

North Halifax Grammar School

Pupil premium strategy 2018/19

| 1. Summary information | | | | | |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------|---|----------------|
| School | North Halifax Grammar School | | | | |
| Academic Year | 2018/19 | Total PP budget | 41,140.00 | Date of most recent PP Review | September 2018 |
| Number of pupils | 779 | Number of Eligible for PP | 39 | Date for next internal review of this strategy | December 2018 |

| 2. 2017/18 Outcomes | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | School Pupils eligible for PP (2018) | Pupils not eligible (2018) |
| % Achieving 4+ English and Mathematics | 100 | 99.3 |
| % Achieving 5+ English and Mathematics | 91.7 | 93.8 |
| Progress 8 score average | -0.802 | 0.119 |
| Attainment 8 score average | 59.25 | 67.24 |

| 3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP) | |
|--|--|
| In-school barriers <i>(issues to be addressed in school, such as poor literacy skills)</i> | |
| A. | Literacy and oracy skills linked to cultural capital which could prevent students accessing our “Gold” KS3 curriculum, GCSE grades 7 to 9 and A*-B at A Level in particular |
| B. | Financial barriers which could deprive students of access to key resources at home, such as: access to ICT at home to do homework/research etc., books, desk, other learning resources and rich learning experiences such as residential trips and other school visits |
| C. | Possible social anxiety and lack of confidence/self-esteem when comparing themselves to other high prior attaining students in school (PP students nationally less likely to be self-confident) which could make some disadvantaged students less resilient |

| | |
|---|---|
| D. | Potential lack of access to professional role models and “inside” information about careers and universities that might impact adversely on motivation and aspiration or lead to a lack of understanding of the need to complement academic studies with a broad range of enrichment activities to compete for certain courses and jobs |
| External barriers (<i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i>) | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| 4. Desired outcomes | Success criteria |
| High levels of progress in English and other subjects | PP students at or above EAP score |
| Access to ICT at home for PP students in Year 7 | 100% have access to ICT at home |
| PP students who display signs of anxiety/lack of self-confidence are signposted to Well-being team | Average improvement of 5 or above on well-being scale |
| Attitudes towards learning in class, independent and home learning are in line with non-PP students. | Scores for PP students at monitoring rounds are in line with non-PP students. |
| | |
| | |

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|--|--|-------------------|---|
| 5. Planned expenditure | | | | | |
| Academic year | 2017/2018 | | | | |
| The three headings below enable schools to demonstrate how they are using the Pupil Premium to improve classroom pedagogy, provide targeted support and support whole school strategies. | | | | | |
| i. Quality of teaching for all- Remove barriers | | | | | |
| Desired outcome | Chosen action / approach | What is the evidence and rationale for this choice? | How will you ensure it is implemented well? | Staff lead | When will you review implementation? |
| | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|-----|---|
| Higher levels of progress for disadvantaged | Quality first teaching CPD has focused on differentiation, with a particular focus on underachieving boys. | Attention to different starting points means that all students are pushed to achieve the best they can. | Lesson observations and work scrutiny shining a light on the need for all teachers to be aware of and act upon the different starting points of students in their classes | CAT | Constant in-school monitoring through QA framework. Report to Governors' meetings |
| All staff use prevention template for disadvantaged students by October half-term | Launched at whole-staff training, piloted by T and L group | Anticipating barriers for all disadvantaged students. All staff aware of potential barriers and act to prevent them | Monitored by T and L group, Lead teachers, DLC and CAT. | DLC | December 2018 |

ii Targeted support – Remove Barriers

| Desired outcome | Chosen action / approach | What is the evidence and rationale for this choice? | How will you ensure it is implemented well? | Staff lead | When will you review implementation? |
|---|---|--|--|-------------------|--|
| Higher levels of language and literacy/ reading ages | Librarian will be given specific brief to work individually to support the reading by providing books based on 1:1 meetings with PP | Individual support to foster enjoyment of reading whilst developing the literacy and cultural capital of PP students | Records of interviews, books read etc. Reading age assessed annually for all students and every 6 months for disadvantaged students. | DRW | Pilot reviewed July 2018. Half-termly review of records of interviews with students and reading records. |
| Disadvantaged students have a positive attitude to learning, achieving 3 or better in monitoring. | Close monitoring of Pupil Premium students' attitude to learning can be basis for discussions around barriers in class and at home. | 3 or higher attitude to learning for disadvantaged students should result in required levels of academic progress. | Results from monitoring rounds analysed and improvements tracked. Regular review of post-monitoring action plans by YGLs. VP to check reviews of YGLs. | DRW | After each monitoring round. |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--------|--|
| Disadvantaged students make progress in line with or above non-disadvantaged students | Analysis of progress of PP students in comparison to non-PP students in all year groups at each of monitoring rounds | 1:1 post-monitoring discussions with students to set targets for future progress. | Results from monitoring rounds analysed and improvements tracked. | DRW | After each monitoring round |
| Disadvantaged students make progress in line with or above non-disadvantaged students | Customised spending plan in response to individual needs and concerns raised by staff, teaching staff, parents and students themselves | Remove any barriers to learning that could impede the progress of individuals. | VP to monitor through spreadsheet, keeping a tally of spending on individuals | DRW | Initial interviews, letters to parents etc. administered by end of first half term. Spreadsheet / spending reviewed half-termly. |
| Disadvantaged students make progress in line with non-disadvantaged students | Produce SEND style one-page profiles inc. specific reference to career plans | The successful use of one-page profiles provided by the SEND team, extending the good practice of SEND to disadvantaged students | Member of support team has dedicated responsibility to produce plans for all disadvantaged students. Monitored by SENDCo and VP | JA/DRW | Pilot reviewed July 2018. Half-termly reviews. |
| Equal access to ICT at home for PP students from Year 7 | Provide students with internet access, laptops and printers as required | Disadvantaged students to have equal access to ICT at home as non-PP students | Monitor the percentage of disadvantaged students in Year 7 who have been provided with ICT equipment. Monitor homework records of disadvantaged students. | DRW | Ongoing in first term. Reviewed December 2018 |
| Disadvantaged students show similar resilience and well-being as non-disadvantaged students. | All staff monitor and signpost students to drop-in with Welfare Officer and/or appointments with Well-being and Engagement Officer for engagement sessions or confidential counselling | Increasing numbers of students experiencing mental health issues. Evidence in school and nationally to support early intervention to lower rates of more serious mental health issues. | Well-being and Engagement Officer tracks progress through established well-being scale. Average improvement of 5 or above. Reports to VP and to the Governing Body. | DRW/CB | Termly reports for Governors' meetings. |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|-----|---------------|
| All disadvantaged students participate in extra-curricular activities at similar rate to non-disadvantaged students. | PP students given questionnaire regarding extra-curricular activities. Results analysed and compared to control group of non-PP students. | Lower levels of engagement of disadvantaged students in extra-curricular activities nationally. Extra support and encouragement needed to identify and remove any possible barriers to participation. | One-to one discussions with PP students during the course of the school year to monitor extra-curricular activity. Numbers analysed and comparisons made with non-PP students. | DRW | December 2018 |
| Disadvantaged students to have a full range of options to be able to make the best choices at post-16. No NEETs. | Disadvantaged students encouraged through specific one-to one meetings and continual encouragement and support. | Relatively lower numbers of disadvantaged students entering 6 th form nationally means extra encouragement / support needed. | Destinations for disadvantaged students monitored separately and analysed for trends. No NEETs. | DRW | January 2019 |

6. Review of expenditure –2017/18

i. Quality of teaching for all

| Desired outcome | Chosen action / approach | Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate. | Lessons learned (And whether you will continue with this approach) | Cost |
|---|--|---|--|--------|
| Higher levels of progress for disadvantaged | Quality first teaching CPD has focused on differentiation, with a particular focus on different starting points. | Staff awareness of the need to prevent as well as intervene in any differences in progress between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students. Extra provision and resources in and out of the classroom to support progress. | Higher levels of progress for the majority of disadvantaged students in the school, but not all. This strategy needs to be more consistent throughout all staff in the school and therefore monitoring and analysis of impact of the various strategies needs to be more forensic. The introduction of the prevention template | 11,714 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|-------------|
| | Classroom resources introduced to support differentiated learning. | At final monitoring of the year disadvantaged students had a better average EAP difference total than non-disadvantaged students in years 7,8 and 10. EAP scores had improved over the year in each year group in 7-9 by at least 66%; average points scores were up by 66% for year 10 and 72% for Year 11 students. | and one-page profiles for disadvantaged students to be used by all staff next year. | |
| ii. Targeted support | | | | |
| Desired outcome | Chosen action / approach | | Lessons learned (And whether you will continue with this approach) | Cost |
| Equal access to ICT at home for PP students from Year | Provide students with internet access, laptops and printers as required | Year 7 disadvantaged students provided with a laptop where required (4 out of 6 students). These Year 7 students had a better EAP average difference than that of the whole cohort. Only one student received below 2s in the monitoring for homework. 5 students in Year 8 and one in Year 9 were also identified as requiring better computer access and were provided with laptops. | All but one of the Year 7 students who were provided with a laptop achieved 2s and above for homework in the monitoring, suggesting that for the majority there was no barrier to producing quality work at home. This is an effective strategy in providing a level playing field in this aspect for students to study at home. Continued close analysis of the monitoring scores for independent/homework for all disadvantaged students along with one-to-one interviews next year. | 3,872 |
| Equal access to educational trips and | Support for students to | | Disadvantaged students were given equal access to educational visits and residentials such as Normandy and Rome, and were | 7,373 |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--------------------|
| <p>visits thereby broadening the cultural capital of disadvantaged students.</p> <p>Disadvantaged students show similar resilience and well-being as non-disadvantaged students.</p> | <p>go on trips and residential; to get involved in sports; SMSC delivery in PSCHE and tutorial time.</p> <p>All staff monitor and signpost students to drop-in with Welfare Officer and/or appointments with Well-being and Engagement Officer for engagement sessions or confidential counselling</p> | <p>No disadvantaged student unable to go on an educational visit or residential due to economic factors. SMSC provision mapped to inform future delivery.</p> <p>The average impact of counselling was 4.8 on a scale of 1-10 (meaning that a student starting counselling on a 3 would end the sessions on 7.8). 8 disadvantaged students received a total of 28 hours Counselling. 17 students had a total of 99 Emotional support interventions. One disadvantaged student received 10 hours of engagement work. Evidence in school and nationally to support early intervention to lower rates of more serious mental health issues. Analysis of counselling and engagement student feedback shows 81% of students reported that their focus in school and on their work had improved as a result of the intervention they received.</p> | <p>able to participate fully in Activities Week. This is a key strategy which will continue next year.</p> <p>The wellbeing of all students is a school priority in the light of increasing numbers of students in society in general experiencing mental health issues. This strategy has been one of the school's major successes and is a model that other schools are seeking to emulate. This will continue in its current format next year.</p> | <p>23,609</p> |
| <p>iii. Other approaches</p> | | | | |
| <p>Desired outcome</p> | <p>Chosen action / approach</p> | <p>Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.</p> | <p>Lessons learned (And whether you will continue with this approach)</p> | <p>Cost</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---------|
| Disadvantaged students make progress in line with or above non-disadvantaged students | Customised spending plan in response to individual needs and concerns raised by staff, teaching staff, parents and students themselves | Remove any barriers to learning that could impede the progress of individuals. | This approach, used mainly by pastoral staff to help the general progress of disadvantaged students, will continue but will be in addition to a raft of other prevention and intervention strategies next year as outlined above | 8299.60 |
| | Extra 1:1 intervention in lessons by TAs | Students given extra support in areas of weakness or where entered for different tier of exams will improve in these subjects | Will look to dovetail this with support for SEND students. One-page profiles for disadvantaged students to be produced by TAs | 965.92 |

Total expenditure 55832

Additional detail

- It is worth noting that the barriers to learning faced by any of our Pupil Premium students are very individual and there are few obvious trends.
- 100% of Year 11 disadvantaged students achieved 5 standard GCSE grades including English and Maths, (compared to 99.3 non-disadvantaged) giving them a sound basis for the next stage of their careers. Average attendance for the 12 disadvantaged students in Year 11 was 92.6% (96% for the whole year group).
- Small groups of disadvantaged students in the last two years have performed markedly less well than the majority of the cohort. The data across the rest of the year groups in the school shows that disadvantaged students are progressing very well.