

# Pupil premium strategy statement: Alderman Peel High School

1. Summary information					
<b>School</b>	Alderman Peel High School				
<b>Financial Year</b>	2017/18	<b>Total PP budget</b>	£133,025	<b>Date of most recent PP Review</b>	January 2017
<b>Total number of pupils</b>	472	<b>Number of pupils eligible for PP</b>	149	<b>Date for next internal review of this strategy</b>	April 2018

2. Attainment		
Year 11 2015-2016	A* - C	
<b>English Progress</b> -0.3 V All -0.02	English 70%	V 46% Disadvantaged
<b>Mathematics Progress</b> -0.19 V All 0.03	Mathematics 67%	V 50% Disadvantaged
<b>Progress 8</b> -0.58 V All -0.10		
<b>APS Attainment</b> All 47.02 V Disadvantaged 37.00		
<b>English &amp; Mathematics A*-C</b> School 60% V Disadvantaged 42%		

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP, including high ability)	
<b>In-school barriers</b> ( <i>issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills</i> )	
	The need to address quickly and implement interventions early in Year 7 for students who are “not secondary ready” in English and Mathematics. Since September 2016 English/Maths staff are closely liaising with Year 6 teachers to have a more co-ordinated approach to literacy/numeracy which will need to be consolidated and embedded.
	With curriculum changes at KS4 and assessment methods becoming 100% terminal examination and the new 9-1 grading system (grade boundaries) students will need to decode new exam techniques and teachers will need to refine and embed the new curriculum.
<b>External barriers</b> ( <i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i> )	

### 3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP, including high ability)

C.	Attendance is a constant challenge due to the attitude of some parents. Seasonal work motivates parents to holiday outside of peak holiday times. This is improving due to the work of the school. Attendance was below average but due to the hard work of staff and parents this has risen to 95.3 (April 2017) against a national average of 94.8%. School PA is 12.6% (April 2017) against a national figure of 13.1%. There is still more work to be done here.
D.	The very high percentage of children within Child Protection and Child in Need processes. (Three times higher than National Average). Also, the number of students with mental health issues or their parent/carer being affected by mental health issues are rising significantly.

### 4. Desired outcomes

	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>
	Rates of progress at KS3 are increased and at KS4 attainment is at or above expected.	<p><b>KS3:</b> Reading ages show rapid improvement and internal “data drop” show students are making rapid progress in English and Mathematics for ALL ability groups. ALL students are set challenging and ambitious targets in all subjects. Student/parental surveys show that students are challenged (especially MAGT).</p> <p><b>KS4:</b> Internal/external school data show students are making rapid progress and attainment levels are at or above that is expected.</p> <p>Students speak ambitiously about heir future Post16 and work. No PP students are NEET.</p>
	Embed the good/outstanding quality of teaching and learning for all students in the school including PPG students and reduce in-school variances.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers addressing in class needs of PPG children to maximise progress Half termly data analysis for each year group and the Post-Data Intervention sheets to monitor under-achievement of PP students.</li> <li>• HOD/LT Link Meeting calendared every fortnight to discuss the progress/attainment of PP students in every subject.</li> <li>• Use of specialist TA to support in core subjects of PP students to gather evidence of impact on progress/attainment of students that they support.</li> <li>• Monitor and evaluate the T&amp;L by Middle Leaders/LT members and record progress on Blue Sky – see MER schedule.</li> </ul>
	The attendance of PP children improves to 96% and PA is lower than of national average.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attendance for the children is in line with national at 96%.</li> <li>• Also, reduce PA so that is lower than national average (2016: 13.1)</li> </ul>

D. E.	Improved levels of well-being/mental health and personal student development. Regulating social and emotional needs, improve resilience, reduce anxiety levels and raise levels of self-esteem.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific issues to be addressed as per CP / CIN / FSP plans</li> <li>• Levels of attendance of PP students are 96%+</li> <li>• Lower referral rates to outside agencies</li> <li>• Annual student survey</li> </ul>
----------	---	--

Academic year	2017/18	
The priorities below enable schools to demonstrate how they are using the pupil premium to improve classroom pedagogy, provide targeted support and support whole school strategies.		
Action	Objective	Amount allocated
Specialist Teaching Assistants in English, Mathematics and Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To raise levels of progress and attainment in English, Mathematics and Science</li> <li>• Improving the reading ages, literacy and numeracy levels of PP students at KS3/KS4</li> </ul>	<p>£54,852</p> <p>See L3 plans 2017/18</p>
Embed the good/outstanding quality of teaching and learning for all students in the school including PPG students and reduce in-school variances.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To adjust the curriculum to meet individual needs (Holkham/Easton College NVQ1). To ensure the curriculum meets the needs for all students and allows them to attain an accredited qualification.</li> <li>• To provide students with strong feedback, this allows for quick rates of progress and attainment. (Sutton Trust Toolkit 9+)</li> <li>• Greater Home Learning Opportunities (Sutton Trust Toolkit 5+) (Eg e-learning)</li> <li>• Improving the reading ages, literacy and numeracy levels of PP students at KS3/KS4</li> </ul>	<p>£12,000</p> <p>School Budget</p> <p>£3000</p> <p>See L3 Catch-up plans 2017/18</p>
To develop meta-cognition and self-regulation approaches in our students at KS3 and KS4. Through Programmes such as Maximise and through growth mindset training.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve rates of progress and attainment at KS3 and KS4 (Sutton Trust Toolkit 8+)</li> <li>• KS4 how to prepare for GCSE exams</li> </ul>	<p>£3,000</p> <p>£2200</p>
Personal Student Development: (see Core Pledges document)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To provide a personalised intervention to each Pupil Premium student</li> <li>• To promote an “all round student” and develop strong personal skills</li> <li>• To remove barriers to learning</li> <li>• To promote mastery and resilience</li> </ul>	<p>£13,131</p>

To improve levels of attendance and reduce levels of PA by employing a Pastoral Support Worker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attendance for the children is in line with national at 96%.</li> <li>Also, reduce PA so that is lower than national average (2016: 13.1)</li> <li>Attendance rewards</li> <li>Improve progress for PP children (and others)</li> </ul>	£21,016  £1000
Supporting good well-being/mental health and personal student development. Regulating social and emotional needs, improve resilience, reduce anxiety levels and raise levels of self-esteem. Through the appointment of a Student Well Being Lead Practitioner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To remove emotional, social and mental health barriers to learning</li> <li>Specific issues to be addressed as per CP / CIN / FSP plans</li> <li>Levels of attendance of PP students are 96%+</li> <li>Lower referral rates to outside agencies</li> <li>Annual student survey</li> </ul>	£8426
Supporting Success Programme APHS £1000, WP&N £500, BMPS £250	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Federation initiative to inform and support parents support their children</li> </ul>	£1000
External Annual Review of PP plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To ensure impact of plans on PP progress and attainment</li> <li>To ensure best value for money of interventions</li> <li>To allow for continuous improvement of PP Plans and give quality assurance to Governing Body and PP Lead.</li> </ul>	£900
Face to Face and on-line mentoring through Charity "Connect" via North Norfolk CIAEG Group of which Asst HT is a member.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide additional support re careers and work from "external" adviser</li> <li>40 pupils, Yr 8,9 and 10</li> </ul>	Free
Letter and survey to all parents asking for what their children need to help them achieve the very best.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understand and support the needs of parents and pupils from the parent perspective</li> </ul>	Admin
Contingency		£12,500
The Brilliant Club	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funded from MAGT. 12 pupils in total, 5 of whom Disadvantaged.</li> <li>Understand how to apply and and experience life as a University student</li> <li>Raise aspiration and belief</li> </ul>	

Total		£133,025
-------	--	----------

### Governor Monitoring

1	<p>Do Governors know how much money is allocated to the school for the Pupil Premium?</p> <p>a. What percentage of Pupil Premium eligible pupils have you in your school. How does this compare with national data?</p> <p>b. Do governors know the breakdown between FSM, Looked After Children and Service Children?</p> <p>c. Do you know the breakdown of each group by academic year/</p> <p>d. Do you know how many of each cohort appears in other vulnerable groups i.e. SEN(D), BAME (Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic), Gender?</p>	<p>a. <b>148</b> PP students <b>451</b> roll (April 2017) = <b>32.96%</b> v Nat Avg =<b>28.9%</b></p> <p>b. <b>2</b> LAC, <b>5</b>=Service Children</p> <p>c. No of children: Yr7=<b>31</b>,Yr8=<b>37</b>, Yr9=<b>22</b>, Yr10=<b>30</b>, Yr11=<b>28</b></p> <p>d. Yes – 30.40% of PP Cohort have SEN(D) need</p>
---	---	---

2	<p>Is the Pupil Premium money identified in the school's budget planning?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. How much does the Pupil Premium money represent in percentage terms of the total income of the school?</li> <li>b. Is the Pupil Premium money likely to alter significantly over time?</li> <li>c. How is the delegated authority to make decisions over Pupil Premium spend decided and documented?</li> <li>d. Is income and expenditure reported explicitly for Pupil Premium?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) 5.06%</li> <li>b) No</li> <li>c) Delegated to Assistant HT who reports to LT and PP Link Governor</li> <li>d) Yes</li> </ul>
	<p>Do Governors have a clear understanding of where gaps exist, both within the school and against national performance data?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Do the school's systems enable governors to have a clear picture of the progress and attainment of pupils who are eligible for the Pupil Premium <b>in all year groups across the school and for all subjects</b> and how this compares to non-Pupil Premium pupils?</li> <li>b. What is the trend of progress and attainment for each group over a 3 year period i.e. has the gap closed for each group?</li> <li>c. How does this compare to National data?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Half termly data identifies and demonstrates the progress and attainment of PP students in every year group. Data also identifies all other groups.</li> <li>b. Gaps have varied from year to year due to a large number of in year admissions out of catchment and a high percentage of students (2016) PP children with SEN and/or mental health issues</li> <li>c. No comparative data available for PP and SEN children nationally</li> </ul>

4	<p>Do Governors discuss in detail, including intended outcomes/impact, how Pupil Premium funding is used?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Does the school have a standalone Pupil Premium strategy to raise attainment and close the gap in all year groups?</li> <li>b. Is the Pupil Premium strategy linked to the SIDP and other school policies?</li> <li>c. Have the governors considered external research and reports about what works to inform their decisions about how to spend the Pupil Premium? E.g. The Sutton Trust / Education Endowment Fund, Ofsted updates and previous Pupil Premium award winners.</li> <li>d. Are this year's Pupil Premium interventions tailored to this year's Pupil Premium eligible pupils to meet their individual and group needs?</li> <li>e. Have the governors challenged the interventions and their predicted impact and is this documented?</li> <li>f. Will interventions close the gap against predicted end of year attainment and progress?</li> <li>g. Is there a correlation between the intervention on other outcomes i.e. attendance, behaviour, punctuality?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Yes and it is a whole-school strategy on the SIDP 2016/17</li> <li>b. Yes and is PM target for staff</li> <li>c. Yes. External review of PP in January 2017. Sutton Trust information is used across the school to influence strategies to increase rates of progress.</li> <li>d. Yes – see Link Governor meeting minutes</li> <li>e. Yes – see Link Governor meeting minutes</li> <li>f. Yes</li> <li>g. Attendance is continuing to rise across the school as is the standard of behaviour. High expectations, levels of challenge, rigorous monitoring and greater use of data to inform interventions are all having a positive impact.</li> </ul>
---	---	---

5	<p>Do Governors regularly monitor the outcomes of Pupil Premium and know gaps are being reduced/removed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. How often are Pupil Premium reports monitored by the governors?</li> <li>b. Is there a Pupil Premium governor and have they undertaken training?</li> <li>c. Is Pupil Premium a standing agenda item at committee or full GB?</li> <li>d. Are Pupil Premium monitoring visits scheduled and completed on a regular basis?</li> <li>e. Is Pupil Premium part of the Headteacher's report and informs governors about intervention impact across all year groups in comparison with non-Pupil Premium?</li> <li>f. Do the governing board use the Ofsted Pupil Premium and challenge toolkit?</li> <li>g. Do <b>all governors</b> have a broad understanding of Pupil Premium funding and its use within the school?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Every secondary Standards Committee meeting (every 6 weeks)</li> <li>b. Yes and training has been attended.</li> <li>c. Yes</li> <li>d. Yes (see Governors ROV)</li> <li>e. Yes</li> <li>f. Yes</li> <li>g. Yes, Information regarding criteria and funding has been shared via Governors Hub</li> </ul>
6	<p>Is value for money (in terms of impact on pupil outcomes) regularly discussed and challenged by governors (e.g. is Pupil Premium having the impact we anticipated?).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Is the income and expenditure related to Pupil Premium being monitored and how often?</li> <li>b. If money is held in reserve as a contingency, is this being monitored?</li> <li>c. Is the expenditure on the intervention proving value for money in comparison to other interventions and the impact on attainment and progression or predicted outcomes?</li> <li>d. Are the school's interventions providing value for money when compared externally e.g. evidence of the Sutton Trust.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Yes. Every 6 weeks via secondary Standards Committee</li> <li>b. No contingency is kept</li> <li>c. Yes. See recent progress data</li> <li>d. Yes, See recent progress data</li> </ul>



7	<p>Does the school's website provide parents with a clear understanding of the amount of funding, how it is spent and what difference it makes to pupil outcomes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Does the website show the amount of the school's allocation from the Pupil Premium grant in respect of the current academic year?</li> <li>b. Does the website show details of how it is intended that the allocation will be spent for this academic year including individual interventions, their costs and the predicted impact including the target groups (each academic year if appropriate)?</li> <li>c. Does the website show the details of how the previous academic year's allocation was spent by intervention and target audience (each academic year if appropriate)?</li> <li>d. Does the website show the impact of the previous year's Pupil Premium expenditure on raising attainment and closing the gap when compared with non-Pupil Premium pupils?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Yes</li> <li>b. Yes</li> <li>c. Yes</li> <li>d. Yes</li> </ul>
8	<p>Is the above work documented to show a true audit trail of the governing board's work in relation to Pupil Premium?</p>	<p>Yes</p>