

## Pupil Premium Report 2017/2018



In 2011/12 the government launched its pupil premium funding. This money is sent to schools based on the number of pupils in the school who are eligible for Free School Meals (FSM). From 2012/13, it was expanded to include all children who have been eligible for FSM in the last 6 years. The money is allocated to ensure that pupils reach their full potential, both academically and socially. It is used in a variety of ways to tackle disadvantage and in order to raise achievement and improve outcomes for pupils.

Burnley High School received a total of £120,420 for the period of September 2017 to August 2018 as a direct grant from the Department for Education.

At Burnley High School 39% of the cohort are eligible for the PPG compared to 29% nationally. Below is a table detailing a range of the school's provisions which have been allocated to PPG students.

### Approaches used

The Pupil Premium Grant is used in a variety of ways as seen in the table below. At BHS, we have developed clear strategies in order to achieve our main objective of raising the attainment of disadvantaged pupils.

The five key objectives:

1. **Transition:** to improve transition for identified PP students to ensure students are equipped and ready to engage in school life
2. **Attainment:** to improve attainment outcomes for PP students to ensure attainment is in line with or exceeding expected levels of progress
3. **Engagement:** to improve curriculum engagement and academic achievement for PP students.
4. **Attendance / emotional barriers to progress:** to implement strategies addressing the attendance gap between for PP non PP students and remove emotional barriers to progress
5. **Literacy:** to maintain the reading scheme intervention to improve the reading ages of students whose reading age is below chronological reading age.

### Aim Higher and Aim Higher+ Overview

All pupils baselined in English, Maths, Science, Numeracy, Reading, CAT's

Once all pupils given individual flightpaths based on baseline to FFT5 (top 5% schools or above), PP targets then analysed and adjusted

Adjustment aims to eliminate attainment targets and therefore outcomes between PP and non-PP pupils.

PP pupils identified as being able to "Aim Higher" by internal data, CAT results and how close they are to National benchmarks

PP pupils who are close to but not quite at the KS4 predicted outcome of a 5 (they may have been predicted a 4 or 4+ FFT5%) have their baselines, CATS and teacher assessments reviewed and anyone deemed to have the potential have their targets raised to a 5.

A top 5% target is a very aspirational target in itself however, when this is applied to a pp student and then have this increased to an even higher level, it becomes a huge task. It is therefore vital that these pupils are given support from the beginning of their secondary schooling rather than once underperformance starts to appear. These pupils are therefore put into a group programme called "Aim Higher"

The same scenario happens for PP pupils who are close to but not quite at the KS4 predicted outcome of a 7. These pupils are put on the Aim Higher+ programme.

All of these pupils have a mentor meeting bi-weekly with PP intervention support assistant with parental engagement

Pupils who then also fall behind target are then given additional 1-2-1 support with PP intervention support assistant. Our main focus has been with year 10 pupils.

1. Parents informed via meeting with DHT or PP lead
2. Pupils given a presentation of the program and what these higher targets can mean to their life after school
  - PP is never mentioned. Pupils are told that they have been identified purely because we have seen potential in them to achieve these potentially life changing targets.
3. Initial meeting with PP mentor and the student
  - Look at current performance
  - Inform of any 1-2-1 lessons needed
  - Discuss any issues hindering performance
4. Meet with PP mentor every 2-3 weeks
  - Review performance (data analysis)
  - Teachers will report on progress and attitude to learning
  - Speak to mentor with any problems with understanding
  - Extra interventions/help put in place to boost weaker areas
  - Parental meetings if effort or behaviour is an issue
  - This is assertive mentoring and targets and actions are issued at this point
  - Pupils then sign the meeting record to show they agree with these actions
5. Progress analysed every half term
6. Parents informed
7. Program is adapted where necessary after analysis of impact

Area of support/actions taken	Aim	Cost	Impact														
<p><b>Transition:</b> Transition support days for Year 6 identified PP students</p> <p>Specific Maths and English activities</p>	<p>Initiative to help disadvantaged students make a successful transition from primary to secondary school.</p> <p>Reduce the traditional attainment dip between year 6 and 7 for an identified group of PP students</p>	<p>£600 - £1000 supply cost</p>	<p>Data analysis of KS2 entry and year 7 first DC point. Full Impact will be seen after first DC</p> <p><b>The year 7 cohort of 2017/18</b></p> <p>In English, the biggest impact can be seen with the improvements of reading ages across the whole year group.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1218 600 1637 762"> <thead> <tr> <th>Average Reading Age</th> <th>year 7</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Start of year PP</td> <td>11.76</td> </tr> <tr> <td>End of year PP</td> <td>14.39</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Difference</td> <td>2.63</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="1218 807 1637 930"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Start of year non PP</td> <td>13.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>End of year non PP</td> <td>15.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Difference</td> <td>1.8</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>As we can see from the above table, PP pupils improved, on average by 2.63 years and non-PP pupils improved by 1.8 years.</p> <p>In Maths, at HT3a, 65.9% of PP pupils were on or above target compared to 70.5% of non-PP pupils. This is a gap of 4.6%. Although this is not a big gap, we are improving our transition experience year on year in a bid to close this gap further. Use of the PASS survey during transition will allow us to highlight any problem areas sooner.</p>	Average Reading Age	year 7	Start of year PP	11.76	End of year PP	14.39	Difference	2.63	Start of year non PP	13.3	End of year non PP	15.1	Difference	1.8
Average Reading Age	year 7																
Start of year PP	11.76																
End of year PP	14.39																
Difference	2.63																
Start of year non PP	13.3																
End of year non PP	15.1																
Difference	1.8																
<p><b>Transition:</b> Pass Survey taken during transition</p>	<p>Pass survey was taken by the whole cohort. This</p>	<p>£3000</p>	<p>Pass Survey originally used for the whole school. After analysing the report, it had identified issues around school that we were already</p>														

	<p>enabled us to flag up any potential issues with specific pupils before they happened.</p> <p>Long term aim is to set up a peer mentoring scheme using positive role models as the mentors</p>		<p>aware of. We have since decided that the Pass survey will be used as part of our transition process and was used at the end of 2017/2018 to help us plan for the arrival of our new year 7 cohort in 2018/2019.</p> <p>Peer Mentoring scheme set up for 2018/2019</p>
<p><b>Attainment:</b> Assertive mentoring programme to be further extended, developed and embedded across the school</p>	<p>To ensure that PP students who would benefit and are falling behind in their progress have mentoring from an adult.</p> <p>A reduction in the attainment gap of PP and non PP students in year 7 to 10 from Dec 2017 in core subjects in particular. Levels of confidence also increase as a result</p>	<p>Time of staff, 1 hour each week AG salary</p>	<p><b>Pupil voice</b></p> <p>90% of pupils asked said that the assertive mentoring program had had a 'positive impact' on their performance in Maths and English. It had given them more confidence.</p> <p>The most common suggestion was that the mentoring sessions are more regular. This has influenced our decision to make mentoring sessions weekly in the first instance in 2018/19</p> <p>PP Pupils receiving intervention and mentoring compared to PP students not receiving intervention and mentoring.</p> <p>Due to improvements and developments in our assessment approach following extensive standardisation and improvement in knowledge of the new assessment frameworks, average residual grades across all subjects declined.</p> <p>When we analyse the data for PP students who received mentoring and intervention compared to PP students who did not receive mentoring and intervention, we can see in Maths, PP (intervention) had an average residual of -3.3 compared to PP (no intervention) of -4.6. So those pupils who received intervention made more progress than those pupils who did not.</p>

			<p>In English Language, PP (intervention) had an average residual of -2.1 compared to PP (no intervention) of -4.4. So those pupils who received intervention made more progress than those pupils who did not.</p> <p>In English Literature, PP (intervention) had an average residual of -0.5 compared to PP (no intervention) of -5. So those pupils who received intervention made more progress than those pupils who did not.</p>
<p><b>Attainment:</b> Focussed intervention for core subjects led and coordinated by HOD for English and Maths</p>	<p>To support underachieving PP students from a subject level prospective</p> <p>Evaluation of data post data drop</p> <p>A reduction in the attainment gap of PP and non PP students in year 7 to 10 from September 2017 in core subjects in particular. Levels of confidence also increase as a result</p>	<p>Time of staff, 1 hour each week</p> <p>AG salary</p>	<p><b>Pupil voice</b></p> <p>100% of the pupils who received English and/or Maths intervention valued the experience and believe that it had a positive impact on their performance.</p> <p>Due to improvements and developments in our assessment approach following extensive standardisation and improvement in knowledge of the new assessment frameworks, average residual grades across all subjects declined.</p> <p>When we analyse the data for PP students who received mentoring and intervention compared to PP students who did not receive mentoring and intervention, we can see in Maths, PP (intervention) had an average residual of -3.3 compared to PP (no intervention) of -4.6. So those pupils who received intervention made more progress than those pupils who did not.</p>

			<p>In English Language, PP (intervention) had an average residual of -2.1 compared to PP (no intervention) of -4.4. So those pupils who received intervention made more progress than those pupils who did not.</p> <p>In English Literature, PP (intervention) had an average residual of -0.5 compared to PP (no intervention) of -5. So those pupils who received intervention made more progress than those pupils who did not.</p>
<p><b>Attainment:</b> Increased parental engagement for PP students who are not making expected progress</p>	<p>Increase engagement and support from home in order to further secure academic progress</p> <p>% of PP attendance at parents evenings</p> <p>Evaluation of data post data drop</p>	<p>Time of staff, 1 hour each week</p> <p>AG salary</p>	<p>Form tutors act as first port of call for pupils. Parents evening reply slips chased with focus on PP pupils. Phone calls made to chase up any missing slips. If form tutor is unable to contact home, information was passed to Pastoral and PP team. The result was the highest percentage attendance at a parents evening for BHS. This was achieved with 97% attendance at year 7 parents evening. Following this, the pastoral team made calls home and were able to contact over 99% of pupils in that year group.</p> <p>All year groups:</p> <p>Year 7: 97%</p> <p>Year 8: 82%</p> <p>Year 9: 67%</p> <p>Year 10: 80%</p> <p>The strategy discussed above was in place for the year 7 and year 10 parent's evenings but we were still developing the approach for year 8 and year 9.</p>

<p><b>Attainment:</b> Ensure in class support is being effective and helping secure strong progress for PP students in line with teaching plans</p>	<p>All PP students that are working under or at risk of working under EP are supported in lesson</p>	<p>Proportional LSA salary for those working with SEN&amp;PP students AG Salary</p>	<p>QA of in lesson support by all LSAs This was overseen by PMc and involved co-ordinating with AB regarding LSA performance in lessons. Supporting LSA where appropriate in the best ways to support individual pupils and in some cases, changing timetables to better suit the pupils needs.</p> <p>Evaluation post data drop of in class support by AB and the impact it is having</p> <p>Specific in class support for PP focussed on English and Maths with a bigger focus on Year 9 and 10. This intervention was largely carried out by AG, however, due to illness, AG missed a considerable part of the year.</p> <p>In year 9 Maths, the pupils receiving intervention with AG improved, on average, by 1 residual point (or a quarter of a grade). In year 9 English Language, the pupils receiving intervention with AG dropped, on average, by 1 residual point (or a quarter of a grade). In year 9 English Literature, the pupils receiving intervention with AG, dropped, on average, by 0.25 residual points.</p> <p>In year 10 Maths, the pupils receiving intervention with AG dropped, on average, by 8 residual points (2 whole grades). In year 10 English Language, the pupils receiving intervention with AG dropped, on average, by 5 residual points (just over a whole grade). Most of this decline can be attributed to 1 pupil and with that pupil removed, the drop reduces to 0.67 residual points. In year 10 English Literature, the pupils receiving intervention with AG dropped, on average, by 2 residual points (half a whole grade). Most of this decline can be attributed to 1 pupil (same pupil as above) and with that pupil removed, the average residual change is 0. Meaning that the pupils have benefited from the intervention.</p>
---	--	---	---

<p><b>Engagement:</b> To implement an academic subsidy to enable PP students to fully access the curriculum and reduce attainment gap</p>	<p>The attainment gap between PP and non PP reduces. PP students make progress in line with expectations across all year groups Enrichment activities for PP students has an impact on curriculum engagement, as pupils feel more self-confident Departments able to prioritise funding for maximum impact</p>	<p>£2000 peripatetic lessons £10000 towards educational resources and experiences</p>	<p>75.6% of PP students are on or above target in Music compared to 72.4% non PP</p>
<p><b>Engagement:</b> Implement an engagement subsidy to enable PP students to fully access the extra-curricular and financially dependent curriculum activities and reduce attainment gap.</p>	<p>PP cohort attendance of extra-curricular activities not inhibited by financial constraints Enrichment activities designed to raise aspirations funded by school; clear impact on engagement in lesson</p>	<p>Support to participate in enrichment visits (£ 13,000)</p>	<p>Condoover £1,100 Paris £130 PinPoint £155.61 Other (Mrs Khan PP reimbursement) £75.74</p>
<p><b>Engagement:</b> Resilience building to provide PP students with necessary skills to achieve and fully access the curricular and raise aspirations.</p>	<p>Staff equipped with a range of strategies to increase cohort engagement and levels of progress Starting points for further interventions identified</p>	<p>£2000</p>	<p>PENN resilience training attended by PMc, AE and AG. Some useful strategies have been developed throughout the year, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developing a safe classroom environment where pupils do not feel scared to make mistakes.</li> </ul>

	and strategies implemented		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Actively help students to search for potential misconceptions within a subject area.</li> <li>• Not providing all answers and encouraging pupils to discover information for themselves</li> <li>• Model resiliency and provide pupils with examples of how to deal with challenging situations</li> <li>• Provide a routine where appropriate as this can encourage self-discipline</li> </ul> <p>PMc subsequently delivered a parent seminar on “Raising Resilient Children”. This is something we will look to build on in 2018 with the introduction of a series of classes for selected parents (See plan 18/19)</p>
<b>Attendance:</b> Embed strategies to promote good attendance of PP students and reduce the attendance gap between PP and Non PP students	<p>Intervention for targeting attendance</p> <p>During registration daily target of PP attendance cohort</p> <p>Rewards for cohort for improved attendance – in line with whole school rewards for high attendance</p> <p>Rewards to maintain PP attendance – in line with whole school rewards for high attendance</p> <p>Removal of barriers to attendance e.g.</p>	<p>JM salary</p> <p>MN partial</p> <p>EC partial salary</p> <p>Rewards for attendance £10000</p> <p>Counselling Support £20000</p> <p>Uniform provision £5000</p> <p>Psychology service £10000</p> <p>Appointment of a head of year 8/9 TLR £2500</p>	<p>Attendance gap between PP and non PP reduces</p> <p>Attendance PP v whole school for the whole year.</p> <p>Year 7: 93.5% v 95.2%</p> <p>Year 8: 91.7% v 94.3%</p> <p>Year 9: 84.1% v 92.7%</p> <p>Year 10: 86.1% v 92.7%</p> <p>PP attendance September compared to June/July</p> <p>Year 7: 97.1% v 94.4%/88.2%</p> <p>Year 8: 90.3% v 92.5%/88.3%</p> <p>Year 9: 88.2% v 84%/81.9%</p> <p>Year 10: 91% v 80.5%/81.8%</p>

	counselling support, uniform provision		Increased parental engagement Attendance at parents evenings have been steady but for year 9 we had the best ever attended parents evening at BHS. Continued push to improve this parental engagement will continue through the PENN Resilience																																			
<b>Literacy:</b> Embed the Reading scheme and whole school Literacy Policy to improve the reading age of all students whose reading age is below their chronological age.	All students targeted for reading support attain their chronological reading age  Students receive a high aspiration diet of reading materials, supported by an adult to unpick the difficult language used in these GCSE texts.	£IDL  £2000  £2000 for further texts	Reading ages  PP v non PP Overall PP students are 0.65 years above non PP students for the whole school Year 7: 0.82 Year 8: 0.34 Year 9: 0.17 Year 10: 0.92  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Average Reading Age</th> <th>year 7</th> <th>year 8</th> <th>year 9</th> <th>year 10</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Start of year PP</td> <td>11.76</td> <td>13.5</td> <td>16.8</td> <td>15.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>End of year PP</td> <td>14.39</td> <td>14.5</td> <td>14.9</td> <td>17.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Difference</td> <td>2.63</td> <td>1</td> <td>-1.9</td> <td>1.5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Start of year non PP</td> <td>13.3</td> <td>13.3</td> <td>15.3</td> <td>14.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>End of year non PP</td> <td>15.1</td> <td>14</td> <td>12.1</td> <td>16.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Difference</td> <td>1.8</td> <td>0.7</td> <td>-3.2</td> <td>1.3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> From the information above, it is clear to see that the literacy program is having a huge impact on PP students. In all cases, PP students have improved more than non-PP students. The only	Average Reading Age	year 7	year 8	year 9	year 10	Start of year PP	11.76	13.5	16.8	15.7	End of year PP	14.39	14.5	14.9	17.2	Difference	2.63	1	-1.9	1.5	Start of year non PP	13.3	13.3	15.3	14.8	End of year non PP	15.1	14	12.1	16.1	Difference	1.8	0.7	-3.2	1.3
Average Reading Age	year 7	year 8	year 9	year 10																																		
Start of year PP	11.76	13.5	16.8	15.7																																		
End of year PP	14.39	14.5	14.9	17.2																																		
Difference	2.63	1	-1.9	1.5																																		
Start of year non PP	13.3	13.3	15.3	14.8																																		
End of year non PP	15.1	14	12.1	16.1																																		
Difference	1.8	0.7	-3.2	1.3																																		

			anomaly is in year 9 where all pupils seemed to decline. However, PP students declined less than non-PP students.
--	--	--	---