maths and Science.</p>	<p>A more focussed approach to TA support with the aim of closing attainment gaps and improving progress in English, mathematics and science is needed. Any academic intervention needs entry and exit assessment to be in place to ensure impact.</p> <p>Revisit CPD with TLR holders regarding marking and feedback and ensure monitoring focuses on progress being made by PP students.</p> <p>It is recommended that this funding allocation continues but with an adapted focus and accountability model.</p>	£106,034
Provide opportunities for out of hours provision with after school clubs / To ensure PPG is allocated for appropriate resources and staff deployment.	<p>Revision – Easter and May half term revision sessions focussed on Y11/Y13. One to one tuition during the school day. Adhoc after school tuition after school</p> <p>EEF Toolkit Extending School time +2 (Low impact for moderate cost. One to One tuition +5 (Moderate impact for high cost)</p>	<p>Revision sessions took place for a number of subjects during the Easter and May half term breaks. The impact of these sessions is unclear as many sessions were not centrally recorded.</p>	<p>A significant number of PP students did not attend revision sessions meaning targeted support was not in place.</p> <p>It is recommended that this funding allocation continues but with an adapted focus and accountability model.</p> <p>A formalised programme of additional study time needs to be implemented to ensure impact on those targeted students.</p>	£28,126
			Total Budget	£134,160

ii. Targeted support – Behaviour Intervention				
Desired outcome - SIP	Approach identified in the PP Budget	Impact:	Lessons learned / Recommendations	Cost
Improvement in number of consequences received by PP students – pastoral support with attendance	<p>Behaviour - St John Vianney – Intervention</p> <p>EEF Toolkit Behaviour interventions +4 (Moderate impact for moderate cost)</p>	<p>During the last academic year PP students continued to receive significantly more (16621 v 13125) consequences than non PP students. PP students had a higher percentage of consequences applied in almost all high level categories (C4+) and in lower categories significant differences can be seen in C3 Late for school, C2 Putting others down and C2 Not bringing PE Kit.</p> <p>Analysis of data by the Behaviour support manager would indicate that PP students who are supported by the programme achieve less consequence points as a result in the immediate period following the intervention</p> <p>Attendance data for 2015/16 would indicate that PP students have a lower attendance percentage than non PP students with the lowest being current Y11 (2015/16 Y10)</p>	<p>Those PP students who participate in specific targeted behaviour intervention support show decreased numbers of behaviour consequences in the immediate period during and after the programme.</p> <p>It is recommended that that this funding allocation continues but with an adapted focus and accountability model which focusses on attendance issues as well as behaviour.</p>	£80,653
Improvement in number of Vivos received by PP students – Enhance vivo system and develop student self confidence	<p>Reward system – Vivo (33% of total) and Vivo admin</p> <p>No EEF Toolkit evidence</p>	<p>PP students received less Vivos on average across the academic year than non PP students (86441 v 119558). the difference was lowest in Y10 and widest in Y11.</p>	<p>There is no current direct correlation evident between the amount of Vivos received and an improvement in either academic progress or behaviour.</p> <p>It is recommended that this funding allocation continues but with an adapted focus and re launch of the Vivo system.</p>	£9,034
			Total Budget	£89,687

i. Targeted support – Academic Intervention

Desired outcome - SIP	Approach identified in the PP Budget	Impact:	Lessons learned / Recommendations	Cost
Increased attainment of PP students specifically in Eng / Maths / Science	Intervention - St Pauls – Raising Achievement EEF Toolkit Small group tuition +4 (Moderate impact for moderate cost)	The focus of academic intervention was working with Y11 students. Intervention staff worked with small groups withdrawn from lessons to support and focus on gaps in the students learning. Progress scores would indicate that less progress was made by PP students than others	Intervention staff have traditionally been used to 'firefight' in Y11 with students who are underperforming in a range of subjects. Interventions need to start lower down the school – working with PP students who are in need of catch up. It is recommended that this funding allocation continues but with an adapted focus and accountability model.	£97,936
Create a base room and base for first call. Establish protocol for entry to the	Intervention - Don Bosco centre – EEF Toolkit Behaviour interventions +4 (Moderate impact for moderate cost)	Students have attended the Don Bosco centre for a variety of reasons and for a variety of timescales. The majority of work done is with managed move students.	It is recommended that this funding allocation continues but with an adapted focus and accountability model.	£31,689
Provide safety net option group for students who are at risk on not achieving -	GCSE Media Studies No EEF Toolkit evidence	12 out of 18 students who moved onto the course at the beginning of the 2015/16 academic year were classed as eligible for PP grant support. Of these students 83.3% achieved A*-C and all made significant progress from their KS2 starting points.	Highly successful use of the PPG. Exceptional progress made by the students targeted. As a result this qualification has been taken on by current Y11 students already studying Creative Media – teaching staff on these courses are being supported by Media department staff who managed and delivered the course so successfully in 2015/16. This funding allocation is no longer applicable as staffing costs are now included in the main staffing budget.	£12,805
Total Budget				£142,430

ii. Additional approaches				
Desired outcome - SIP	Chosen action / approach identified in the PP Budget	Impact:	Lessons learned / Recommendations	Cost
Improved sharing of data across the school – Identification of barriers to learning	Leadership and support No EEF Toolkit evidence	Analysis of PP questionnaires allowed some identification of barriers to learning. Greater consistency of data and information relating to PP students across the school.	There continues to be a need for leadership and support to be funded through the PPG allocation. Some additional support is required to facilitate more focussed projects aimed at improving PP student's academic progress and engagement with school activities.	£37,545
General PPG support	Enriching Learning No EEF Toolkit evidence	Allocation in this area is intended to support a wide range of smaller projects with individual and specific impacts ranging from enabling more PP to attend school trips through to supporting students who are educated off site.	There continues to be a need for funds to be allocated for enriching learning.	£41,635
			Total Budget	£79,180

PPG Expenditure Summary	
Quality of teaching for all	£134,160
Targeted support –Behaviour Intervention	£89,687
Targeted support – Academic Intervention	£142,430
Additional approaches	£79,180
Total	£445,457