

Pupil premium 2017-18 Strategy – 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 Results			
	Pupils eligible for PP	Pupils not eligible for PP	Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)
Progress 8 score average 2017 (2017 results)	-0.31 (excl 1 outlier)	-0.56 (excl 1 outlier)	0.11 (2017)
Attainment 8 score average (2017 results)	37.1	35.3	49.76 (2017)

Whole school PP data:

3. Current attainment 2017-18 Internal School data						
	KDP1	KDP2	KDP3	KDP4	Movement to date	Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)
Progress 8 score Whole School PP students	-0.49	-0.57	-0.30		+0.19	0.11 (2017)
Progress 8 score Whole School NON PP students	0.01	-0.21	-0.11		-0.12	
In-school difference	0.5	0.36	0.19		0.31	
Attainment 8 score Whole School PP students	31.5	31.9	32.3		+0.7	49.76 (2017)
Attainment 8 score Whole School NON PP students	40.1	39.8	39.2		-0.9	

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

It should be noted that as our percentage of disadvantaged students is 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>Analysis to date: All the SI interventions have shown increased benefit for PP student other than reading and engaging with books – this should be considered when creating the SI curriculum for next year, whether a different intervention or adjusted to benefit PP students more.</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	Summer 2
PP Students YTD	94.87	94.50	94.62	94.51		
Non PP Students YTD	98.07	97.38	96.77	96.25		

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	-0.32	-0.07	+0.01	
Maths	-0.15	-0.06	+0.14	
Science (Trilogy)	+0.09	+0.09	+0.09	

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

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. See individual case studies for more details.

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
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
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