

Pupil premium 2017-18 Evaluation – Beacon Hill Community School

1. Summary information					
School	Beacon Hill Community School				
Academic Year	2017-18	Total PP budget	£50,490	Date of most recent PP Review	April 2018
Total number of pupils	113	Number of pupils eligible for PP	54	Date for next internal review of this strategy	July 2018

2. Current attainment 2017 and 2018 Results			
	Pupils eligible for PP	Pupils not eligible for PP	Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)
Progress 8 score average 2017 and 2018 (internal calculation)	-0.89 2017 -0.34 2018	-0.93 2017 -0.08 2018	0.11 (2017)
	Difference 2017 +0.04 Difference 2018 -0.26 and improvement of +0.55		
Attainment 8 score average 2017 and 2018 (internal calculation)	37.1 2017 32.4 2018	35.3 2017 39.2 2018	49.76 (2017)
	Difference 2017 +1.8 Difference 2018 -6.8		
4+ in English and Maths	50% 2017 44% 2018	40% 2017 60% 2018	
	Difference 2017 +10% Difference 2018 -16%		

It is pleasing that our PP students have done so well this year, with a significant improvement over last year's P8 score – an uplift of half of a grade on average. The size of our PP cohort compared to non-PP students does have a big impact – with over

37% PP in year 11, and 4 of those students low prior attainers, 1 high prior attainer and 3 with SEN, the attainment figures for our students do not compare like for like year on year. 5 of our students were within 0.15 of a grade of their expected progress according to our calculations, and 3 had positive scores.

Whole school PP data:

3. Current attainment 2017-18 Internal School data						
	KDP1	KDP2	KDP3	KDP4 (inc Y11 actuals)	Movement to date	Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)
Progress 8 score Whole School PP students	-0.49	-0.57	-0.30	-0.43	+0.07	0.11 (2017)
Progress 8 score Whole School NON PP students	0.01	-0.21	-0.11	-0.12	-0.12	
In-school difference	-0.5	-0.36	-0.19	-0.31	0.19	
Attainment 8 score Whole School PP students	31.5	31.9	32.3	30.6	-0.9	49.76 (2017)
Attainment 8 score Whole School NON PP students	40.1	39.8	39.2	38.7	-2.0	
In-school difference	-8.6	-7.9	-6.9	-8.1		

Our whole school PP cohort have done well, improving their P8 score by 0.07 and diminishing the difference by 0.19 of a grade.

1. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)

It should be noted that as our percentage of disadvantaged students in the whole school is approaching 50%, each strategy that is designed and delivered for our disadvantaged students is also relevant for non-disadvantaged students. Therefore, our Pupil Premium strategy is driven in part by the whole school strategies defined and driven by internal and external data and, for example, Ofsted judgements, but also by the needs of individual students who are considered and analysed on a case by case basis to ensure their needs are met.

In-school barriers *(issues to be addressed in school, such as poor literacy skills)*

A.	Poor attitude to work, minimal effort and concentration
B.	Poor attendance at school, possibly due to lack of aspiration and attitude, but also contributed to by other factors which may be outside the control of the school
C.	Lack of deep learning and ability to articulate that learning

External barriers *(issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)*

D.	Low aspirations and lack of higher status jobs in the area.
-----------	---

2. Desired outcomes *(desired outcomes and how they will be measured)*

Success criteria

A.	Improved attainment at all levels, measured internally via progress data	Improved progress scores across the board
B.	Improved attendance	Improved attendance, particularly in PP cohort – target attendance of 96%
C.	Improved deeper learning, measured as an improvement in progress and attainment via internal measures	Improved progress scores at KS3
D.	Higher aspirations	More students go on to higher / further education than in the past

3. Planned expenditure					
Academic year		2017-18			
The three headings below enable schools to demonstrate how they are using the Pupil Premium to improve classroom pedagogy, provide targeted support and support whole school strategies.					
i. Quality of teaching for all					
Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
A. Improved attainment at all levels	Project Group KS4 Entry Level Classes 1-2-1 interventions in various subjects SI Lesson to solidify red line objectives	Enables better targeted of interventions to students who require additional assistance	Evaluation via progress data. Ongoing evaluation through work scrutiny, lesson observations and learning walks.	Headteacher	At data points
<p>Commentary</p> <p><u>Autumn 1:</u> Y7 Maths SI (Autumn 1) PP students showed an average improvement of 53% compared to all students 37.8%. Y8 Science PP students AtL improved by 21.4% compared to all students 18.1%. Y9 and 10 English PP students improved by 11.7% compared to all students 10.8%. Y11 students study skills awareness improved for PP by 72.1% compared to all students 67.1%</p> <p><u>Autumn 2:</u> Reading and engaging with books. PP girls did not show an improvement in engagement, PP boys improved by 1.37% compared to all boys 8.6%</p> <p><u>Spring 1:</u> Y7 and 8 Growth Mindset all students benefited from this intervention, including PP students. Year 9 and 10 General Knowledge improvement of 4.2 average points for PP students. Y11 Maths Key Topics – PP students improved by average 30% compared to all students +24%</p> <p><u>Spring 2:</u> Y7,8 and 9 PEE skills – all students improved by an average of 353%, PP students improving on average 303%. Year 10 Maths PP improved ‘back to basics’ score was 66% compared to all students 49%. Y11 Science and English improvement by PP students of 40.7% compared to all students 38.6%.</p> <p><u>Summer Term:</u> Year 10 students improved by an average of 53% compared to non PP average of 74%. Y7 and 8 students improved quiz scores by an average of 7.9 points compared to whole cohort improvement of 8.2 points. Y9 studied literature and improved scores by an average of 1 point, which was comparable to the improvement in the non-PP cohort of a similar amount.</p>					

B. Improved attendance	Focus on attendance, communication with students and parents.	Identified by EEF as good practice, future focus for local PP specialist groups; while it is a strength of a school it is also essential to making progress with these students	Regular updates to SLT from Attendance Officer. Continual emphasis at SLT and in day to day communications.	SLT	At SLT meetings
------------------------	---	---	---	-----	-----------------

Commentary:

Attendance of PP students has not been as high as non-PP students to date, but has not dropped off as rapidly as non-PP students:

Attendance as at end:	Autumn 1	Autumn 2	Spring 1	Spring 2	Summer 1	Difference Autumn – Summer 1
PP Students YTD	94.87	94.50	94.62	94.51	93.23	-1.64
Non PP Students YTD	98.07	97.38	96.77	96.25	94.29	-3.78

C: Lack of deep learning and ability to articulate that learning	Daily SI (Structured Intervention) lesson including red line objectives as well as development of deeper thinking and oral skills. Normal lessons to include deeper learning / higher order questioning / challenge (EACH)	Our data requires a renewed focus on English, Maths and Science to ensure good progress data.	Evaluation via progress data. Ongoing evaluation through work scrutiny, lesson observations and learning walks. Evaluation of specific interventions through regular reporting by teachers	SLT	Half termly
--	--	---	--	-----	-------------

Commentary:

See above for analysis of SI interventions as at each half term. Improvement in PP P8 score overall (see above). English, Maths and Science have all seen improvements in P8 average score for those subjects over time:

P8 score for subjects – gap P8 students vs other students (whole school)	KDP1	KDP2	KDP3	KDP4
English	-0.43	-0.18	-0.14	-0.14
Maths	-0.13	-0.02	+0.03	-0.11

Science (Trilogy)	-0.43	-0.20	-0.03	0.00	
Total budgeted cost				£30000	
ii. Targeted support					
Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
A, C Individual interventions as identified raising performance	Various, including specific small group work, targeted SI time	As evidenced in case studies for each individual; identified across faculties, sharing good practice	Tracked and monitored by SLT via WS, LOs to ensure interventions are having an impact	SLT	Half termly, with renewed focus on interventions as frequently as necessary
<p>Commentary:</p> <p>Individual interventions are detailed in case studies held by individual departments and Learning Support department. SI interventions are tailored to individuals wherever possible, with differentiated and targeted teaching to those who require additional support.</p> <p>Overall improvement in P8 scores, and in English, Maths and Science (see above) demonstrate interventions are raising performance.</p>					
Total budgeted cost				£15000	

iii. Other approaches					
Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?

D: Higher aspirations via P Dev lessons	Access to internal and external mentoring and enrichment activities as identified for individual students	EEF identifies mentoring as being useful in improving attainment.	Monitoring by SLT.	SLT	Half termly
<p>Commentary: P Dev continues to focus on improving social and community skills as well as providing enrichment and aspirational opportunities. External mentors for specific students are in place in order to support better learning and attainment. All students leaving year 11 have a clear career path in front of them, and have accessed their first choice education / training / employment. See individual case studies for more details.</p>					
Total budgeted cost					£6000

4. Review of expenditure				
2016-17				
i. Quality of teaching for all				
Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost
A. Improved attainment at all levels	Project Group KS4 Entry Level Classes 1-2-1 interventions in various subjects SI Lesson to solidify red line objectives	It is clear that PP students have, in general, benefited from our holistic approach to supporting all of our students who need additional help. For example, SI (structured intervention, a once-a-day lesson to focus on red line objectives and embedding of learning) has in particular has been beneficial, with PP students making at least as much progress as others in most of the intervention cycles. The progress of PP students has not markedly outstripped non PP students, which is positive with our cohort profile, although PP students have made more progress this year than the rest of our students. Our KS4 Entry level classes were so successful that we entered some very low prior achievers into English GCSE, and they achieved good grades.	All of our students deserve and receive personalised support. Our SI Lesson has proven beneficial, particularly in literacy and reading interventions. We are therefore intending to re-focus SI on supporting red line objectives in Maths and English, together with focused interventions for specific students as gaps and issues are identified via our data and knowledge of our students.	£10453

B. Improved attendance	Focus on attendance, communication with students and parents.	Our Attendance Officer has worked hard this year to focus on reducing absence, in particular persistent absence, and in promoting the benefits of students being in school to both students and parents. This has resulted in an improvement in PP attendance compared to non PP students – PP students attendance fell less last year than the rest of the school; a testament to the focus on PP students and their parents and engagement with school.	Students cannot make progress if they are not at school, and although we missed our 96% attendance target last year this was primarily as a result of a minimal number of students, a very few of which have been persistently absent due to medical and mental health conditions which the school is support them with as far as we are able. Attendance is essential, and we feel our approach worked well this year. With some tweaks to further tighten up our approach, we will continue with this action next academic year.	£2744
C: Lack of deep learning and ability to articulate that learning	Daily SI (Structured Intervention) lesson including red line objectives as well as development of deeper thinking and oral skills. Normal lessons to include deeper learning / higher order questioning / challenge (EACH)	EACH has been particularly successful this year, as evidenced in our work scrutiny and improvement in lesson & student learning observations. The differentiated approach has resulted in particular improvements in Maths, English and Science for all students, but in particular PP students. Coupled with the focus on red line objectives, debating skills and other transferrable skills in SI (see above), we feel that our approach has improved the ability of our students to learn and to know how to learn effectively, and how to articulate what they have learned.	Our focus for 2018-19 is to achieve a P8 of 0 and to boost HPA attainment, amongst others. By providing differentiated lessons and opportunities for students to embed and deepen learning, we feel we will be better able to achieve our objectives. We will therefore continue with SI and encouraging deep learning and articulation of learning through a variety of methods in 2018-19.	£19,723
ii. Targeted support				

Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost
A, C Individual interventions as identified raising performance	Various, including specific small group work, targeted SI time	Although the difference between PP and non PP students did not diminish this year (partly due to an excellent result last year with PP students outperforming non-PP students) we feel that, taking into account their starting points, our PP students have done well. In particular, we supported two of our LPA students to achieve GCSEs in English as well as entry level qualifications in Maths and Science. We have worked hard with individuals to find interventions that have worked with them, and feel that our reasonable progress results and comparable results at 4+ and 5+ have been successful; indeed, PP students out performed non PP at 5+ in English and Maths crossover.	We feel that this approach worked – we know our students well and want all students, regardless of ability, to do well. Although it is difficult to track and quantify some of our interventions, we feel that the results of our students speak for themselves and we will continue to focus at an individual level in the coming academic year.	£15273
iii. Other approaches				
Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost

<p>D: Higher aspirations via P Dev lessons</p>	<p>Access to internal and external mentoring and enrichment activities as identified for individual students</p>	<p>Our suite of aspirational careers guidance and personal development curricula have been very well received by students, and judged against external benchmarks (e.g. Gatsby) as very effective and comprehensive. All of our year 11 students have gone on to study or work in their preferred areas of interest.</p>	<p>Improving aspirations and enabling our students to become the rounded people they should be is one of our key aims. We feel that with the leaving cohort achieving what they needed to follow their ambitions. Our new LLMAC curriculum will expose our students to the world of work and help them to see what is possible with the education they will receive with us; this can only help to raise aspirations and improve their chances of success in the wider world.</p>	<p>£3417</p>
--	--	--	---	--------------

TOTAL SPENT £51,611