**Pupil Premium 2015-16**

 **Background**

The pupil premium is a government initiative designed to target resources on those students deemed to be from a disadvantaged background. This is measured as those students who have been on Free School Meals (FSM) at any point over the last six years (Ever6) or those pupils who have been looked after continuously for at least 6 months (CLA), or those where one or more parents are in the armed forces. The current financial rate of the pupil premium is £935 per eligible student. The school is free to spend this money as it wishes but the money should be used to promote strategies which improve outcomes for disadvantaged students.

Our school is smaller than the average-sized secondary school. The proportion of students supported by the Pupil Premium is above average. We also have a higher than average proportion of students with additional nee ds and on entry to the school the KS2 scores are below average.

In 2014 Ofsted noted:

*‘In 2013 the attainment of students known to be eligible for free school meals was approximately one GCSE grade lower than their classmates in English and mathematics. However, this wide gap was largely the result of a very high proportion of students known to be eligible for free school meals having special educational needs and/or joining the school late with low levels of prior attainment. School data and inspection evidence show that, currently, the gap in attainment between students supported by the pupil premium and other students is closing rapidly and securely.’*

Since 2013 the attainment gap between pupil premium students and others have narrowed significantly and is much lower than the gap nationally.

**Pupil Premium Cohort**

Approximately one third of our students are on the Pupil Premium register. Of these 7 students are Looked After students (CLA), 6 of which are in Y7 and one in Y8. The table below illustrates the percentage of Pupil Premium students by year group and gender in 2015-16.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | All | Boy | Girl |
| All | 34.4% | 30.1% | 38.9% |
| Y7 | 37.0% | 28.7% | 48.5% |
| Y8 | 30.1% | 21.4% | 38.2% |
| Y9 | 34.8% | 40.0% | 29.1% |
| Y10 | 38.2% | 34.8% | 41.5% |
| Y11 | 31.9% | 27.7% | 35.7% |

Clearly there are differences across year groups with Y7 and Y10 having the highest percentage of disadvantaged students and Y8 the lowest.

There are also significant differences between boys and girls. Overall the school has a higher percentage of female disadvantaged students than boys. This difference is also more significant within different year groups, with a 17% point difference in Y8. However in Y9 the gap is reversed with a higher percentage of PP boys.

**Prior Attainment**

* There is variation in ability across year groups. In general terms younger students, on entry, are more able than older students, although Y10 students are by far weaker. The weakest cohort of disadvantaged students are in Year 10, consistent with the ability profile of the whole year group, but this is also where there is the largest gap between PP and nonPP students.
* There is clearly a gap between disadvantaged and other students. On average this gap is a third of a level across the school, but this varies across year groups, with the widest gap being in Y10 (0.6 of a level), and the smallest gap being in Y9.
* The average gap across year groups between boy and girl attainment at KS2 is quite small (0.12) but widens to 0.19 for disadvantaged students. This gender gap within disadvantaged students is widest in Y8 (0.34).
* In Year 8 there is also a large gap in KS2 attainment between disadvantaged boys and other boys (0.79). Other year groups have a gap of around 0.3 for boys.
* In Year 10 there is a large gap in KS2 attainment between disadvantaged girls and other girls (0.9). Other year groups have a gap of around 0.2 for girls.

**Special Educational Needs**

* With the exception of Year 9 all year groups have a higher proportion of PP students with special needs than in the case of non PP students. This is most extreme in Year 10 where PP students are THREE times as likely to have a special need (21% points difference). For other year groups there is a smaller gap ranging from 3% to 11%. In the case of Y9, where the number of special needs students appears to be low, there are slightly more SEN students who are non PP students.
* However, in Y9 there are a large number of students who had PREVIOUSLY been on the SEN register – some 30% of the year group – which is much higher than other year groups with the exception of Y11.
* For students on school support there is a large number of students on the register for BESD reasons. In this category PP students are more likely to be on the register for BESD reasons than non PP students. In Years 7,9, and 10 HALF of PP students are given School Support for BESD reasons.

**Spending plan**

* The school is allocated just over £200,000 to implement strategies which will improve outcomes for disadvantaged students. Our action plan (Appendix 1) outlines the use of this funding. Whilst most of the intended outcomes of this plan are related to academic outcomes, and are thus discussed below, it is worth noting that some money is allocated to supporting disadvantages students in a material way – The Pupil Premium Support Fund. It is believed this is an effective way of using money as it ensures, for example, that parents can afford to send students to school (hence the rise in attendance in recent years) and enable participation in activities such as trips.
* Fewer parents chose to spend their monies on trips this year (approximately half as many as last year)
* More parents are choosing to use the money for bus fares (average attendance for those who purchased a bus pass was 94.13%, this included a persistent non-attender; without her average attendance is 94.9%). This compares to an overall PP attendance of 92.8%. It is worth noting that only Blackburn and those living in the Ribbleton area of Preston benefit from the bus pass which will be less than half the entire disadvantaged cohort.

**OUTCOMES FOR PUPIL PREMIUM STUDENTS**

The general picture is a positive one which shows a significant improvement in key measures for disadvantaged students and an equally significant reduction in the gap between these students and others. For example the proportion of disadvantaged students achieving 5 A\*-C (EM) has been above national averages for similar students for the last 2 years. The attainment gap between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students for 5A\*-C(EM) is thus about 10%, compared to a national gap of 27%.

A similar pattern can be seen with Capped Points score (above), resulting in positive value added scores for both disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students (see below). Value added scores compare particularly favourably against value added scores for Pupil Premium students nationally.

This pattern is again present when considering the rate of progress in English and Maths. Expected rates of progress for both disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students are in line with all students nationally. In Maths rates of progress for Pupil Premium students are similar to non-Pupil Premium students, with a narrow gap when compared to national figures.

Overall the gaps between PP students and other students is much narrower than the gap nationally (@-27% in 2015). Disadvantaged students at Walton le Dale do better than similar students nationally in both English and Maths. The attainment gap between PP students at the school and all other students nationally is also much narrower than the national gap in both core subjects (see graph below).

*Comparing results of PP students in school against other students in school, against PP*

*students nationally and other students nationally. National gaps are approx. -27%*

**Attendance 2015-16**

* Attendance of Pupil Premium students, at just over 93%, was 3% lower than that of other students. Pupil Premium students were also more likely to be late and were much more likely to have unauthorised absences. This compares well against national averages; national average attendance for PP students was 92.5%, with a gap of 3.2%.
* This gap in attendance between PP students and non-PP students widens for boys to 4%, with the gap for girls being 2%. There is also some variation across year groups with the largest gap between PP students and others being in Year 9 and Year 11.
* PP students make up half of students whose attendance is below the persistent absence threshold (85%), which is a higher proportion than the percentage of PP students within the school.
* Disadvantaged students make up 40% of excluded students in 2015-16 which is slightly above their representation within the school.

**Rewards**

* The school uses MyStickers as a key means of rewarding students. Stickers are given for the quality of work. Latest analysis of MyStickers shows differences between disadvantaged students and other students in the percentage of students who have such rewards, with the difference between PP and nonPP girls being much wider than that of the males. Disadvantaged students also have on average 4.5 points lower than other students. However, in reality the male / female difference is stronger than that of the PP / nonPP difference in the distribution of merits (approximately 5% difference). The average number of points for girls is also over 7 points higher than that of boys.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | male | female | all |
| PP | 55% | 54% | 55% |
| nonPP | 59% | 67% | 62% |

**Other**

* During 2015-16 78.6% of disadvantaged students took part in extra-curricular activities, 2% below all students. PP girls are slightly more likely to get involved than PP boys and disadvantaged SEN students are also slightly less likely to be involved in such activities (which reflects SEN student involvement in general). Whilst these differences need to be considered they are not at a significant level.
* Pupil premium students were slightly less likely to go on a school trip in 2015-16 than other students, with 95% of PP students having such an experience compared to about 97% overall. However disadvantaged students were more likely to go on a residential than other students – 42.5% as against 39%.

**Conclusion**

Disadvantaged students at Walton le Dale do well when compared to similar students nationally, particularly in terms of value added scores, although there remains a gap in their achievement when compared to non-disadvantaged students nationally. This in part can be explained by the fact that such students enter the school with academic scores below those of their peers. However there remains a gap, particularly for the 5 A\*-C (EM) threshold. It should also be noted that there is variation in ability across different year groups and as a school we will continue to adjust our work to reflect this. We are also pleased to note that the school provides well for disadvantaged students in other respects. Attendance of pupil premium students is above the national average, for example, and disadvantaged students are as likely to participate in activities such as trips and extra-curricular activities as their peers.