Review of Pupil Premium Action Plan 2015-16

| Objective | Action | Lead | Success Criteria | Monitoring | Resources |
|--|---|---------|---|--|-----------|
| (Desired end result) | (Strategy) | | (Impact) | (How do we know) | costs |
| Improve outcomes for all disadvantaged pupils through effective timely interventions | HLTA in English, Maths and Science to ensure progress and attainment of disadvantaged students | CJe/MSi | Timetabled in-class support and extracurricular support Improved outcomes for students: no significant gap between disadvantaged students and non-disadvantaged students in any key English/Maths/Science measure | Intervention timetable Intervention log sheets Exam/internal tracking data | £69,000 |

Evaluation of impact

Interventions carried out to support students currently have no individual impact assessment. Overall impact is through whole school measures (see below). % EBacc for disadvantaged students improved, but other measures fell. See PP exams analysis for an in depth scrutiny of the reasons behind this. Predominantly the academic profile of the disadvantaged cohort and the options taken by disadvantaged students (not filling A8/P8 baskets) are the reasons behind the decline in measures for disadvantaged students.

Tracking of individual students and their personalised intervention arising from RAG meetings worked very well last year. There was a 60% increase in the number of interventions carried out, all aimed at improving individual's progress and attainment. The tracking of individual interventions through log sheets did not work as none were received through the year. HLTA Impact reviews at the end of the year showed 83% of students who received intervention from our HLTA in Science made 3 or 4 levels progress in their final GSCSE, compared to 34% of these after their mock exams. Half of the students in these interventions were disadvantaged students. Of the disadvantaged cohort, 79% achieved 3+LP, with 79% improving or maintaining their mock results.

In maths, 52% of the students who received HLTA intervention met or exceeded their aspirational targets. 66% improved or maintained their mock result. Of the ten disadvantaged students who accessed either controlled assessments or exam revision intervention, 9 made at least expected progress.

In English, 65% of the students who received HLTA intervention for their controlled assessment made more than expected progress overall. Of these students 40% were disadvantaged. Of the disadvantaged cohort, 55% met or exceeded their target, and 73% improved or maintained their mock result.

| | | 20 |)14-15 | 20 | 015-16 | |
|--------------|--------|------|---------|------|---------|--------|
| | Cohort | Size | Score/% | Size | Score/% | Change |
| | All | 97 | -0.11 | 87 | 0.09 | +0.20 |
| Progress 8 | D | 20 | -0.22 | 24 | -0.35 | -0.13 |
| | N-D | 77 | -0.08 | 63 | 0.24 | +0.32 |
| | All | 99 | 54 | 87 | 53 | -1 |
| % Basics | D | 21 | 48 | 24 | 38 | -10 |
| | N-D | 78 | 55 | 63 | 59 | +4 |
| | All | 99 | 46.38 | 87 | 47.89 | +1.51 |
| Attainment 8 | D | 21 | 42.69 | 24 | 40.54 | -2.15 |
| | N-D | 78 | 47.38 | 63 | 50.68 | +3.30 |
| % EBacc | All | 99 | 15 | 87 | 17 | +2 |
| | D | 21 | 0 | 24 | 8 | +8 |
| | N-D | 78 | 19 | 63 | 21 | +2 |

- Tracking system needs to be redeveloped to determine the cumulative effect of individual interventions for 2016-17.
- HLTA's have been asked to compile reports to evaluate impact after each intervention next year
- HLTA's timetables need to be scrutinised for what they are doing, when and with whom, and impact statements need to be gathered throughout the year

| Objective | Action | Lead | Success Criteria | Monitoring | Resources |
|----------------------|--------------------|------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|
| (Desired end result) | (Strategy) | | (Impact) | (How do we know) | costs |
| | | | | | |
| Improve | Year managers | MSi | Absence and PA remain | Attendance statistics | £46,000 |
| outcomes for all | appointed and part | CJe | below national | PA statistics | , |
| disadvantaged | funded through PPG | | expectations. | Late log | |
| pupils through | with a brief to | | Punctuality statistics of | Detention log | |
| effective timely | coach/mentor | | disadvantaged students | | |
| interventions | disadvantaged | | match/exceed non- | | |
| | students in their | | disadvantaged | | |
| | cohort so their | | students. | | |
| | attendance, | | Behaviour as a | | |
| | punctuality and | | hindrance to progress | | |
| | behaviour support | | reduces | | |
| | excellent progress | | | | |
| | and attainment | | | | |

Sept 2016: Attendance for last year and 2014/15 shows:

| Y7-11 | D Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap | Significance | National D Average | National ND Average | School D to National ND Gap | Significance |
|---------|-------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|
| 2014-15 | 90.8 | 94.9 | -4.1 | Sig - | 85.5 | 95.7 | -4.9 | Sig - |
| 2015-16 | 91.3 | 95.5 | -4.2 | Sig - | | | | |

Attendance procedures have become much more rigorous through the year, with the YM's being instrumental in the day to day implementation of these. The engagement of some PP students is seriously skewing the overall statistics.

- This is a real concern as the inschool gap is not altering and for 2016-17 a new facility "The Bridge" has been introduced with the aim of re-engaging D students with school, improving their attendance and consequently their outcomes
- Consistency of staff involved is crucial this should be the case in 2016-17

| Objective (Desired end result) | Action (Strategy) | Lead | Success Criteria (Impact) | Monitoring (How do we know) | Resources costs |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | |
| Improve | Individual/group | CJe | Strategies planned and | Attendance at CPD | £500 |
| outcomes for all | staff CPD on | | implemented in | Collaborative events | |
| disadvantaged | strategies for raising | | conjunction with other | Student voice | |
| pupils through | the attainment and | | schools in | Lesson observations | |
| effective timely | progress of | | Derbyshire/Peak 11 | Book scrutiny | |
| interventions | disadvantaged | | In house dissemination | | |
| | students, focussed | | of techniques that | | |
| | on the groups | | work, and these | | |
| | within the PP cohort | | strategies observed in | | |
| | | | lesson observations, | | |
| | | | book scrutiny etc. | | |

Approaches to teaching and learning for disadvantaged students are currently being investigated and developed either at T&L groups, by individual staff as they work towards performance management targets or by SLT members. Classroom strategies which work well for PP students were introduced but evidence of impact almost impossible to ascertain.

Peak 11 shared strategies which led to 1-2-1 interviews being conducted with all disadvantaged students. These resulted in personalised interventions actioned e.g. revision guides, university trips. YM/PL and tutors shared pertinent information on individuals regularly in briefings

Cross-school intervention days occurred, each aimed at specific cohorts within the disadvantaged students. All evaluations were positive, but impact on learning is impossible to determine

Peer-to-peer evaluation days were carried out amongst Peak 11 schools. Within this the work scrutiny of D students found that regular marking was evident in most books seen. Excellent practice was observed in a KS4 physics book with excellent presentation and peer assessment in evidence and a music performance feedback sheet. However, it was also found that student response to feedback was not sufficiently apparent.

Peer tutoring between sixth formers and lower years was initiated but broke down due to poor attendance/commitment by sixth formers and a lack of training for the students and staff.

- "Extras" implemented from the interviews were appreciated and useful to students this will be done again in 2016-17
- Generic strategies were not useful to staff. A programme of regular PP briefings set up for 2016-17 to allow personalised strategies to be discussed
- Whole school driving many priorities led to a dilution of efforts. Whole school focus on the T&L of D boys for 2016-17
- Work scrutiny does not differentiate between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students, except when bespoke ones have occurred. This needs to be investigated for 2016-17.

| Objective | Action | Lead | Success Criteria | Monitoring | Resources |
|----------------------|----------------------|------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|
| (Desired end result) | (Strategy) | | (Impact) | (How do we know) | costs |
| | | | | | |
| Improve | Faculty level data | CJe | Improved progress and | Snapshot data | |
| outcomes for all | analysis requires | | attainment of | Exam data | |
| disadvantaged | whole cohort | | disadvantaged students | FTL data presentations to | |
| pupils through | statistics compared | | More interventions | SLT links | |
| effective timely | to disadvantaged | | with measurable impact | Intervention log sheets | |
| interventions | students statistics, | | Interventions evaluated | | |
| | and intervention | | and continued, or | | |
| | plans/review | | altered | | |

Several subjects saw a decrease in their gaps between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged progress. In several subjects this is due to the very small numbers of disadvantaged students studying them. There are however, some subjects whose progress gaps have decreased, whilst having a significant number of disadvantaged students: Business Studies, Additional Science. Some other subjects have seen an increase in their gap between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students' progress, and have significant disadvantaged students. Art, Construction, English Language and English Literature, and Maths.

RAG meetings calendared and occurred for every year group within 2 weeks of snapshot close. The data analysis that generated the priority groupings of students "weights" PP students so they preferentially receive intervention. Interventions are now clearly more tailored for the individuals needing them, and these interventions are shared with all staff. However, the tracking of interventions through log sheets did not work as none were received throughout the year.

SLT Progress Reports now analyse the changes in performance of each gender, ability bandings and disadvantaged students. As well as this feeding into the RAG analysis, SLT use these reports with the Heads of Maths and English to determine underachievement and interventions.

FTL data analysis is now available for every subject with boys, disadvantaged and more able students separated as cohorts, and FTL's are beginning to use these to support intervention planning.

A year 11 intervention protocol involving a FTL developed schedules of subject time slots and student booking system has been developed and is being used by the core faculties well. Overall the booking system was more costly in terms of time and effort than the gain from it

Lessons Learned:

- Faculty and SLT data needs to be available from the beginning of the year
- SLT links need to be reviewing FTL data sheets in line management meetings after every snapshot
- A clear process for initiating, implementing and monitoring individual and groups intervention needs to be established
- The interventions in certain subject areas for disadvantaged students need to be further scrutinised

| Objective | Action | Lead | Success Criteria | Monitoring | Resources |
|----------------------|-------------------------|------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|
| (Desired end result) | (Strategy) | | (Impact) | (How do we know) | costs |
| Improve | Progress leader data | CJe | Improved progress and | Snapshot data | |
| outcomes for all | analysis focus on | | attainment of | Exam data | |
| disadvantaged | disadvantaged | | disadvantaged students | PL Data analysis and half | |
| pupils through | students as a | | Coordinated | termly reviews | |
| effective timely | priority and drill into | | interventions with | Intervention schedules | |
| interventions | the needs of the | | measurable impact | Intervention log sheets | |
| | groups within the | | Interventions evaluated | | |
| | PP cohort | | and continued, or | | |
| | | | altered | | |

Evaluation of impact

PL half term reviews focus on the needs of the whole cohort, disadvantaged students and more able students. PL's are heavily involved in interventions for each disadvantaged individual that requires it in their year groups. They all hold KASH conversations with the highest underachievers and celebrate to top achievers/most progress. PL set up group interventions for example: a general student skills group for underachieving Y11's within curriculum time and a Y10/11 study/revision skills day. **Lessons Learned:**

- Review documents were found to be a "paper exercise" and not condusive to improving experiences for students. To be redeveloped by PL in 2016-17
- The variety and regularity of PL interventions still needs development, as does the protocol for evaluating their impact.

| Objective | Action | Lead | Success Criteria | Monitoring | Resources |
|----------------------|------------|------|------------------|------------------|-----------|
| (Desired end result) | (Strategy) | | (Impact) | (How do we know) | costs |
| | | | | | |

| 2. Ensure the | Disadvantaged and | CJe | Improved awareness | Student voice | f |
|------------------|------------------------|-----|-------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| progress and | more able group | | leads to more action | Snapshot data | – Contingency |
| attainment of | identified to staff at | | taken to enhance the | Exam data | fund |
| disadvantaged | all levels as a high | | learning experiences of | All levels data analysis | |
| more able pupils | priority | | these students | Intervention schedules & log | |
| across Y7-13 | | | | sheets | |
| | | | | Visit registers & evaluations | |

For Y11 there was an increase in the number of more able disadvantaged students. There was an increase in A8 by both disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged more able. Greater increase by more able disadvantaged students so gap narrowing. Increase in P8 by both disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged more able. Greater increase In Progress 8 by more able disadvantaged students so gap narrowing. Static performance by more able disadvantaged student in basics, falling performance by more able non-disadvantaged, gap more positive. More disadvantaged students and less more able non-disadvantaged students achieving Ebacc so gap narrowing

| More able disadvantaged students: | | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | Change |
|-----------------------------------|-----|---------|---------|--------|
| Number | ND | 23 | 12 | -11 |
| Number | D | 3 | 5 | 2 |
| | ND | 61.13 | 66.33 | 5.62 |
| A8 | D | 55.33 | 62.40 | 7.07 |
| | Gap | -5.80 | -3.93 | |
| | ND | -0.12 | 0.24 | 0.23 |
| P8 | D | -0.90 | -0.28 | 0.42 |
| | Gap | -0.78 | -0.52 | |
| | ND | 96 | 92 | -4 |
| % C+ En & Ma | D | 100 | 100 | 0 |
| | Gap | 4 | 8 | |
| | ND | 10 | 8 | -2 |
| Ebacc (Number achieving) | D | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| | Gap | -10 | -6 | |

Lessons Learned:

• Focus on one specific ability banding within disadvantaged students through performance management and through monitoring and tracking appears to have had a positive effect. This will be repeated in 2016-17

| Objective | Action | Lead | Success Criteria | Monitoring | Resources |
|----------------------|----------------------|------|------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| (Desired end result) | (Strategy) | | (Impact) | (How do we know) | costs |
| Ensure the | Specific extra- | CJe | More varied experience | Student voice | £ |
| progress and | curricular | | for these students | Snapshot data | Contingency |
| attainment of | opportunities for | | leading to improved | Exam data | fund |
| disadvantaged | this cohort sought | | outcomes and | All levels data analysis | |
| more able pupils | and taken | | aspirations | Visit registers & evaluations | |
| across Y7-13 | advantage of (e.g. | | | | |
| | Sheffield University | | | | |
| | Discover US | | | | |
| | programme) | | | | |

Evaluation of impact

The school peer to peer review reports that disadvantaged students are pleased with the quality of the education they receive and they talked positively about the trips linked to raising aspirations such as Sheffield Hallam University (in conjunction with GCC, BCC & SPH). Raising Aspirations received 100% positive feedback from students. Discover US has also had a positive impact with two of the five Discover US students opting for the full EBacc saying that they hadn't previously thought themselves able to do this.

- Discover US will be applied for again in 2016-17 led by SPo
- Raising aspirations will run, led by MTa
- More able disadvantaged students to be positively encouraged to take EBacc again, through small group information

| Objective (Desired end result) | Action (Strategy) | Lead | Success Criteria (Impact) | Monitoring (How do we know) | Resources costs |
|--|--|------------|--|---|--------------------------|
| session Evaluations of | of events need to be mo | re rigorou | S | | |
| Ensure the progress and attainment of disadvantaged more able pupils across Y7-13 | Disadvantaged pupils form a significant part of the groups involved in the new whole school more able programme (triple stranded – Enhance, Extend and Enrich) | CJe | Lesson observations and work scrutiny show disadvantaged students taking up challenges in every day lessons (extend) Subject specific "extras" completed by disadvantaged students (enrich) | Lesson observations Book scrutiny Registers and evaluations for "enhance" and "enrich" activities Snapshot data Exam data | £ Contingency fund |
| | | | Disadvantaged students taking on and excelling in the MA enhance activities (e.g. weekly meets) | | |

The cross curriculum more able group "Enhance" for Y7 and Y8 has run weekly and the students involved have produced some outstanding projects. Simply sending letters to inform parents and students that they are the most able in the year group has had anecdotal impact on students' attitude. Students eligible for the PPG with KS2 average of a 5b have all been included in this group to account for the inherited gap in attainment from primary stage. One measure of success is that through the year students asked to join the group and this was allowed on merit.

Faculties have identified the most able students in their subjects. Further actions of developing a wider reading/activity list for the more able students, reviewing the curricular and extra-curricular offers for the more able have become longer term actions due to pressures of new courses, changing assessment structures and improving results. Some subjects are providing opportunities for the more able in various ways (e.g. trips in Science, national competitions in Maths).

More able Y9 students were brought together to discuss the opportunities that arise from choosing subjects to form a full EBacc. The uptake of EBacc has increased from 24% in Y10 to 33% in Y9, with 57% of the more able disadvantaged students choosing it. Those more able disadvantaged students that did not opt for full EBacc have choses Computer Science rather than a language.

The more able cohort are rigorously tracked in English and Maths at SLT level, and are now able to be tracked at FTL level in every subject.

- Enhance will run again, and will incorporate Y9 students as well in 2016-17, led by SPo and RRa
- Faculty more able initiatives need to be collated and the will be possible through the new style termly reviews
- Faculty reading lists etc. to be developed when time allows not everything is possible at once!
- More able disadvantaged students to be positively encouraged to take EBacc again, through small group information session
- Tracking to be used in line management and links to intervention more clearly made

| Objective | Action | Lead | Success Criteria | Monitoring | Resources |
|--|---|------|---|--|-----------|
| (Desired end result) | (Strategy) | | (Impact) | (How do we know) | costs |
| Ensure the progress and attainment of disadvantaged more able pupils across Y7-13 | Specific data gathered from primary schools on the more able disadvantaged students, and this data leads to early intervention | CJe | Students who were expected to attain L5/6 and didn't boosted in Y7 through classroom teaching and intervention Detailed student KASH information known by NMS class teachers from day 1 and used in class | Transition data Lesson observations Book scrutiny Intervention log sheets | |

The February INSET was used to tailor KS3 SOW specifically with more able students in mind, so there is no dip in achievement. Schemes from this are now running. RAISE Online's QLA data is with the English and Maths faculties which gives specific areas for development for each individual more able disadvantaged student. Primary school visits by RRa involving 1-2-1 student and staff interviews by are a major source of information on students. This is shared as prudent through conversation and e-mail. The year group profile has been shared with all staff for use in planning. KS2 scaled scores have been used to group students and set targets. Primary Y6 teacher afternoon is in the calendar to spot any changes in quality of work produced. The impact of this work will not be able to be demonstrated until snapshot 1 at the earliest.

- Specificity of information is useful, but communicating it to the relevant people needs reviewing for maximum impact
- Snapshot 1 data to be thoroughly analysed for this specific cohort to determine impact
- More work needs to be done with Y6 teachers to prevent a dip meetings to run in 2016-17 with NMS and primary staff
- Year group, form group and individual info would be even more useful if given to staff before the summer break

| Objective (Desired end result) | Action (Strategy) | Lead | Success Criteria (Impact) | Monitoring (How do we know) | Resources costs |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| | | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| 3. Ensure the | Disadvantaged boys | CJe | Improved awareness | Student voice | |
| progress and | identified to staff at | | leads to more action | Snapshot data | |
| attainment of | all levels as a high | | taken to enhance the | Exam data | |
| disadvantaged | priority (class | | learning experiences of | All levels data analysis | |
| boys across Y7- | teacher, FTL, | | these students | Intervention schedules & log | |
| 13 | intervention team, | | | sheets | |
| | visits etc) | | | Visit registers & evaluations | |

Male and disadvantaged data available for every class daily through SIMS. All faculties have had a member of staff with a performance management target that centres on the progress and attainment of disadvantaged students, boys within this being a high priority. A T&L group focussing on the attainment and progress of boys had run and fed back effective strategies to staff. FTL data analysis now shows boys, disadvantaged and more able students as separate cohorts so the priority of disadvantaged boys is high in faculty intervention planning, and they are weighted during RAG analysis, so are top priority for cross school interventions.

Despite this work disadvantaged boys remain an area for concern

| | | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | Change |
|---------------------|----------|---------|---------|--------|
| Number | PP Girls | 12 | 11 | -1 |
| Number | PP Boys | 9 | 13 | +4 |
| | PP Girls | 43.83 | 48.82 | 4.99 |
| A8 | PP Boys | 41.17 | 33.54 | -7.63 |
| | Gap | -2.66 | -15.28 | |
| | PP Girls | -0.10 | 0.12 | 0.22 |
| P8 | PP Boys | -0.39 | -0.83 | -0.44 |
| | Gap | -0.29 | -0.95 | |
| | PP Girls | 58 | 55 | -3 |
| % C+ En & Ma | PP Boys | 33 | 23 | -10 |
| | Gap | -25 | -32 | |
| | PP Girls | 12 | 9 | -3 |
| Ebacc (% achieving) | PP Boys | 9 | 8 | -1 |
| | Gap | -3 | -1 | |

More disadvantaged boys and less disadvantaged girls last year compared to the year before. Increased A8 performance by disadvantaged girls and decreased A8 performance for disadvantaged boys, therefore the gap is widening significantly. Increased P8 performance by disadvantaged girls and decreased P8 performance for disadvantaged boys, therefore gap widening significantly. Decreased basics attainment for disadvantaged boys and girls, but a larger decrease by disadvantaged boys, gap increasing. Decreased EBacc performance by disadvantaged girls and decreased girls and decreased Ebacc performance for disadvantaged boys, therefore gap closing

- Underlying attitudes of certain disadvantaged boys have had more of an impact on their achievement that the work of the staff. Efforts need to be made in 2016-17 to identify students who may fall into this group and find ways of altering their mindset. This may involve work with the families, and will probably be a long term goal
- Further work needs to be done on how to increase the achievements of boys at NMS

| | Dbjective Desired end result) | Action (Strate | | | Lead | Success Cr (Impact) | iteria | Monitoring (How do we know) | Resources costs |
|----|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---|--|--------------------------|
| 4. | Ensure the progress and attainment of disadvantaged SEN/low ability pupils across Y7- 13 | Disadv SEN/Lo group staff at high pr teache interve visits e | ow abil identif t all lev riority (er, FTL, ention t | ity ied to els as a (class | CJe | | ore action nhance the operiences of | Student voice Snapshot data Exam data All levels data analysis Intervention schedules & log sheets Visit registers & evaluations | £ Contingency fund |
| E | valuation of impact Low ability stude | ents | - | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | Change |] | | |
| | Number | | ND D | 14 | 11 9 | -3 | | | |
| | A8 | | D | 28.93 32.33 | 37.86 28.89 | 8.93 -3.44 | | | |
| | | | Gap | 3.40 | -8.79 | | | | |
| | P8 | | ND D Gap | -0.12 0.33 0.45 | 0.60 -0.51 -1.11 | 0.72 | | | |
| | | | ND | 0.43 | -1.11 | 18 | | | |
| | % C+ En & Ma | a | D | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| | | | Gap ND | 0 | -18 | 1 | | | |
| | Ebacc (Number ach | ieving) | D Gap | 0 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |

Increase in number of low ability disadvantaged students since 2014-15. Increase in A8 by non-disadvantaged lower ability students, but a decrease by lower ability disadvantaged students so gap widening. Increase in P8 by lower ability non-disadvantaged, decrease in P8 by lower ability disadvantaged, so gap widening significantly. Static (0!) performance by lower ability D students, increasing performance by lower ability non-disadvantaged, gap widening. More lower ability non-disadvantaged students (1) achieving Ebacc so gap widening.

| SENK (A&P) students | SENK (A&P) students | | | Change |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| Number | ND | 11 | 7 | -4 |
| Number | D | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| | ND | 34.55 | 48.21 | +13.66 |
| A8 | D | 37.13 | 12.63 | -24.50 |
| | Gap | 2.75 | -35.58 | |
| | ND | -0.60 | 0.89 | 1.49 |
| P8 | D | -0.38 | -1.42 | -1.04 |
| | Gap | 0.22 | -2.31 | |
| | ND | 27 | 43 | +16 |
| % C+ En & Ma | D | 50 | 0 | -50 |
| | Gap | +23 | -43 | |
| | ND | 0 | 2 | +2 |
| Ebacc (Number achieving) | D | 0 | 1 | +1 |
| active ving) | Gap | 0 | -1 | |

Lessons Learned:

• SEN support and PP support needs to be more closely linked in 2016-17

• Specific individuals curriculum needs to continue to match their needs, irrespective of "measures", which may skew

| Objective | Action | Lead | Success Criteria | Monitoring | Resources |
|---|---|-------------|--|---|-----------|
| Desired end result) | (Strategy) | | (Impact) | (How do we know) | costs |
| figures | | | | | |
| Ensure the | TA's used | CJe/MS | Support given in class | Snapshot data | |
| progress and | strategically in | i | improves outcomes for | Exam data | |
| attainment of | classes to support | | SEN/low ability | All levels data analysis | |
| disadvantaged | disadvantaged SEN | | disadvantaged students | | |
| SEN/low ability | students in all years, | | | | |
| pupils across Y7- | rather than in | | | | |
| 13 | peripheral activities | | | | |
| nerefore has a signifi essons Learned: | cantly negative score. H | • | ported in these studies by T | | |
| nerefore has a signifi essons Learned: • Review TA al | cantly negative score. F locations in 2016-17 | le was supp | - | A's ad HLTA's. See above. | ., |
| nerefore has a signifi essons Learned: • Review TA al • Look for way | cantly negative score. F locations in 2016-17 | le was supp | ported in these studies by T | A's ad HLTA's. See above. | Resources |
| herefore has a signifi essons Learned: • Review TA al • Look for way bjective | cantly negative score. H locations in 2016-17 s to maximise TA impac | le was supp | borted in these studies by T | A's ad HLTA's. See above. | - |
| herefore has a signifi essons Learned: • Review TA al • Look for way bjective Desired end result) | cantly negative score. F locations in 2016-17 s to maximise TA impac | le was supp | borted in these studies by T staff training and student gr Success Criteria | A's ad HLTA's. See above. roupings Monitoring | Resources |
| herefore has a signifi essons Learned: • Review TA al • Look for way bjective Desired end result) | cantly negative score. H locations in 2016-17 s to maximise TA impac Action (Strategy) | t through s | borted in these studies by T staff training and student gr Success Criteria (Impact) | A's ad HLTA's. See above. roupings Monitoring (How do we know) | Resources |
| herefore has a signifi essons Learned: • Review TA al • Look for way bjective Desired end result) • Develop the | cantly negative score. H locations in 2016-17 s to maximise TA impac Action (Strategy) MAT | t through s | borted in these studies by T staff training and student gr Success Criteria (Impact) All Y11 PP students | A's ad HLTA's. See above. roupings Monitoring (How do we know) Appointment timetable by | Resources |
| herefore has a signifi essons Learned: • Review TA al • Look for way Dbjective Desired end result) • Develop the expectations of, | cantly negative score. H locations in 2016-17 s to maximise TA impac Action (Strategy) MAT intervention/career | t through s | Success Criteria (Impact) All Y11 PP students have careers | A's ad HLTA's. See above. roupings Monitoring (How do we know) Appointment timetable by Sept 2015 | Resources |
| herefore has a signifi essons Learned: • Review TA al • Look for way bbjective Desired end result) • Develop the expectations of, and aspirations | cantly negative score. H locations in 2016-17 s to maximise TA impac Action (Strategy) MAT intervention/career s advisor | t through s | Success Criteria (Impact) All Y11 PP students have careers appointments and | A's ad HLTA's. See above. roupings Monitoring (How do we know) Appointment timetable by Sept 2015 Individual Action plans | Resources |
| herefore has a signifi essons Learned: • Review TA al • Look for way bbjective Desired end result) • Develop the expectations of, and aspirations of | cantly negative score. H locations in 2016-17 s to maximise TA impac Action (Strategy) MAT intervention/career s advisor | t through s | Success Criteria (Impact) All Y11 PP students have careers appointments and follow-up liaison with | A's ad HLTA's. See above. roupings Monitoring (How do we know) Appointment timetable by Sept 2015 Individual Action plans written by Nov 15 MAT initial appointments completed by Feb 16 | Resources |
| essons Learned: Review TA al Look for way Dbjective Desired end result) 5. Develop the expectations of, and aspirations of disadvantaged | cantly negative score. H locations in 2016-17 s to maximise TA impac Action (Strategy) MAT intervention/career s advisor | t through s | Success Criteria (Impact) All Y11 PP students have careers appointments and follow-up liaison with MAT careers adviser | A's ad HLTA's. See above. roupings Monitoring (How do we know) Appointment timetable by Sept 2015 Individual Action plans written by Nov 15 MAT initial appointments | Resources |

Careers interviews completed for all Y11 students. The raising aspirations programme continues to run with positive feedback. Careers advisor present at parents evenings for Y9-11 Awaiting NEET data

PP NEET=0% Summer 16

Lessons Learned:

- Raising aspirations will run, led by MTa
- Careers interviews will be completed again, with disadvantaged students prioritised
- Protocol for booking appointment with careers advisor at parents evening needs developing so disadvantaged students' access can be ensured

| Objective | Action | Lead | Success Criteria | Monitoring | Resources |
|----------------------|------------------------|------|--------------------------|------------------|-------------|
| (Desired end result) | (Strategy) | | (Impact) | (How do we know) | costs |
| Develop the | Aspirational visits to | CJe | All Y10/11 middle | Attendance lists | £ |
| expectations of, | Universities for | | ability students visited | Student voice | Contingency |
| and aspirations | middle ability as | | at least one university | | Fund |
| of | well as more able | | during KS4 (for more | | |
| disadvantaged | disadvantaged | | able see section 2) | | |
| students | students | | | | |

Evaluation of impact

All Y10 disadvantaged students visited university at least once over last year. Highly positive student evaluations from visits.

- Several people organising visits meant effort was duplicated. All university visits in 2016-17 to go through Eda to minimise this
- University visits will run again in 2016-17, focussed on Y9 and Y10 so aspiration is there for GCSE courses, and time not taken out of final year exam preparations

| Objective (Desired end result) | Action (Strategy) | Lead | Success Criteria (Impact) | Monitoring (How do we know) | Resources costs |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| <u>(</u> | (0110108)/ | | (| | |
| Develop the | Raise staff | CJe | Improved awareness of | Book trawls | |
| expectations of, | expectation of and | ABa | ability levels within PP | Lesson observations | |
| and aspirations | aspiration for PP | | cohort, and use of this | Lesson plans | |
| of | students, through | | data by class teachers | | |
| disadvantaged | understanding the | | | | |
| students | varied nature of the | | Lesson observations | | |
| | disadvantaged | | and book trawls reflect | | |
| | cohort | | high aspiration & | | |
| | | | expectation (no | | |
| | | | difference in PP and | | |
| | | | non-PP or similar | | |
| | | | ability) | | |

Ability data and PP data is always available to staff. 1-2-1 interview outcomes were shared with relevant staff this term. Ability profile of disadvantaged students highlighted through year profile documents, staff aware.

Peer-to-peer evaluation days were carried out amongst Peak 11 schools. Within the Peak 11 peer review day the work scrutiny of D students found that regular marking was evident in most books seen. Excellent practice was observed in a KS4 physics book with excellent presentation and peer assessment in evidence and a music performance feedback sheet. However, it was also found that student response to feedback was not sufficiently apparent.

Lessons Learned:

• Work scrutiny does not differentiate between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students, except when bespoke ones have occurred. This needs to be investigated for 2016-17.

| Objective | Action | Lead | Success Criteria | Monitoring | Resources |
|----------------------|-------------------|------|-----------------------|----------------------------|-----------|
| (Desired end result) | (Strategy) | | (Impact) | (How do we know) | costs |
| Develop the | Ensure the | CJe | Students report | Student voice | |
| expectations of, | experience of | EDa | positively on the | Post-16 destinations | |
| and aspirations | disadvantaged | | experiences | (including NMS Sixth Form) | |
| of | pupils during | | Students apply to | | |
| disadvantaged | Futures week is | | suitable (and | | |
| students | appropriate to | | aspirational) | | |
| | individuals needs | | employers/educational | | |
| | and inspirational | | establishments | | |

Evaluation of impact

Futures week planned by EDa. Student evaluations of futures week show81% enjoyed the week, with 76% stating the week was useful or very useful. The most useful experiences were the university visits, the specific employment visits and the mock interviews. Almost half the students said they would now do more research into their future career, and that they now had a wider view of possible career routes.

- Review provision for disadvantaged students to ensure futures week provides bespoke, relevant experiences for all
- Review how evaluation/impact evidence is gathered to pinpoint the effects for students eligible for the Pupil Premium

| Objective (Desired end result) | Action (Strategy) | Lead | Success Criteria (Impact) | Monitoring (How do we know) | Resources costs |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| (, | (0.0.008)/ | 1 | (| (| |
| 6. Ensure the | Disadvantaged | CJe | No dip in performance | Snapshot data | |
| progress and | students have an | | during transitions for | All levels data analysis | |
| attainment of | additional level of | | disadvantaged students | Registers for transition | |
| disadvantaged | transition support | | | events | |
| students during | (e.g. summer | | Students report | Student voice | |
| transitions | schools) appropriate | | positively on their | | |
| (primary to | to their need | | pastoral and academic | | |
| secondary, and | | | transition | | |
| GCSE to A Level) | | | | | |

Transition programme was much expanded in 2015-16 with 4 faculty days and 2 pastoral days. Links with primaries have been forged at headship level, faculty level and through the PL. Evaluations show students feel more prepared for Y7 (99% agree or strongly agree), and the first few weeks have shown a calm start. 100% of students said that transition was useful as they worked in different groups, felt they could ask questions and they got to know the site (including the dining hall). Exit surveys of Y6 parents show the events hosted throughout the year have a positive effect on decisions to attend NMS. The support for all levels of ability, the close contact with primaries, improving reputation, parent fora, the attitude of staff, testimony from students and specific departments (Music, SEN) were all cited as positive reasons to choose New Mills.

Data available to all staff on Y7 cohort and specific information on SEN students shared. English and Maths have QLA data for the year group. Rates of progression cannot be determined until the first snapshot at the earliest. Primary/secondary work scrutiny afternoon in place (Oct 2016) to determine any dip in quality of class/homework produced by individuals.

Lessons Learned:

- The information on which students were eligible for PP was difficult to obtain, hampering efforts to raise awareness of them before the summer break. This info should be easier to get as relationships with primary's improve further
- The timing of CATS testing will again be reviewed
- Impact of academic transition to be reviewed after Y7 snapshots

| Objective | Action | Lead | Success Criteria | Monitoring | Resources |
|----------------------|----------------------|------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------|
| (Desired end result) | (Strategy) | | (Impact) | (How do we know) | costs |
| Ensure the | Level of data from | CJe | Improved awareness of | Snapshot data | |
| progress and | primary school is | | KASH within PP cohort, | All levels data analysis | |
| attainment of | detailed (KASH), | | and use of this data by | Book trawls | |
| disadvantaged | passed on to | | class teachers | Lesson observations | |
| students during | relevant NMS staff | | | Lesson plans | |
| transitions | and used in | | No dip in performance | | |
| | planning/delivery of | | during transitions for | | |
| | lessons | | disadvantaged students | | |

Evaluation of impact

As KASH not fully embedded in school yet, the info from primary schools has taken the form of personalised notes on the students, shared with the relevant staff.

- Review how data is transferred and how it is shared with NMS staff
- Develop Y6 teachers & NMS staff transition group so this is a sensible process for all parties, and includes the detail of information on interventions disadvantaged students have received in primary

| Objective | Action | Lead | Success Criteria | Monitoring | Resources |
|----------------------|------------|------|------------------|------------------|-----------|
| (Desired end result) | (Strategy) | | (Impact) | (How do we know) | costs |
| | | | | | |

| 7. Improve the | Ensure the | CJe | Attendance at parents | Sign in sheets | |
|----------------|--------------------|-----|-------------------------|----------------|--|
| engagement of | attendance of | | evenings, rewards | | |
| parents of | parents of | | evenings, intervention | | |
| disadvantaged | disadvantaged | | evenings etc. matches | | |
| pupils | students at school | | (or exceeds) that of ND | | |
| | events | | students | | |

PL tried to ensure all parents of all disadvantaged students attended parents evenings. They telephoned and personally invited each family. Parents evenings generally attended well, but disadvantaged families attendance still needs further work:

| Year | Overall Attendance | PP attendance | Number of PP families attending | Number of PP families non- attending |
|------|--------------------|---------------|---------------------------------|---|
| 11 | 80% | 60% | 14 | 10 |
| 10 | 73% | 60% | 8 | 6 |
| 9 | 89% | 75% | 24 | 8 |
| 8 | 83% | 57% | 16 | 12 |
| 7 | 87% | 68% | 17 | 8 |

Lessons Learned:

- Look at the families not engaging in parents evenings to determine reasons (geography, past experience....)
- Develop relationships with these families using YM, PL and MAT team
- Investigate ways to overcome any barriers to engaging in school (more informal location, more personalised meeting...)

| Objective | Action | Lead | Success Criteria | Monitoring | Resources |
|--|---|------|--|------------------|--------------------------|
| (Desired end result) | (Strategy) | | (Impact) | (How do we know) | costs |
| 8. Ensure that aspects of poverty do not impact on the progress or attainment of disadvantaged students | Use PPG to fund uniform, equipment, revision guides and ICT support at home so these aspects do not hinder progress | CJe | All students in uniform, with access to suitable equipment/resources to compete work set by teachers | Student voice | £ Contingency fund |

Evaluation of impact

1-2-1 interviews conducted with all disadvantaged students. Personalised interventions actioned from these interviews (e.g. revision guides) the cost of these was covered by the PPG. PPG has been accessed by several new students for uniform costs and equipment and an increase in the awareness of this fund has enabled one Y9 student to choose Food Preparation & Nutrition which was previously thought too expensive for her.

Lessons Learned:

 Discussion to be held about talking about "premium" status with students and/or parents and how to access their grants

| Objective | Action | Lead | Success Criteria | Monitoring | Resources |
|----------------------|------------------|------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|
| (Desired end result) | (Strategy) | | (Impact) | (How do we know) | costs |
| Ensure that | Use PPG to fund | CJe | Learning dependent on | Visit registers | £ |
| aspects of | places on | | trips is accessed by | Controlled assessments data | Contingency |
| poverty do not | curriculum trips | | disadvantaged students | | fund |
| impact on the | | | (e.g. History controlled | | |
| progress or | | | assessment) | | |
| attainment of | | | | | |
| disadvantaged | | | | | |
| students | | | | | |

Evaluation of impact

Two applications for support with trip funding have been approved this year so far (History controlled assessment and France/Belgium trip). All Raising Aspirations, Discover US and Peak 11 PP visits have been funded wholly through the PPG.

Lessons Learned:

• Discussion to be held about talking about "premium" status with students and/or parents and how to access their

| Objective (Desired end result) grants | Action (Strategy) | Lead | Success Criteria (Impact) | Monitoring (How do we know) | Resources costs |
|---|---|------|---|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| Objective (Desired end result) | Action (Strategy) | Lead | Success Criteria (Impact) | Monitoring (How do we know) | Resources costs |
| 9. Widen participation in extra-curricular activities amongst disadvantaged pupils | Ascertain current level of participation in music and sport amongst disadvantaged students compared to others | CJe | Data available and analysed for gaps Subject staff aware of any gaps, and use some positive discrimination to close them | Data analysis | |

Music registers for last academic year obtained. Sport registers unavailable. Analysis shows there are gaps in Music participation. Wider advertising of extra-curricular activities is now occurring

Lessons Learned:

• Review how participation in extra-curricular activities is monitored so more accurate data can be used to determine if real gaps exist

| Objective | Action | Lead | Success Criteria | Monitoring | Resources |
|--|---|------|---|---|--------------------------|
| (Desired end result) | (Strategy) | | (Impact) | (How do we know) | costs |
| Widen participation in extra-curricular activities amongst disadvantaged pupils | Interview disadvantaged students and gauge interest in extra- curricular. Encourage students into attending current activities. Create extra- curricular activities they will attend. Remove barriers to attendance (| CJe | Wider variety of extra- curricular activities available Higher proportions of disadvantaged students attending | Activities schedule Data collection and analysis | £ Contingency fund |

Evaluation of impact

1-2-1 interviews conducted with all disadvantaged students, extra-curricular activity forming part of these. Of those who did not do any extracurricular the reason was that they did not want to participate, or felt they had commitments at home that were a higher priority. There were no requests for specific extracurricular activity other than more quiet spaces to work, so students were offered quiet spaces to work.

Lessons Learned:

• The whole school extra-curricular offer needs reviewing; updating and then the students who are eligible for PPG can be encouraged into these opportunities.