**PP Plan Impact Measures 2016-17**

**PP Cohorts**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2015-16** | Female | | Male | | All |
| D Cohort | ND Cohort | D Cohort | ND Cohort |
| More Able | 3 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 17 |
| Middle Ability | 4 | 20 | 4 | 20 | 48 |
| Lower ability | 4 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 20 |
| NA | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| All | 11 | 33 | 13 | 30 | 87 |

Overall ND to D in school gap KS2 APS: -0.9 Overall national all to school D gap KS2 APS: -1.56

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Y11** | Female | | Male | | All |
| D Cohort | ND Cohort | D Cohort | ND Cohort |
| More Able | 4 | 16 | 4 | 17 | 41 |
| Middle Ability | 2 | 15 | 3 | 18 | 38 |
| Lower ability | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 6 |
| NA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| All | 6 | 34 | 8 | 38 | 86 |

Overall ND to D in school gap KS2 APS: 0.0 Overall national ND to school D gap KS2 APS: +0.66

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Y10** | Female | | Male | | All |
| D Cohort | ND Cohort | D Cohort | ND Cohort |
| More Able | 3 | 18 | 4 | 10 | 35 |
| Middle Ability | 8 | 20 | 7 | 15 | 50 |
| Lower ability | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 12 |
| NA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| All | 12 | 40 | 16 | 30 | 98 |

Overall ND to D in school gap KS2 APS: -2.43 Overall national ND to school D gap KS2 APS: -1.93

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Y9** | Female | | Male | | All |
| D Cohort | ND Cohort | D Cohort | ND Cohort |
| More Able | 4 | 11 | 7 | 20 | 42 |
| Middle Ability | 8 | 10 | 3 | 12 | 33 |
| Lower ability | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 7 |
| NA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| All | 13 | 21 | 14 | 34 | 82 |

Overall ND to D in school gap KS2 APS:-3.11 Overall national ND to school D gap KS2 APS: -1.68

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Y8 ~** | Female | | Male | | All |
| D Cohort | ND Cohort | D Cohort | ND Cohort |
| More Able | 4 | 21 | 4 | 15 | 44 |
| Middle Ability | 1 | 13 | 13 | 20 | 47 |
| Lower ability | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| NA | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| All | 7 | 37 | 18 | 38 | 100 |

Overall ND to D in school gap KS2 APS: Overall national ND to school D gap KS2 APS:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Y7 #** | Female | | Male | | All |
| D Cohort | ND Cohort | D Cohort | ND Cohort |
| More Able |  |  |  |  |  |
| Middle Ability |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lower ability |  |  |  |  |  |
| NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| All | 13 | 45 | 16 | 44 | 118 |

Overall ND to D in school gap KS2 APS: Overall national ND to school D gap KS2 APS:

# TBC when info on new KS2 and banding is published

~ awaiting official RAISE figures

1. Being ready to learn
   * 1. The percentage attendance for NMS disadvantaged students to be better than national disadvantaged, aiming towards the percentage for all pupils nationally (2016 = 95.0%), then to percentage of ND students nationally

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Y7-11 | D  Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap | National D Average | School D to National D Gap | National ND Pupil Average | School D to National ND Gap |
| 2013-14 | 92.6 | 95.4 | -2.8 | 92.7 | -0.1 | 95.9 | -3.3 |
| 2014-15 | 90.8 | 94.9 | -4.1 | 92.5 | -1.7 | 95.7 | -4.9 |
| 2015-16 | 92.7 | 96.1 | -3.4 | 92.8 | -0.1 | 95.9 | -3.2 |
| 2016-17 | 88.9 | 94.6 | -5.7 | 92.8 | -3.9 | 95.9 | -7.0 |

Attendance of D students declined between 2014 and 2015, but then improved to be within 0.1% of national D in 2016.

In 2016 NMS D students had 2.3% lower attendance than all pupils nationally, and 3.2% lower attendance than ND student nationally.

In 2017 attendance of D students fell, and the in-school and gap to national figures increased

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Y11 | D  Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap |
| 2015-16 | 90.8 | 93.3 | -2.5 |
| 2016-17 | 84.1 | 87.0 | -3.0 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Y10 | D  Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap |
| 2015-16 | 90.4 | 94.3 | -3.9 |
| 2016-17 | 83.2 | 95.1 | -11.8 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Y9 | D  Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap |
| 2015-16 | 88.1 | 95.5 | -7.4 |
| 2016-17 | 89.6 | 95.9 | -6.3 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Y8 | D  Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap |
| 2015-16 | 93.3 | 97.0 | -3.7 |
| 2016-17 | 92.2 | 97.4 | -5.2 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Y7 | D  Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap |
| 2015-16 | 94.2 | 97.2 | -3.0 |
| 2016-17 | 94.0 | 97.1 | -3.1 |

* + 1. The percentage of NMS disadvantaged students who are persistently absent to be lower than national disadvantaged, aiming towards the percentage for all pupils nationally (2016 = 12.4%), then to percentage of ND students nationally

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Y7-11 | D  Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap | National D Average | School D to National D Gap | National ND Pupils Average | School D to National ND Gap |
| 2013-14 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 2014-15 | 28.1 | 9.0 | -19.1 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 2015-16 | 23.8 | 9.8 | -14.0 | 21.6 | -2.2 | 8.3 | -15.5 |
| 2016-17 | 30.9 | 9.1 | -21.8 | 21.6 | -9.9 | 8.3 | -22.6 |

The in-school gap in persistent absence narrowed between 2015 and 2016. In 2016 NMS D students had 2.2% higher PA than D students nationally, and 11.4% higher than all pupils nationally. In 2017 the percentage of D students who are PA increased and the percentage of ND decreased, so gaps widened significantly

Different year groups contribute differently to this overall figure. PA for D students in Y7, Y9 and Y11 fell, but Y8 and Y10 increased.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Y11 | D Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap |
| 2015-16 | 32.0 | 17.7 | -14.3 |
| Term 3 | 21.4 | 8.7 | -12.7 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Y10 | D Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap |
| 2015-16 | 26.7 | 14.1 | -12.6 |
| Term 3 | 51.9 | 8.7 | -43.2 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Y9 | D Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap |
| 2015-16 | 37.5 | 8.8 | -28.7 |
| Term 3 | 26.9 | 14.3 | -12.6 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Y8 | D Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap |
| 2015-16 | 20.7 | 5.4 | -15.3 |
| Term 3 | 28.0 | 6.7 | -21.3 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Y7 | D Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap |
| 2015-16 | 30.8 | 2.6 | -28.2 |
| Term 3 | 23.1 | 7.9 | -15.2 |

* + 1. The percentage of NMS disadvantaged students who are late to be lower than all pupils nationally (2016 = 1.4%)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Y7-11 | D  Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap | National All Average | School D to National All Gap |
| 2013-14 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 2014-15 | 3.0 | 1.4 | -1.6 | NA | NA |
| 2015-16 | 2.4 | 1.0 | -1.4 | 1.4 | -1.0 |
| 2016-17 | 2.6 | 1.0 | -1.6 | 1.4 | -1.2 |

Punctuality improved between 2015 and 2016 for D students at NMS. The in school gap narrowed by 0.2% to 1.4%. Compared to national averages, NMS D students were 1% higher. In 2017 punctuality got slightly worse for D students so the gaps increased slightly.

Y10 D students were the least punctual

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Y11 | D Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap |
| 2015-16 | 2.1 | 1.8 | -0.3 |
| Term 3 | 0.9 | 0.5 | -0.4 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Y10 | D Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap |
| 2015-16 | 3.1 | 1.4 | -1.7 |
| Term 3 | 4.1 | 1.2 | -2.9 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Y9 | D Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap |
| 2015-16 | 3.7 | 0.8 | -2.9 |
| Term 3 | 1.0 | 0.9 | -0.1 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Y8 | D Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap |
| 2015-16 | 3.7 | 0.8 | -2.9 |
| Term 3 | 2.9 | 2.6 | -0.3 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Y7 | D Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap |
| 2015-16 | 3.7 | 0.8 | -2.9 |
| Term 3 | 1.7 | 0.0 | -1.7 |

* + 1. The proportion of NMS disadvantaged students with fixed term exclusions to be lower than national disadvantaged, aiming towards the percentage for all pupils nationally 2015 = 3.97%)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Y7-11 | D  Cohort | ND Cohort | School  Gap | National All Pupils Average | School D to National All Pupils Gap |
| 2012-13 | 3.74 | NA | +2.14 to all | 3.86 | -0.12 |
| 2013-14 | 4.17 | 1.04 | +3.13 | 3.68 | +0.49 |
| 2014-15 | 14.04 | 3.51 | +10.53 | 3.97 | +10.07 |
| 2015-16 | 23.40 | 4.50 | +18.90 | 3.97\*  (2015) | +19.43 |
| 2016-17 | 6.97 | 1.29 | +8.04 | 3.97 | +3.00 |

Fixed term exclusions rose markedly for D students between 2014 and 2015, and again in 2016. This coincided with the change in leadership at the school. This year there has been a decline in the percentage of D students with a FTE and the gaps have closed significantly.

1. Engaging with school (students and families)
   * 1. The proportion of C3 and C4 incidents from eligible students and non- eligible students to be in line with cohort proportions

C3 incidents C4 Incidents

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Y7-11 | D  Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap |  | D  Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap |  |
|  | 22 | 78 | +56 |  | 22 | 78 | +56 |  |
| 2016-17 | 51 | 49 | -3 |  | 54 | 46 | -8 |  |
| Term 3 | 38 | 62 | +24 |  | 53 | 47 | -6 |  |

D students account for a higher proportion of C3 and C4 incidents in Y7-10 than they should do (e.g. if 25% of the population are D students, 25% of the incidents should come from them). In the vast majority of cases the incident proportions were falling in term 2 to be closer to the proportion the students represent, but are still too high. In term 3 these proportions have sung back the wrong way. Notable groups are Y10 C4 incidents (75% from D students who represent 29% of the year), and Y10 C3 incidents which are the closest to representative.

* + 1. A difference of less than 10% between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged in the percentage of the parents attending parents evenings

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2015-16 | D  Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap | 2016-17 | D  Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap |
| Y11 | 60% | 84% | -24% | Y11 | 43% | 71% | -28% |
| Y10 | 60% | 76% | -16% | Y10 | 62% | 87% | -25% |
| Y9 | 75% | 96% | -21% | Y9 | 48% | 75% | -27% |
| Y8 | 57% | 96% | -39% | Y8 | 75% | 95% | -20% |
| Y7 | 68% | 93% | -25% | Y7 | 85% | 87% | -2% |

* + 1. A difference of less than 10% between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged in the percentage of the students attending extra-curricular provision

Gaps in extracurricular uptake have narrowed over the year in nearly all cases, in some, the proportion of D students attending is greater than the proportion of ND. Y9 girls and Y8 boys are the only two groups where the gap has widened over the year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Y7-Y11 | D-Girls  Cohort | ND-Girls Cohort | School Gap | D-Boys  Cohort | ND-Boys Cohort | School Gap |
|  | 25 | 32 | -6 | 17 | 20 | -3 |

* + 1. No significant differences in 3R’s scores\* or work scrutiny

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Y7-Y11 | D  Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap | Significance |
|  | 2.29 | 1.93 | -0.36 | Not Sig |

Overall there is a 0.36 difference in 3R’s scores between D and ND students. Y8, 9 and 10 show a significant difference between the two cohorts. Y11, Y9 and Y7 D students have improved their 3R scores between term 1 and term 2, Y8 is static, but Y10 have declined.

In the years where there are significant differences, most D students do have positive attitudes to learning. In Y10 15 of 26 D students have 3R’s scores 2.5 or better, in Y9 this proportion is 17 of 28 students, and Y8 it is 16 of 24.

Whole school work scrutiny using a matched cohort of D and ND students form all years showed no differences in the work produced, the marking, or the DIRT from the D and ND students. In a work scrutiny exercise with year 10 pupil premium students carried out by our SIP all but one was able to present a piece of work that they were proud of, and many were able to explain the nature of the work undertaken. Their workbooks were generally well marked with evidence of time being allowed for reflection on teacher comments. Good practice was evident in English and particularly, Media.

* + 1. Positive pupil voice

A student voice exercise with year 10 pupil premium students carried out by our SIP revealed a generally positive endorsement of the school, and a recognition that provision is improving. A small number of the students are finding it hard to adjust to the increased demands being placed upon them.

Students expressed positive opinions about work in the creative subjects and sports science, but were less positive about work in English, mathematics, science, history, RE and core PE. Students were thoughtful about their classroom experience. They expressed a concern that occasionally in mathematics they are made to feel ‘dumb’, that, on occasions, they do not receive the immediacy of support that they need and that sometimes the pace of work does not match their capacities. All would like greater clarification of course demands.

Some students did not understand if they were making progress or not, and two students expressed negative attitudes.

1. Learning and achieving: For disadvantaged pupils as a cohort, and when analysed for gender and ability differences there is:
   * 1. Less than 5% difference in the percentage of students achieving or exceeding expected targets

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Y11 | D  Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap |
| 2015-16 | 51 | 60 | -8 |
| 2016-17 | 29 | 45 | -16 |

The % at/above expected target for D students decreased from 2016 level in 2017. This was forecast, and another drop is forecast for Y10, after that forecasts increase rapidly.

Looking at all year groups, the progress of female disadvantaged students is good, but mid, high ability and male disadvantaged students’ progress must continue as whole school priorities

* + 1. Attainment 8 scores in line with targets for the cohort (2017 points) – Green = within 5 pts of targets gap

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Y11 | D  Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap  (2016/17 = 0.00 on entry) |
| 2013-14 |  |  |  |
| 2014-15 | 42.69 | 47.38 | -4.69 |
| 2015-16 | 34.76 | 45.28 | -10.52 |
| 2016-17 | 40.71 | 47.13 | -6.42 |

In school gaps are within the range (5 points) of their target gaps for all years. The in school gaps decreased over the year for all years except Y9. All gaps except Y7 are still larger than targets would suggest they should be.

Looking at all year groups, the attainment of female and low ability disadvantaged students is good, but mid, high ability and male disadvantaged students’ attainment must continue as whole school priorities

* + 1. A difference of less than 10% between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged on the basics measure (9-4)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Y11 | D  Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap | National ND Average | National All Average | School D to National ND Gap |
| 2013-14 | 41 | 57 | -21 | NA | NA | NA |
| 2014-15 | 48 | 55 | -7 | NA | NA | NA |
| 2015-16 | 38 | 59 | -21 | 70 | 62 | -32 |
| 2016-17 | 54 | 75 | -21 | 70 | 62 | -16 |

The gap between NMS D students and ND students nationally has halved in the last year (using 2016 NA). It is still -16% which is too high, as using our targets there should have been a positive gap. The gap in Maths was -12% (targets give a -6% gap), and the gap in English was -36% (targets give a +4% gap). This indicates a need for work on D students in English.

Large gaps persist throughout all year groups. In Y7 and Y10 these gaps are comparable or better than the gaps forecast through our targets. In Y8, 9 and 11 the gaps are larger that prior attainment would suggest.

Y11: Gap caused by both genders, higher and mid ability

Y10: Average figure masks a shortfall by higher ability boys

Y9: Gap caused by both genders, higher and mid ability

Y8: Gap caused by mid ability boys (girls are actually above target)

Y7: Slight under achievement of mid ability girls

* + 1. A difference of less than 10% between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged on the EBacc measure

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Y11 | D  Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap | National ND Average | National All Average | School D to National ND Gap |
| 2013-14 | 4 | 19 | -15 |  |  |  |
| 2014-15 | 0 | 19 | -19 |  |  |  |
| 2015-16 | 8 | 21 | -13 | 29 | 24 | -21 |
| Actual | 15 | 19 | -4 | 29 | 24 | -14 |

In Y11 the in-school gap diminished, and is narrower than targets would suggest is should be. The gap in the proportion of D students achieving the EBacc between NMS and national has decreased. The proportion of D student entered for EBacc is 14% in Y11 and 15% in Y10.

* + 1. All D students continue to appropriate further education and training. Figures show % continuing to sustained education, employment or training

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Y11 | D  Cohort | ND Cohort | School Gap | National ND Average | National All Average | School D to National ND Gap |
| 2012-13 | 76 | 89 | -13 | 93 | 90 | -17 |
| 2013-14 | 94 | 94 | 0 | 94 | 92 | 0 |
| 2014-15 | 96 | 93 | +3 | 96 | 94 | 0 |
| 2015-16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The proportion of NMS D students continuing to further education and training has risen between 2013 and 2015, and is now equal to national ND students. In the 2016 cohort only 1 D student is NEET, and over 70% of the D cohort are in sixth form at schools or colleges.