

## Pupil Premium 2015-2016 Report (including Plans for 2016- 2017)

In 2015-2016 St Matthew Academy received £662,172.50 in Pupil Premium funding. The profile of our academy means the need for additional support is one shared by a significant number of pupils. 52% of our pupils were part of the count for Pupil Premium. This is well above the national average (roughly 28%).

Because of this, our work to close the attainment gap continues to be central to all we do.

In 2015-2016 we planned to continue a relentless focus on the quality of teaching and learning and raising attainment. We targeted our interventions to secure better than expected progress and at least age related attainment for all disadvantaged pupils.

### Pupil Premium Key expenditure 2015-2016

In 2015-2016 we funded a range of support costs, some of which were high cost and focused on a small number of particularly needy pupils and others which had a wider impact across the large group of disadvantaged pupils.

Expenditure	Cost
<b>Academic intervention and support</b>	
<b>Full time Teaching Assistants in every KS1 and KS2 class</b> , working closely with the class teacher with the aim to secure good progress for all children. (Calculated at 52% of the total)	£127,756
<b>One intervention teacher and a Higher Level Teaching Assistant</b> to work with Primary booster classes, small groups and one to one during the school day, after school and during the Easter holidays.	£70,000
<b>Primary Inclusion Managers and Acting Head</b> running booster groups during the Summer Term 2016 and Easter holidays	£26,800
<b>Funding of Primary school journeys</b> , visitors and other educational visits, Forest School and art workshops	£1500
<b>After school enrichment clubs:</b> Primary PP children given priority	£2,000
<b>Secondary literacy programmes</b> run by 5 trained Teaching Assistants	£20,618
<b>Staffing for the ACE group</b> , all of whom were in receipt of PP. This is a small group for less able pupils who require extra support and intervention in the transition to secondary school. It is taught by highly skilled senior staff, supported by two Teaching Assistants.	£62,416
<b>Key Stage 4 Alternative Curriculum:</b> We have continued the development of the alternative curriculum at Key Stage 4, providing some of our weakest pupils with qualifications which focus on both academic success and key skills. These are taught in small	£30,000

groups, and ensure that all of our young people leave school with a suite of high quality qualifications alongside the Core.	
<b>Secondary Saturday and School Holiday Sessions:</b> Teachers and members of Support Staff ran extra study sessions during school holidays, and on Saturdays during term-time.	£30,000
<b>Secondary Maths and English Consultants,</b> working with vulnerable pupils in order to improve outcomes.	£15,000
<b>Secondary Teaching and Learning Consultant</b> working with teachers to improve quality of teaching for all pupils	£8,000
<b>SEN Consultant</b> working with both sections to improve provision for those pupils with SEND	£6,000
<b>EAL HLTA</b> to improve outcomes for those who have not yet reached fluency in English	£22,820
Debate Mate for more able pupils – 2 hours a week led by a teacher	£1,520
KPMG mentoring scheme for more able secondary pupils	£4,500
Speech Therapist advice to staff and group work with targeted pupils	£ 8,750
Educational Psychologist : assessment and subsequent advice	£ 9,857
Drumbeat ASD advice and training for staff across the academy	£ 3,900
<b>Pastoral Care</b>	
Funding allocated to enable vulnerable children to attend Primary Breakfast Club and our after school provision	£1,500
PP children were given priority on a Primary 'Cook to Eat' programme designed by the food mentor	£18,378
Primary Learning Mentor to provide support for children with emotional and behavioural needs	£22,159
Drama therapist worked with pupils of all ages to improve behaviour and concentration skills on a 1:1	£18,235
4 PP pupils attended New Woodlands School on a full time basis in order to reduce the risk of exclusion and improve their engagement with school	£19,500
Jimmy Mizen Foundation, who worked with disadvantaged and vulnerable pupils to improve attendance and behaviour	£20,000
Alternative off site education for a small number of PP secondary pupils with the aim of avoiding permanent exclusion, improving engagement in school and avoiding NEET at age 16.	£15,000
Secondary behaviour interventions and mentoring: The continued improvement of behaviour across the secondary sector has been an important aspect of our focus to drive forward the attainment of those pupils who are subject to the pupil premium. We have appointed a Director of Learning for every year group, supported by a non-teaching Pastoral Support Manager who is able to carry out behaviour interventions and mentoring.	£50,000
Use of the Behavioural Support Unit to remove pupils from class allowing the teacher to concentrate on teaching the majority, while operating as a serious sanction for the pupil.	£25,000
Strategies to improve attendance and punctuality across the school : employment of a dedicated Attendance Officer, supported by an independent specialist attendance service	£45,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£686,209</b>

## Pupil Premium Key outcomes 2015-2016

As a general rule across the Academy, less able pupils in receipt of Pupil Premium funding performed very well indeed, in most cases better than the national comparator (i.e. non disadvantaged pupils). Middle ability pupils performed broadly in line with national. Higher ability pupils underperformed. This reflects the fact that much of the funding used was more successful at boosting the performance of the less able.

### KS1

#### Reading attainment

	Expected or above			Greater depth	
	All	Disadvantaged		All	Disadvantaged
Cohort	52	24		52	24
School %	81	75		12	17
National %	74	78		24	27
<b>Difference %</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>-3</b>		<b>-12</b>	<b>-10</b>

**At expected or above** 'all pupils' performed **better** than national (+7%) . However, disadvantaged pupils performed slightly **worse** than the national comparator (i.e. non disadvantaged pupils), though still **above** National 'all'.

**At greater depth** performance of both groups was less than national. 'All' pupils were -12% below, disadvantaged

-10% below. This may reflect the profile of our intake, with high numbers of EAL pupils.

#### Writing attainment

	Expected or above			Greater Depth	
	All	Disadvantaged		All	Disadvantaged
Cohort	52	24		52	24
School %	73	63		4	8
National %	65	70		13	16
<b>Difference %</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>-7</b>		<b>-9</b>	<b>-7</b>

**At expected or above** 'all pupils' performed better than national (+8%). However, disadvantaged pupils performed slightly **worse** than the national comparator (i.e. non disadvantaged pupils) (-7%) though broadly in line with national 'all'.

**At greater depth** performance of both groups was less than national. 'All' pupils were 9% below, disadvantaged -7% below. This may reflect the profile of our intake, with high numbers of EAL pupils.

## Mathematics attainment

	Expected or above		Greater Depth	
	All	Disadvantaged	All	Disadvantaged
Cohort	52	24	52	24
School %	85	79	8	4
National %	73	77	18	20
Difference %	12	2	-10	-16

**At expected or above** 'all pupils' performed better than national (+12%). Disadvantaged pupils also performed better (+2%) than the national comparator (i.e. non disadvantaged pupils).

**At greater depth** performance of both groups was less than national. 'All' pupils were 10% below, disadvantaged -16% below.

## KS2

### Reading Progress

	Low		Middle		High	
	All	Dis	All	Dis	All	Dis
Cohort	7	4	26	16	13	8
Score	8.15	6.94	1.93	2.86	-1.44	-4.51
National	0	0.36	0	0.35	0	0.30
Difference	8.15	6.57	1.93	2.51	-1.44	-4.81
CI +/-	4.64	6.13	2.41	3.07	3.40	4.34
Rank	9	12				95

### Writing progress

	Low		Middle		High	
	All	Dis	All	Dis	All	Dis
Cohort	11	8	26	16	13	8
Score	6.27	7.29	- 0.73	1.79	0.01	-0.42
National	0	0.34	0	0.10	0	0.11
Difference	6.27	6.95	- 0.73	1.69	0.01	-0.52
CI +/-	3.73	4.38	2.43	3.10	3.43	4.38
Rank	12	9				

## Maths progress

	Low		Middle		High	
	All	Dis	All	Dis	All	Dis
Cohort	7	4	26	16	13	8
Score	6.73	7.82	1.97	1.96	-0.61	-1.48
National	0	0.45	0	0.26	0	0.17
Difference	6.73	7.37	1.97	1.70	-0.61	-1.64
CI +/-	3.95	5.22	2.05	2.61	2.90	3.69
Rank	10	7				

**Low ability** pupils, overall, made outstanding progress (significantly above national) in Reading, Writing and Mathematics. Disadvantaged pupils were in the top 10% nationally in Writing and Mathematics and significantly above national in Reading. This reflects the excellent support and intervention carried out by a team of professional, skilled Teaching Assistants who focussed heavily on the less able.

**Middle ability** pupils performed broadly in line with national in Reading, Writing and Mathematics. In Reading and Writing, disadvantaged pupils made more progress than 'all pupils'. In Maths, they matched 'all pupils' progress.

**High ability** pupils' overall progress was disappointing overall, although numbers were small so may not be significant. The small number of disadvantaged pupils (8) made very poor progress in Reading, though above the floor target.

In Writing and Mathematics disadvantaged pupils made less progress than national, and less progress than 'all pupils' in the school.

Of note, though, is that 2 of the 8 high ability pupils had significant child protection issues throughout the year. One pupil was newly arrived in the Academy, following interrupted schooling elsewhere.

## Secondary sector

### Progress 8

	All	Dis	Progress 8 scores for 'all pupils' is significantly <b>above</b> national, though not in the top 10%. Disadvantaged pupils' scores are in line with national and with 'all pupils' at the academy.
Cohort	137	67	
Score	0.2	0.2	
CI +/-	0.2	0.3	
Rank			

However, these results are due to the excellent progress made by **low and middle ability** pupils.

## Overall

	Low		Middle		High	
	All	Dis	All	Dis	All	Dis
Cohort	36	25	77	36	24	6
Score	0.20	0.40	0.38	0.14	-0.26	-0.50
National	0.00	0.19	0.00	0.14	0.00	0.07
Difference	0.20	0.21	0.38	0.00	-0.26	-0.57
CI +/-	0.35	0.42	0.24	0.35	0.43	0.85
Rank						87

## English element

	Low		Middle		High	
	All	Dis	All	Dis	All	Dis
Cohort	36	25	77	36	24	6
Score	0.59	0.69	0.34	0.37	-0.38	-0.71
National	0.00	0.16	0.00	0.11	0.00	0.05
Difference	0.59	0.53	0.34	0.27	-0.38	-0.75
CI +/-	0.37	0.44	0.25	0.37	0.45	0.90
Rank						94

## Maths element

	Low		Middle		High	
	All	Dis	All	Dis	All	Dis
Cohort	36	25	77	36	24	6
Score	- 0.02	0.05	0.048	0.20	-0.22	-0.47
National	0.00	0.19	0.00	0.12	0.00	0.06
Difference	- 0.02	- 0.14	0.48	0.08	-0.22	-0.53
CI +/-	0.41	0.9	0.28	0.41	0.50	0.99
Rank			12			

Overall, all **low ability** pupils outperform national by 0.20. This is above national. Disadvantaged pupils in fact make more progress than 'all pupils'. They outperform the national comparator (non-disadvantaged pupils) by 0.21. Of note, is that low ability pupils make outstanding progress in English: the difference for all pupils is 0.59 (sig +) and disadvantaged is 0.53 (top 10% nationally). In Maths, the picture is different, with 'all' low ability pupils and disadvantaged pupils doing worse than national, though this is not significant.

**Middle ability** (all) make significantly more progress than national (0.38) , though not in the top 10%. Disadvantaged pupils are in line with national. In English, the difference when compared to national is 0.34 for all pupils (sig+) and +0.27 for disadvantaged pupils. In Maths, 'all' pupils outperform national at 0.34 (sig +) while disadvantaged pupils also do better (0.27) though this is not significant. 'All' pupils are in fact ranked 12<sup>th</sup> overall.

**High ability** pupils, whether disadvantaged or not, do not make sufficient progress. However, there are only 6 disadvantaged pupils, and the confidence interval is large, so results may not be significant. High ability disadvantaged pupils have been placed in the 87<sup>th</sup> rank nationally. In English they are 94<sup>th</sup>. Again, one should note, however, that the English confidence interval is large, so not only are numbers small, but their scores vary widely. In Maths, both 'all' and disadvantaged pupils underperform when compared to national, although the confidence interval is large (0.99) which points to a wide variation in results between the 6 pupils.

Of note, is that out of the 6 high ability disadvantaged pupils, two had significant mental health issues leading to school refusal, despite intervention from a range of outside agencies. This explains the wide confidence interval between the highest and lowest scores among the most able.

### Attainment 8

Overall, both 'all' and disadvantaged underperform when compared to national, though not significantly so.

	<b>All</b>	<b>Dis</b>
Cohort	154	74
School	48.08	44.02
National	49.34	52.56
<b>Difference</b>	<b>-1.26</b>	<b>-8.54</b>

However, there is some variation between the ability groups, with high ability pupils underperforming to a greater extent than middle and low ability pupils:

	Low		Middle		High	
	All	Dis	All	Dis	All	Dis
Cohort	36	25	77	36	24	6
School	32.21	33.58	52.48	49.85	62.50	58.83
National	28.39	31.16	48.86	50.63	64.17	65.00
Difference	3.81	2.42	3.62	-0.78	-1.67	-6.16
<b>Diff (grades)</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>-0.1</b>	<b>-0.2</b>	<b>-0.6</b>

English element						
	Low		Middle		High	
	All	Dis	All	Dis	All	Dis
Cohort	36	25	77	36	24	6
School	8.50	8.56	11.09	11.11	12.38	11.50
National	6.83	7.33	10.42	10.69	12.97	13.10
Difference	1.67	1.23	0.68	0.42	-0.59	-1.60
<b>Diff (grades)</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>-0.3</b>	<b>-0.8</b>

Maths element						
	Low		Middle		High	
	All	Dis	All	Dis	All	Dis
Cohort	36	25	77	36	24	6
School	5.06	5.04	10.55	9.94	12.75	12.00
National	4.89	5.46	9.62	9.95	12.99	13.14
Difference	0.17	-0.42	0.92	-0.01	-0.24	-1.14
<b>Diff (grades)</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>-0.2</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>-0.1</b>	<b>-0.6</b>

**Low ability** pupils outperform national. 'All' pupils outperform national by 0.4 of a grade, while disadvantaged pupils outperform the national comparator (non-disadvantaged pupils) by 0.2. In English, low ability pupils outperform national by 0.8 (all) and 0.6 (disadvantaged). In Maths, although all pupils outperform national, disadvantaged pupils underperform by 0.2 of a grade.

**Middle ability** pupils perform broadly in line with national.

**High ability** pupils underperform national overall. This is more marked, with disadvantaged pupils' underperformance of -0.8 in English and -0.6 in Maths. However, it must be remembered that numbers are small (6) and as was seen with Progress 8, the confidence intervals are large (up to 0.99 in Maths. This points to a wide range of results among disadvantaged pupils.

## Plans for 2016- 2017

Pupil Premium funding in 2016/17 is expected to be £ 659,368. It will be used in a range of specific interventions targeted at improving attainment and progress. With such a high proportion of disadvantaged pupils it is difficult to target support only towards those eligible as funds expended anywhere in the Academy will have an effect on Pupil Premium pupils and interventions that benefit Pupil Premium pupils will benefit other pupils. Results for 2015-16 however, would point to the need to focus our attention on the most able, while not neglecting the others.

At St Matthew Academy our approach will be around improving the quality of Teaching and Learning for all. This has been shown to be beneficial to all pupils, but particularly so to pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds. We will focus on:

- Improve the quality of teaching across the academy. In particular:
  - Raising expectations
  - Improving planning for individual needs
  - Improving the quality of both written and verbal feedback. This is known to have high impact and is good value for money
  - Improving the quality of questioning
- Continue to improve literacy and numeracy across the academy (LEXIA being introduced , new Reading scheme in Primary)
- Improving behaviour for learning. According to the EEF, improving behaviour can have a 'direct and lasting effect on pupils' learning. A new behaviour system has been implemented which aims to reward positive learning behaviours and target behaviours which inhibit learning. Staff have received and will receive on-going training around the successful implementation of this system and strategies to ensure that a highly positive learning ethos is maintained in all classes.
- Appointment of a Coordinator for Gifted and Talented pupils, to focus on improving the quality of teaching for this group, as well as increasing the opportunities available for high ability pupils to benefit from enrichment activities, at all times raising expectations.
- Appointment of an EAL Coordinator across the whole Academy.