

Key Summary Page for PP strategy and outcomes 2016-2017

Please refer to the PP Action Plan. All aspects in the plan were RED, AMBER, GREEN marked for implementation.

Outcomes:

Key headlines comparisons (NOTE: these are best fit comparisons on alphabetical to number grades)

5 A*-C + English and Maths 2016 GAP	5 A*-C Including English and Maths (9-4) GAP	A*-C English GAP 2016	9-4 English GAP 2017	A*-C Maths GAP 2016	9-4 Maths GAP 2017
25%	11% =reduction in gap of 14%	30%	13 % = reduction in gap of 17%	22%	18% =reduction in gap of 4%

Behaviour and Engagement Strategies:

Engagement (Attitude to Learning Grades/Engagement) (Grades run 1-4)

Year Group	Start of Year NON PP	Start of Year PP	Start of year difference	End of Year NON PP	End of Year PP	End of year Difference	Gap Reduced across year?
11	1.45	1.59	-0.14	1.42	1.65	-0.23	NO
10	1.50	1.81	-0.31	1.40	1.65	-0.25	YES
9	1.44	1.65	-0.21	1.40	1.51	-0.11	YES
8	1.39	1.59	-0.20	1.16	1.32	-0.16	YES
7	1.15	1.30	-0.15	1.23	1.22	+0.01	YES

Engagement of PP students in all year groups improved, as reported by their individual subjects Engagement grades, other than Year 11.

The gap is significantly lower in KS3 showing that engagement strategies introduced by the new management team are having greatest effect on those students who joined in 2014 onwards.

Exclusion data:

Year group 15-16	Gap (number of temporary exclusions) between Non PP and PP	Total amount of PP temporary exclusions given	Same cohort in 16-17	Gap (number of temporary exclusions) between Non PP and PP	Total amount of PP temporary exclusions given	RAG
7	8	29	Now Yr8	6 (-2)	23 (-7)	Gap and total reduced
8	31	48	Now Yr9	16 (-15)	33 (-15)	Gap and total reduced
9	21	38	Now Yr10	11 (-10)	15 (-23)	Gap and total reduced
10	0	19	Now Yr11	9 (+9)	22	

All year groups other than the Year 11 cohort significantly decreased in the number of actual exclusions and the gap also reduced

Be The Change: Headlines

Bullying	Significant recorded incidents in bullying
Ofsted	PP students discussed with inspectors the positive impact the scheme had had on their post 16 plans

Attendance Overall:

15-16				16-17		RAG
Year 7				Year 8		
	Students in Group	Attendances		Students in Group	Attendances	
PP	97	92.4		89	92.6	0.2 improvement
	PP vs Non PP Gap	3.97		Gap	3.42	Gap reduction of 0.55

15-16				16-17		
Year 8				Year 9		
	Students in Group	Attendances		Students in Group	Attendances	
	93	92.95		94	90.87	
	PP vs Non Gap	2.57		Gap	4.84	
15-16				16-17		
Year 9				Year 10		
	Students in Group	Attendances		Students in Group	Attendances	
	78	88.75		78	91.93	3.18 improvement
	PP vs Non PPGap	6.18		Gap	2.67	Gap reduction of 3.51
15-16				16-17		
Year 10				Year 11		
	Students in Group	Attendances		Students in Group	Attendances	
	88	91.86		84	92.56	0.7 improvement
	PP vs Non PPGap	2.48		Gap	2.75	

Overall the attendance strategies had a positive impact on all pupils including PP. The Year 9 group were the only cohort not to improve their attendance overall, but there were some significant improvements for some PP students in this year group.

Attendance mentoring programme: (Individual 1-1 and home visits form Attendance officer et al)

- 52% of PP students on the programme improved their attendance rates after the mentoring, some as much as 8%
- Some of the harder to reach PP students in the 48% that did not improve, would have arguably dropped away further without the intervention

Pick up and read initiative: (PP students mini-bussed in early to follow accelerated reader programme)

Accelerated reader scores % who improved reading age over the year	71% of students made significant progress in their reading ages.
Attendance improvement overall	50% of the cohort improved their attendance

The scheme was enjoyed by participants with a large cohort significantly increasing their reading ages and therefore their access to the curriculum

Some students caught up on 3 years' worth of reading age.

This scheme seemed to raise significant buy in from the group, which actually accounted for 50% of the cohort improving their overall attendance, which was a by-product of the scheme

Head of House interventions (Student Snapshots and HoH Mentoring):

Year 11 students in each of the 5 Houses had detailed plans written for them. Approx 75% of these students also had 1-1 mentoring.

Data shows that on average most of the cohort reduced the progress gap between the start of Year 11 and the Summer GCSE results. Those that had mentoring were the most successful in reducing their personal progress gap

Example: Imperial House

Start of Year 11	Actual GCSE
Total Points score residual for cohort (Target compared to actual – teacher prediction)	Total Points score residual for cohort (Target compared to actual summer GCSE)
-411 GCSE points	-170 GCSE points

The above example demonstrates that although the cohort underperformed from their target, the underperformance was reduced significantly with intervention.