

King Charles I School

Use of the Pupil Premium in 2015/16

Our pupil premium grant for 2015/16 was £287,100.

We are keen to improve the achievement and attainment of the disadvantaged students and so our total allocation of funds for support is significantly higher than the pupil premium. The following areas were identified as priorities for students eligible for the pupil premium:

- 1. Improving the leadership and management at senior and middle leadership level**
- 2. Improving the quality of teaching and learning:** by providing professional development for all teachers so as to improve: the quality of teaching in the school, the quality of the oral and written feedback given to students and the quality and quantity of the homework activities.
- 3. Improving attainment and achievement**
 - GCSE: percentage of students achieving 5+A*-Cs including English and maths.
 - GCSE: percentage of students making at least satisfactory progress in English and maths.
 - GCSE: percentage of students making at least good progress in English and maths.
 - Years 7-10: percentage of students making at least satisfactory progress in English and maths.
- 4. Improving attendance:** by prioritizing the interventions provided by the attendance officer and heads of year to improve the attendance of pupil premium students.
 - Years 7-11: attendance
 - Years 7-11: persistent absenteeism
- 5. Improving behaviour**
 - Low level disruption in Years 7-11
 - Years 7-11: exclusions

Alongside the various strategies to address the priorities listed above, we will continue with the strategies that last year improved disadvantaged students English and maths attainment and the number of exclusions.

We are also using the following strategies:

- providing professional development for all teachers so as to improve: the quality of teaching in the school, the quality of the oral and written feedback given to students and the quality and quantity of the homework activities;
- providing targeted Information and Guidance using a part time Careers Advisor. He prioritized the Year 11 students eligible for the pupil premium; and
- using our attendance officer to provide targeted intervention to improve the attendance of pupil premium students

Appendix A

Summary of the impact of the pupil premium in the priority areas and other key ones (green=improvement from 2014/15 and better than the national average; amber=decrease from 2014/15 but better than the national average; and red=decrease from 2014/15 and below than the national average).

	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	National averages (2015)
Progress 8		-0.17	+0.15 Gap=-0.12	-0.07 Gap=-0.16	-0.40 Gap=-0.52
Attainment 8		42.6	46.14 Gap=-6.07	46.57 Gap=-6.73	39.0 Gap=-12.5
GCSE: percentage of students achieving 5+A*-Cs including English and maths	31 Gap=-36	38 Gap=-20	59 (SIG+) Gap=-9	57 Gap=-19	39 Gap=-27
GCSE: percentage of students making at least satisfactory progress in English	68 Gap=-14	72 (SIG+) Gap=-8	84 (SIG+) Gap=+2	83 Gap=-9	57 Gap=-17
GCSE: percentage of students making at least good progress in English	10 Gap=-16	38 Gap=-6	24 Gap=-4	42 Gap=-18	
GCSE: percentage of students making at least satisfactory progress in maths	34 (SIG-) Gap=-43	34 Gap=-27	67 (SIG+) Gap=-10	60 Gap=-25	49 Gap=-23
GCSE: percentage of students making at least good progress in maths	11 Gap=-17	9 Gap=-14	26 Gap=-9	38 Gap=-8	
GCSE: capped Average Point Score (APS)	300.0 Gap=-51.4	281.2 Gap=-26.7	301.9 (SIG+) Gap=-26.5	304.83 Gap=-32.34	259.9 Gap=-48.7
GCSE: value added	989.3 Gap=-22.1	979.7 Gap=-28.8	1008.6 (SIG+) Gap=-2.5	1003.9 Gap=-18.7	976.3 Gap=-32.4
Year 7: percentage of students making at least satisfactory progress in English		58 Gap=-4	80 Gap=-14	99 Gap=0	
Year 7: percentage of students making at least satisfactory progress in maths		70 Gap=-8	72 Gap=-6	100 Gap=+1	
Year 8: percentage of students making at least satisfactory progress in English		34 Gap=+3	59 Gap=-1	92 Gap=-3	
Year 8: percentage of students making at least satisfactory progress in maths		40 Gap=-9	54 Gap=-15	84 Gap=-6	

Year 9: percentage of students making at least satisfactory progress in English		37 Gap=-7	57 Gap=-0.5	91 Gap=-3	
Year 9: percentage of students making at least satisfactory progress in maths		54 Gap=-16	69 Gap=-8	85 Gap=-7	
Year 10: percentage of students making at least satisfactory progress in English		61 Gap=-9	83 Gap=-11	82 Gap=-13	
Year 10: percentage of students making at least satisfactory progress in maths		75 Gap=-9	76 Gap=-13	37 Gap=-7	
Years 7-11: attendance (Free School Meal students)	92.5% Gap=-2.5%	93.9% Gap=-2.2%	94.6% Gap=-1.8%	93.8% Gap=-2.6%	92.5% Gap=-3.2%
Years 7-11: persistent absenteeism (Free School Meal students)	13.2% Gap=+9.0%	9.3% Gap=+6.5%	4.8% Gap=+2.9%	17.9% Gap=+11.7%	10.9% Gap=+7.6% <i>The threshold for PA was 15% in 2014/15</i>
Years 7-11: exclusions (Free School Meal students)	FSM 32 exclusions (12.5%) Non FSM 35 exclusions (4.5%) Gap=+7.9%	FSM 34 exclusions (14.1%) Non FSM 35 exclusions (4.4%) Gap=+9.8%	FSM 16 exclusions (5.6%) Non FSM 14 exclusions (2.0%) Gap=+3.6%	FSM 17 exclusions (7.9%) Non FSM 12 exclusions (0.8%) Gap=+7.1%	18.8% Gap=+14.2%

Appendix B

During 2015/16 we used the following strategies with the pupil premium grant to improve disadvantaged student provision in the priority areas.

Strategies used	Budget	Impact on disadvantaged students	Will it be continued for next year?
English and maths intervention: The heads of the English and maths departments used their own staff and academic mentors (two for English and two for maths) and spare capacity to intervene with the students eligible for the catch up and pupil premium and improve their progress.	£87,280	Very successful English and maths interventions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Majority of students improved by one grade in GCSE and level in Year 7. GCSE: sustained success in comparison with national averages in progress 8, 5+A*-Cs including English and maths, levels of progress in English and maths and capped average point score. Year 7: Excellent expected levels of progress in English and maths. 	Yes. With the following points of consideration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Year 7 use Key Stage 2 diagnostic analysis More rigour in the intervention strategies in Year 10 and Year 11 including diagnostic baseline and exit assessments. More training required on assessment criteria of new specifications. Less withdrawal from lessons – use tutor time, lunches and after school.
Maths intervention (PET xi): We used an external company to do intensive tuition with fifteen disadvantaged students.	£23,760	Very successful for the disadvantaged Year 11 students who attended the course-for example, the proportion of students achieving at least expected progress is much better than the national averages.	No. Although successful it was too expensive to continue for the low amounts of students involved.
English and maths residential at Malvern Hills Outdoor Centre-14 Pupil Premium students attended the course	£4,000	Moderately successful for the students that attended: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GCSE English: students achieving expected progress and A*-C grades GCSE mathematics: students achieving expected progress and A*-C grades GCSE: better than national averages in 5+A*-Cs including English and maths and Progress 8. 	No. Although the strategy saw some success it is too expensive to continue for the low amounts of students involved.
Improving the quality of leadership and management in the maths department supported by an advanced skills teacher from Haybridge High School worked with the head of maths and deputy head of maths to improve their ability to lead the department.	£2,000	Moderately successful in the first term. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GCSE: 60% achieving at least satisfactory progress. Better than National averages. Years 7-9: Students making at least satisfactory progress increased. 	Yes, with the following points of consideration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using the ContinU network to share best practice. Evaluate suitability of Key Stage 3 assessments Use links to moderate Key Stage 3 outcomes. Use links to moderate GCSE predictions
We employed three 'Achievement Leader's in Years 9, 10 and 11 to focus on the attendance, behaviour and progress of the disadvantaged students.	£68,755	1. Attainment & achievement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Year 9: Good proportion of students achieving at least satisfactory progress in maths and English. Year 10: Sustained levels of expected progress in English. Maths is more disappointing. Further moderation needed of the current and predicted grades in the reformed GCSEs. 	Yes. More focus on academic monitoring of targeted Pupil Premium students.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ GCSE: Good performance measures in comparison to national averages 2. Attendance above national average 3. Exclusions better than national average 																																								
We employed an 'Achievement Leader' in Years 7 and 8 to focus on the attendance, behaviour and progress of the disadvantaged students.	£25,423	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Excellent levels of expected progress in English and Maths 2. Attendance above national average 3. Behaviour incidents increased as a result of an improved behaviour and consequence system. 	Yes. More focus on academic monitoring of targeted Pupil Premium students.																																							
We employed a part time careers advisor and prioritised his time for the Years 10 and 11 disadvantaged students.	£8,600	Successful intervention through raising aspirations. For example, better than national averages in 5+A*-Cs including English and maths, Progress 8 and expected progress in English and maths.	Yes. However not from the Pupil Premium funding																																							
Subscription to 'Mathswatch' and 'Accelerated Maths' to provide additional support for the disadvantaged students.	£1,698	<p>Very successful strategy with a large cohort able to access it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GCSE: Better than national averages in Progress 8, A*-C and expected progress • Year 7: 99% of Year 7 students making expected progress. 	Yes. Must be integrated better into GCSE curriculum. Pupil Premium students assigned tasks throughout the year using the program to catch-up on content.																																							
We allocated money for heads of non core department to bid for so as to raise the attainment and progress of the disadvantaged students.	£10,000	<p>The table below shows the percentage of the disadvantaged students making at least expected progress in 2014/15 and 2015/16:</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Subjects</th> <th>Cost</th> <th>2014/15</th> <th>2015/16</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Art</td> <td>£800</td> <td>88.2%</td> <td>91.7% (+2.2)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Drama</td> <td>£1000</td> <td>71.4%</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Catering</td> <td>£975</td> <td>87%</td> <td>55.6% (-20.6)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PE</td> <td>£914.60</td> <td>80%</td> <td>100% (+9.1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Music</td> <td>£240</td> <td>100%</td> <td>50% (-16.7)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Geography</td> <td>£980</td> <td>83%</td> <td>75% (-7.8)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>History</td> <td>£874.50</td> <td>25%</td> <td>50% (-25)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>French</td> <td rowspan="2">£541</td> <td>50%</td> <td>80% (-5.2)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>German</td> <td>100%</td> <td>100% (+9.1)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Subjects	Cost	2014/15	2015/16	Art	£800	88.2%	91.7% (+2.2)	Drama	£1000	71.4%	100%	Catering	£975	87%	55.6% (-20.6)	PE	£914.60	80%	100% (+9.1)	Music	£240	100%	50% (-16.7)	Geography	£980	83%	75% (-7.8)	History	£874.50	25%	50% (-25)	French	£541	50%	80% (-5.2)	German	100%	100% (+9.1)	No, with the following considerations. Business Studies, science, history, catering and product design may be assigned some funding if appropriate.
Subjects	Cost	2014/15	2015/16																																							
Art	£800	88.2%	91.7% (+2.2)																																							
Drama	£1000	71.4%	100%																																							
Catering	£975	87%	55.6% (-20.6)																																							
PE	£914.60	80%	100% (+9.1)																																							
Music	£240	100%	50% (-16.7)																																							
Geography	£980	83%	75% (-7.8)																																							
History	£874.50	25%	50% (-25)																																							
French	£541	50%	80% (-5.2)																																							
German		100%	100% (+9.1)																																							
Brilliant Club: a programme to extend the more able disadvantaged students in Year 8.	£1,920	Minimal impact on the progress of the students involved.	<p>Yes but with the following considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Better recruitment of high ability disadvantaged students ▪ Promote STEM activities ▪ Improve training for the staff leading the club. 																																							
Resources for learning-eg pencil cases, rulers, calculators, revision guides, study skills sessions, USB visualisers etc.	£24,691		Yes on a personalised basis – resources allocated when need is highlighted																																							
Hardship fund for trips, music tuition and uniforms.	£9,110	Attendance and persistent absenteeism better than national averages.	Yes on a personalised basis – resources allocated when need is highlighted																																							
Breakfast club (Years 7 and 8): a targeted	£1,000	Very few attended.	No. Intervention sessions in the morning now																																							

group of students were able to 'touch base' with a member of staff every morning. Not only did they get a healthy breakfast but were also supported to organise themselves for the day and complete homework where necessary.			to be run in subjects.
Counsellor: we employed a counsellor to work exclusively with the disadvantaged students with mental health issues.	£8,185	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Behaviour improvements: sustained low levels of Fixed Term Exclusions from 2014/15. Significantly lower than national average. 2. Sustained good attendance: Attendance and persistent absenteeism better than national averages 	Yes. Focus on correct students with poor attendance, potential persistent absenteeism or students at risk.
Mentor Link: we used the mentors from Mentor Link to work exclusively with the disadvantaged students with attendance and/or behavioural issues.	£2,000	This was stopped at the end of the autumn term due to minimal impact on the attendance and behaviour of the students involved.	No as the feedback was inconsistent. We have employed our own student counsellor instead.
Alternative/off site provision: Some disadvantaged students attended alternative/off site provision for some/all of their curriculum time.	£10,000	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Attendance and persistent absenteeism better than national averages due to improved engagement. 2. Attainment and achievement: 100% of students passed off-site provision courses. 	Yes. A very small minority already on off-site courses will continue.
Raising aspirations: we took all the Years 7 and 8 disadvantaged students to Birmingham and Aston university on day trips.	£2,000	Years 7 and 8 expected progress excellent.	Yes
Improving reading ages: to support the reading ages of the disadvantaged students we used Renaissance Learning and all Years 7 and 8 disadvantaged students were offered the opportunity to subscribe to a magazine of their choice.	£2,982	Years 7 and 8 expected progress excellent.	To continue with accelerated reader but not to continue with the magazine subscriptions as it had little impact.
We improved attendance by prioritising the interventions provided by the attendance officer and heads of year to improve the attendance of pupil premium students.	-	Although the % attendance decreased from 94.6% in 2014/15 to 93.6% in 2015/16 it is still well above national average.	Yes. More focus and a greater range of strategies needed
Total	£293,404		