Pupil Premium Follow-Up Review
22nd June 2015

School	Headteacher	Review Team	Meeting With	Roles
Poynton	David Waugh	Kevin Harrison (Pupil Premium Lead Consultant Cheshire East)	Wendy Milner	Assistant Headteacher: Director of Progress
			Catherine Holyland	Deputy Headteacher: Standards & Student Progress
			Simon Hoyle	Team Leader: English
			Kate Toby	Team Leader: Maths
			Debra Howells	Team Leader: Science
			Helen Wray	KS4 Intervention Manager PP focus
			Alan McGarvey	PP Lead Governor

Review Context

As part of its monitoring, support and intervention programme, Cheshire East Council has commissioned and funded Pupil Premium Reviews to be completed for all 21 secondary schools between May 2014 and July 2015. A team was established comprising: David Curry, NLE, Headteacher at Bishop Heber School (Cheshire West & Chester); Mike Ridley-Thomas, SLE, Deputy Headteacher at Bishop Heber School; and Kevin Harrison, Pupil Premium Lead Consultant, Cheshire East. David Curry is identified by the NCTL as a System Leader with a specialism in Pupil Premium Reviews.
The team established a review process in five schools in June, July and September which was extended to include Pupil Premium Leads from Cheshire East schools in October 2014.

Key information

The school had a full Pupil Premium Review conducted by an external NLE in February 2014. The aim of this Follow-Up Review is to consider how the school has moved forward from that review. This review will consider the school's strategies directed at Pupil Premium students, and help the school to consider whether these should be sustained and extended as well as identifying areas to be addressed that can secure success for future cohorts of disadvantaged pupils. The review will focus, initially, on the Year 11 cohorts in 2014 and 2015, assessment of these cohorts, interventions and impact on outcomes. The focus will then extend to provision for other cohorts of disadvantaged pupils eligible for Pupil Premium funding in KS4 and KS3.

Main findings

The school has made considerable progress since the last Pupil Premium Review. Appointments have been made with specific responsibility for pupils eligible for the Pupil Premium. Staff awareness has been raised and all show commitment to improving opportunities for disadvantaged pupils. The school's development and action planning for Pupil Premium pupils is clear and has begun to impact on their performance as evidenced by the narrowing gaps seen in 2014. A continued drive to implement the action plans and close monitoring and evaluation by senior and middle leaders should strengthen provision and further impact on performance.

Areas for Consideration

The following points arise directly from the school's current development planning based on the previous Pupil Premium Review and seek to help the school to refine, complement or further develop current good practice so that approaches to support disadvantaged pupils will become embedded in the school.

- Further develop the improved use of data in the school by:
    - Ensuring that aspirational targets are set for disadvantaged PP pupils that lead to more than expected progress
    - Ensuring that the setting of 3, 4 and 5 levels of progress targets for students takes account of the suppressed starting points for PP pupils
    - Closely analysing the sub-levels of progress of pupils in English and mathematics and target improvement where current performance falls below that of pupils nationally
    - Revising targets based on evaluation of progress, when this arises, and not waiting for milestone end of year assessments before changing targets and devising new interventions
    - Ensuring that the prior attainment (L, M, H) of PP pupils is shared with class teachers and that they use this information to devise work and interventions appropriate to their different abilities
    - Ensure that target-setting remains clearly cohort-based with a focus on PP pupils
- Consider extending the impact of specialist Pupil Premium responsibility holders by:
    - Monitoring closely the role of the new Intervention Manager including:
        - the early development of PP profiles for all PP pupils
        - monitoring and evaluating the impact of these profiles
    - Identifying Pupil Premium Advocates in English, maths and science
    - Sharing effective practice within and beyond the core subjects through the PP advocates
- Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of all PP interventions to give:
    - Interim outcomes based on attitudes to learning
    - Impact in terms of progress and attainment
    - Comparison between the performance of PP pupils and other pupils
    - Comparison between Summer School attendees and non-attendees within the PP cohort
- Monitor, record and evaluate the impact of the participation of PP pupils in:
    - Extra-curricular activities
    - Additional learning such as HL and revision sessions
- Review setting changes in years 8 and 9 in terms of impact on disadvantaged pupils and consider whether this should be extended to year 7
- Ensure that governors are empowered to make strategic decisions relating to the funding of interventions by
    - Extended training or in-school familiarisation with PP data for the PP governor

- o   Presenting governors with evaluations of PP interventions in terms of impact and interim outcomes
- o   Share with governors
    - ▪   Appendix B - Ten point plan for spending the Pupil Premium effectively
    - ▪   Appendix C - Pupil Premium Q/A Lead Governor
- Review annual appraisals to assess the impact of PP targets and determine where close monitoring and interim evaluation is needed to maximise impact in 2015/16

- Ensure that the good use of the Teaching eBook is extended to all subjects so that this is established practice in 2015/16.
- Ensure analysis of the rewards system to include:
    - o   Comparison of disadvantaged pupils with other pupils
    - o   Rewards received over time before and after interventions to ensure that the PP cohort is receiving incentives
    - o   Evaluation of PP interventions in terms of attitudes to learning in the rewards system
- Establish Pupil Premium Case Studies that document the progress of disadvantaged individuals including
    - o   Profile of specific circumstance and identified need
    - o   Planned intervention
    - o   Evaluation of impact
    - o   Success in terms of outcomes in and beyond school

Analysis of Pupil Performance – three year trends.

Students' attainment when they join the school has been consistently above the national average, with <mark>Sig+</mark> difference in all year groups:

NC Year starting Sept 2013	School	National	Difference	Sig	% Coverage
Year 11	29.1	27.9	1.2	Sig+	95.1
Year 10	28.7	27.6	1.1	Sig+	98.4
Year 9	28.9	27.5	1.4	Sig+	99.2
Year 8	29.9	28.4	1.5	Sig+	97.6
Year 7	30.2	28.5	1.7	Sig+	97.9

Prior attainment bands for students joining the school from 2010 to 2014 have fewer students in the low band with larger than national average proportions in the high band in all years:

	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High
Year 11	7.7	45.5	46.8	14.6	52.5	32.9
Year 10	8.7	51.2	40.1	16.3	49.1	34.7
Year 9	10.4	43.8	45.8	17.5	51.7	30.8
Year 8	7.9	41.1	51.0	13.6	48.1	38.3
Year 7	6.0	40.8	53.2	13.5	48.7	37.8

Senior Leaders ensure that prior attainment information (with identified PP pupils) is shared with teachers.

Low, medium and high attainment bands are recorded on SIMS which is accessed by class teachers to inform their provision for individual pupils.

The 3 year trends from 2012 to 2014 (2014 validated RAISEonline) show % of FSM pupils is low:

FSM	2012	2013	2014
School	7.0	8.1	8.1
National	26.7	28.2	28.5

The percentage of pupils eligible for FSM in each year 11 group is consistently below national averages. Stability is high 96 and deprivation is low 0.06.

Closing the Gap Trends APS from 2014 RAISEonline analysis. English and Maths

This table shows the number of pupils attaining each English (English GCSE or English language and English literature) Key Stage 4 grade and their corresponding English Key Stage 2 prior attainment.

Number of Pupils		no KS4 result	U	G	F	E	D	C	B	A	A*	Total No. of Disadvantaged pupils	Disadvantaged pupils Achieving Expected Progress	Disadvantaged pupils % Achieving Expected Progress	School (Other pupils)% Achieving Expected Progress	National (Other pupils)% Achieving Expected Progress	Disadvantaged pupils Achieving More Than Expected Progress	Disadvantaged pupils % Achieving More Than Expected Progress	School (Other pupils)% Achieving More Than Expected Progress	National (Other pupils)% Achieving More Than Expected Progress
	Other or no prior available	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	83%	59%	0	0%	50%	27%
KS2 English attainment	W	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	7%	0	0%	100%	6%
	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	34%	0	0%	0%	23%
	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	50%	50%	55%	0	0%	0%	28%
	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	100%	46%	66%	0	0%	0%	27%
	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	1	0	10	7	70%	77%	75%	3	30%	30%	33%
	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	6	4	67%	82%	80%	3	50%	34%	44%
Summary												19	13	68%	78%	75%	6	32%	31%	35%

The % of other pupils achieving more than expected progress is lower than national % at levels 4 and 5 in English but above national % in maths.
Disadvantaged pupils perform better than national at level 5 in English (EP+) and at level 5 in maths (EP) and level 4 in maths (EP+).

This table shows the number of pupils attaining each mathematics Key Stage 4 grade and their corresponding mathematics Key Stage 2 prior attainment.

Number of Pupils		no KS4 result	U	G	F	E	D	C	B	A	A*	Total No. of Disadvantaged pupils	Disadvantaged pupils Achieving Expected Progress	Disadvantaged pupils % Achieving Expected Progress	School (Other pupils)% Achieving Expected Progress	National (Other pupils)% Achieving Expected Progress	Disadvantaged pupils Achieving More Than Expected Progress	Disadvantaged pupils % Achieving More Than Expected Progress	School (Other pupils)% Achieving More Than Expected Progress	National (Other pupils)% Achieving More Than Expected Progress
	Other or no prior available	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	86%	67%	0	0%	71%	37%
KS2 Mathematics attainment	W	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	100%	3%	0	0%	100%	2%
	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	8%	0	0%	0%	5%
	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0%	0%	17%	0	0%	0%	9%
	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	50%	42%	46%	0	0%	26%	23%
	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	2	1	1	14	10	71%	80%	74%	4	29%	32%	24%
	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	2	100%	79%	80%	0	0%	51%	49%
Summary												19	13	68%	76%	71%	4	21%	41%	33%

Closing the Gaps Trend Sub Levels

Percentage achieving expected progress and more than expected progress from different starting points

	KS2 Level	2012 Cohort	2012 Expected progress School %	National other pupils %	Diff %	2012 More than expected progress School %	National other pupils %	Diff %	2013 Cohort	2013 Expected progress School %	National other pupils %	Diff %	2013 More than expected progress School %	National other pupils %	Diff %	2014 Cohort	2014 Expected progress School %	National other pupils %	Diff %	2014 More than expected progress School %	National other pupils %	Diff %
English																						
Disadvantaged pupils	W	-	-	13	-	-	12	-	-	-	3	-	-	3	-	-	-	7	-	-	6	-
Other pupils		-	-		-	-		-	-	-		-	-		-	1	100		93	100		94
Disadvantaged pupils	1	-	-	37	-	-	23	-	-	-	38	-	-	24	-	-	-	34	-	-	23	-
Other pupils		-	-		-	-		-	-	-		-	-		-	-	-		-	-		-
Disadvantaged pupils	2	-	-	54	-	-	24	-	1	100	54	46	0	24	-24	2	50	55	-5	0	28	-28
Other pupils		2	50		-4	50		26	3	67		13	67		43	2	50		-5	0		-28
Disadvantaged pupils	3	1	0	60	-60	0	22	-22	3	67	61	6	33	23	10	1	100	66	**34**	0	27	-27
Other pupils		26	77		17	27		5	20	85		24	30		7	13	46		-20	0		-27
Disadvantaged pupils	4	10	60	71	-11	20	26	-6	7	29	75	-46	14	30	-16	10	70	75	-5	30	33	-3
Other pupils		91	77		6	36		10	135	84		9	44		14	92	77		2	30		-3
Disadvantaged pupils	5	5	40	79	-39	20	43	-23	2	100	81	19	50	45	5	6	67	80	-13	50	44	**6**
Other pupils		100	91		12	60		17	87	92		11	57		12	106	82		2	34		-10
Mathematics																						
Disadvantaged pupils	W	-	-	10	-	-	6	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	3	-	-	2	-
Other pupils		-	-		-	-		-	-	-		-	-		-	1	100		97	100		98
Disadvantaged pupils	1	-	-	16	-	-	7	-	-	-	15	-	-	7	-	-	-	8	-	-	5	-
Other pupils		-	-		-	-		-	-	-		-	-		-	-	-		-	-		-
Disadvantaged pupils	2	-	-	23	-	-	11	-	1	0	20	-20	0	10	-10	1	0	17	-17	0	9	-9
Other pupils		3	0		-23	0		-11	1	0		-20	0		-10	3	0		-17	0		-9
Disadvantaged pupils	3	2	0	49	-49	0	26	-26	1	100	50	50	0	27	-27	2	50	46	**4**	0	23	-23
Other pupils		22	41		-8	27		1	25	44		-6	20		-7	19	42		-4	26		3
Disadvantaged pupils	4	10	30	78	-48	0	26	-26	7	57	81	-24	14	29	-15	14	71	74	-3	29	24	**5**
Other pupils		95	69		-9	23		-3	116	89		8	42		13	91	80		6	32		8
Disadvantaged pupils	5	4	100	82	18	25	53	-28	4	0	84	-84	0	53	-53	2	100	80	**20**	0	49	-49
Other pupils		99	80		-2	51		-2	103	94		10	57		4	100	79		-1	51		2

The 2014 ROL figures highlight **improved performance** of disadvantaged pupils in 2014 at levels 3, 4 in English and 4, 5 in maths in terms of expected progress and 4 in E/M more than expected progress. Yellow shows where the percentage of disadvantaged pupils is equal to or above the national percentage for other pupils nationally by a margin of three or more pupils at Key Stage 4.

Value Added

Value Added	2012		2013		2014	
	Cohort	School	Cohort	School	Cohort	School
Overall						
Disadvantaged pupils	16	990.7	13	954.9	19	1009.1
Other pupils	219	1014.4	244	1016.6	214	1014.6
English						
Disadvantaged pupils	16	998.9	13	997.2	19	1001.8
Other pupils	219	1002.0	244	1002.2	214	1000.4
Mathematics						
Disadvantaged pupils	16	997.2	13	997.1	19	999.3
Other pupils	219	1000.1	244	1001.7	214	1000.5
Science						
Disadvantaged pupils	11	999.2	9	992.5	14	999.6
Other pupils	196	1000.7	220	1001.7	188	1000.6
Languages						
Disadvantaged pupils	7	1005.5	4	997.0	9	1003.1
Other pupils	147	1004.0	172	1003.2	131	1004.1
Humanities						
Disadvantaged pupils	12	1001.3	9	995.2	15	1001.2
Other pupils	162	1002.8	212	1003.7	180	1002.8

National   School
En 998.5   PHS 1001.8
Ma 998.3   PHS 999.3
Sc 998.6   PHS 999.6

The performance of disadvantaged pupils improved in 2014.
Improved overall 1000+.
The performance of other pupils was maintained from 2012 to 2014.

The performance of disadvantaged pupils improved considerably exceeding pupils nationally (998.5) and other pupils in the school who also improved.

Disadvantaged pupils improved in Maths exceeding pupils nationally (998.3). Others were lower than 2013 but 3 year performance is good.

Disadvantaged pupils improved in Science exceeding pupils nationally (998.6). Others were lower than 2013 but consistently above 1000 over 3 years.

Disadvantaged pupils in Languages Improved considerably. Performance of other pupils maintained above 1000.

Disadvantaged pupils improved in humanities above 1000. Other pupils maintained above 1000 over 3 years.

Average Point Score

	2012				2013				2014			
	Cohort	School	National other pupils	Diff	Cohort	School	National other pupils	Diff	Cohort	School	National other pupils	Diff
English APS												
Disadvantaged pupils	16	38.5	40.2	-1.7	15	36.5	40.5	-4.0	19	40.9	40.4	0.5
Other pupils	225	44.1		3.9	254	44.2		3.7	226	42.7		2.3
Within school gap		-5.6				-7.7				-1.8		
Mathematics APS												
Disadvantaged pupils	16	37.0	40.6	-3.6	15	36.8	40.9	-4.1	19	36.9	40.1	-3.2
Other pupils	225	42.8		2.2	254	44.3		3.4	226	42.8		2.7
Within school gap		-5.8				-7.5				-5.9		
Capped APS												
Disadvantaged pupils	16	342.3	352.3	-10.0	15	305.3	350.9	-45.6	19	316.4	324.8	-8.4
Other pupils	225	377.3		25.0	254	373.3		22.4	226	353.9		29.1
Within school gap		-35.0				-68.0				-37.5		

APS scores: A* 58; A 52; B 46; C 40; D 34; E 28; F 22; G 16 (6 points per GCSE grade).

English

The national gap in English has **narrowed** from over half a GCSE grade in 2013 to less than a quarter of a GCSE grade above pupils or **almost in line** with pupils nationally in 2014. The in-school gap has also **narrowed** from one and a quarter GCSE grades in 2013 to just above a quarter of a GCSE grade in 2014.
The performance of disadvantaged pupils improved from 36.5 (D grade) to 40.9 (C grade) but the performance of other pupils decreased from 44.2 to 42.7 (still within the C grade band) and above national at 40.4.

Maths

The national gap in mathematics has **narrowed** from over half a GCSE grade in 2013 to half a GCSE grade above pupils nationally in 2014. The in-school gap has also **narrowed** from one and a quarter GCSE grades in 2013 to just below a full GCSE grade in 2014.
The performance of disadvantaged pupils was maintained at 36.8 to 36.9 (D grade) but the performance of other pupils decreased from 44.3 to 42.8 (still C grade) in line with a national decrease – to 40.1.

Threshold

Threshold	2012				2013				2014			
	Cohort	School	National other pupils	Diff	Cohort	School	National other pupils	Diff	Cohort	School	National other pupils	Diff
English Baccalaureate		%	%	%		%	%	%		%	%	%
Disadvantaged pupils	16	19	19	0	15	7	27	-20	19	26	28	-1
Other pupils	225	34		15	254	46		19	226	44		16
Within school gap		-15				-39				-18		
5 A*-C including English and mathematics												
Disadvantaged pupils	16	38	64	-26	15	33	67	-34	19	53	62	-9
Other pupils	225	72		8	254	77		10	226	75		13
Within school gap		-34				-44				-22		
Basics												
Disadvantaged pupils	16	38	65	-27	15	40	67	-27	19	58	64	-6
Other pupils	225	72		7	254	77		10	226	76		12
Within school gap		-34				-37				-18		
English A*-C												
Disadvantaged pupils	16	63	72	-9	15	47	74	-27	19	68	73	-5
Other pupils	225	80		8	254	84		10	226	81		8
Within school gap		-17				-37				-13		
Mathematics A*-C												
Disadvantaged pupils	16	44	75	-31	15	60	77	-17	19	63	74	-11
Other pupils	225	77		2	254	86		9	226	83		9
Within school gap		-33				-26				-20		
5 A*-G												
Disadvantaged pupils	16	100	96	4	15	93	96	-3	19	100	95	5
Other pupils	225	100		4	254	100		4	226	99		4
Within school gap		0				-7				1		

Improved
Dis +20
N Gap -34 to -9
IS Gap -44 to -22

Improved
Dis +21
N Gap -27 to -5
IS Gap -37 to -13

Improved
Dis +3
N Gap -17 to -11
IS Gap -26 to -20

Improved
Dis +7 (100%)
N Gap -3 to +5
IS Gap -7 to +1

Attainment Using 2014 RAISEonline analysis   **Headline figures**

Forecasts made in May 2015:

Forecast Gaps 2015	5 A*-C EM			English Progress			Maths Progress		
	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015
All Pupils		**73%**	**77%**		**77%**	**84%**		**75%**	**80%**
Disadvantaged Pupils	**33%**	**53%**	**54%**	**47%**	**68%**	**62%**	**60%**	**68%**	**62%**
Non-Disadvantaged Pupils	**77%**	**75%**	**78%**	**84%**	**78%**	**85%**	**86%**	**76%**	**81%**
Gap	**-44**	**-22**	**-24**	**-37**	**-10**	**-23**	**-26**	**-8**	**-19**

Forecasts suggest that outcomes in 2015 will be similar to 2014 but with a dip in English and maths progress although disadvantaged pupils are forecast to perform again considerably better than in 2013.

English	
Areas of celebration	**Areas for focus**
English FSM 3LoP is 10% up on national average English disadvantaged gap closed by 6.1 APS English disadvantaged 3LoP gap closed by 18% English A* - C closed by 25%	Level 5 on entry
maths	
Areas of celebration	**Areas for focus**
Maths FSM 3LoP - v – national other students is 20% for level 5s on entry Maths FSM 4 LoP – v – national other students is 4% for level 3s on entry Maths FSM 3 LoP is 20% up on national average Maths disadvantaged gap closed by 1.8 APS Maths disadvantaged 3LoP gap closed by 35% Maths A* - C closed by 6%	Level 4 on entry

Information from scheduled meetings

Overview

The school has developed a positive approach in 2014/15 aimed at raising the achievement with several foci including:
- Raising aspirations
- Clear focus on disadvantaged PP pupils
- Positive focus on more able boys
- Raising the achievement of boys in Year 9
- Positive choices in Year 11
- Erasmus funding in Years 7 & 8
- Working with staff and student mentors

The school has shifted its focus from attainment to progress for all students, especially with new Progress 8 measures. Target setting has been changed from 3 Levels of Progress for all students to minimum target grades based on national figures using transition matrices for the top 25% of students. Targets are based on KS2 sub-level figures with at least 3 levels of progress including 4 or 5 for some students. This is further refined with the identification of milestone targets with expected levels of progress identified for the end of each year: 7, 8 and 9 rather than the previous expected progress by the end of KS3. Progress measures have been implemented across the school. For instance, in maths there has been a greater focus on the progress of foundation students with achievement for all not simply higher target grades, the focus previously. The emphasis on progress forms the basis for individualised targeting for PP pupils.

The school has created the new post of Year 7 Intervention Manager (from July 2015) whose role will include the interrogation of KS1 and KS2 data (formerly just KS2). The focus has become personal and individualised with the creation of Profiles for Pupil Premium students which are expected to have more impact in 2015/16. These profiles are actively in use for the current Year 11 cohort and can be seen in practice in the Strategy Room in the staffroom where the Y11 Profiles are clearly used and staff share information via whiteboards giving heightened focus to progress and intervention need.

Weekly intervention meetings include the Deputy Headteacher: Standards & Student Progress, the Assistant Headteacher: Director of Progress (& PP Lead); Intervention Managers for English and maths; and the Intervention Manager with PP Focus. The meeting interrogates closely the progress of vulnerable pupils; the Intervention Manager with PP Focus uses her close knowledge of and contact with PP pupils to ensure that concerns re. PP pupils are considered and addressed. Progress is closely analysed using the school's refined tracking system which includes transition matrices and pivot tables.

The school has developed a more aggressive approach to examination preparation which has raised aspirations with staff and students and engaged the support of parents for raised targets. The school has created a more academic expectation with a culture of learning and achievement for all pupils. Identification of barriers and provision of intervention is more aggressively followed up with insistence that pupils attend the identified intervention within and after school.

Progress to target meetings are held with question by question analysis of student performance in each examination creating in-house spreadsheets that inform further teaching and targeted intervention. Structured interventions focus on a specific topic or identification of 'Which two questions will make a difference?' and 'What is the barrier to learning?' so 'What is the required intervention?'.

Target setting in the school is now more closely based on the actual cohort following close performance analysis. This is reinforced by staff training on the use of more user-friendly data and the inclusion of a PP target in the appraisal of all staff.

The school has improved its approach to assessment, tracking and intervention at KS3. This begins with improved transfer from KS2. Counselling provided in Y6 is extended to Y7 and specific projects have been introduced in KS3:
- Emotional health and well-being of girls
- Raising boys' achievement
- Future scholars programme
- Coaching programme
- Erasmus project inc. peer mentoring

Parents are involved in motivational talks, reviewing progress and celebrating achievement. There is emphasis on aspiration to higher targets, with interim outcomes measured in terms of attitudes to learning including improved attendance and reduced behaviour incidents. The improved focus on target-related impact is informed by comparison between Autumn, Spring and Summer data drops. This results in much more personalised analysis of need, for instance on more than expected progress for more able pupils.

There is a heightened focus on the needs of disadvantaged PP pupils. For instance, in science, interventions are considered for all pupils but all PP pupils are required to attend booster sessions in school time before each examination. The close approaches established in English and maths have been transferred to science; profiles have created conversations resulting in addressing need, for instance the provision of iPads following visual stress tests.

English, mathematics and science

All staff are now much more aware of and comfortable using data. Assessments are reviewed and work is scrutinised by team leaders with individual members of staff (who have personal PP appraisal targets) to ensure accurate assessment and appropriate provision. More work is done with the PP cohort including:
- RAG rating of marking,
- Meetings analysis,
- Informed weekly revision sessions,
- Narrowed exam focus for PP students
- PP+ intervention sessions
- PP students withdrawn from lessons for extra lessons in En, Ma, Sc
- Holiday revision sessions

- More focussed exam assessment

Success of intervention for PP students is illustrated by increased demand for revision and support from other students. This reflects the wider 'buy-in' to the improved learning and achievement-focussed culture of the school.

The core departments have become more focussed in their analysis of data and student progress with scheduled meetings to identify weaknesses and implement programmes in KS4 including:
- Revisions sessions
- Revision packs
- Closer exam analysis
- Progress-to-target meetings
- Withdrawal from PSE/PE
- Focus on exam papers
- Targeting of specific topics
- Second mock examinations

In KS3 there is a greater use of data by class teachers which is informing provision for vulnerable pupils. In addition to the Y7 Catch-up cohort, there is the in-house Study Plus provision for low ability pupil groups, a Fit-for-Figures club focusing on numeracy and extra staffing for small groups. In English, all KS3 programmes have been re-written to emphasise the new achievement focus and setting has been introduced to Y9 with Y8 to follow in 2015/16. In English and in science, GCSE courses have been extended into year 9.

Intervention Manager with Pupil Premium Focus

The part-time role provides a dedicated focus for disadvantaged pupils eligible for Pupil Premium funding. This includes counselling, tracking, consultation with staff, intervention and working directly with pupils to address their needs. The Intervention Manager has specialist training for teaching children with dyslexia and dyspraxia. Her role has included raising staff awareness of PP pupils as a cohort and prompting positive intervention strategies. Staff attitudes are now more positive, viewing PP pupils 'as important as statemented pupils' and actively asking for PP Profiles and more detailed backgrounds to inform their own classroom interventions. Interventions beyond the classroom include Study Plus KS3, Catch-Up and Y7, 8 & 9 Inclusion support. The role includes one-to-one tutoring and ensuring that more PP pupils are placed in classes appropriate to their needs. Ensuring pupils attend intervention sessions, such as revision classes is linked to extended communication with parents via emails and telephone as well as occasional collection of pupils from home. Parents for PP pupils value the more personalised, dedicated contact.

In school, the Intervention Manager ensures that PP pupils attend after-school sessions, emails pupils, seeks them out in school and ensures their involvement through persistence in 'making it happen'. She meets with high-achieving PP pupils for counselling sessions and arranges follow-up meetings, for instance with the female family worker. She ensures individualised examination provision including submissions for extra time, readers, and one-to-one support. She also contributes to updating PP Pupil Profiles in the Strategy Room and attends weekly meetings to champion the needs of PP pupils. Her influence is valued by colleagues and is successful because of its triple impact, on pupils, on parents, and on staff.

Students

The meeting was with eight students from years 7, 8, 9 and 10, all of whom are eligible for Pupil Premium funding. The selected pupils were invited to give a picture of their school from a pupil's perspective and, in particular, to identify how they felt that they were supported in school. Reference was not made to the Pupil Premium. The pupils were happy to attend the session and contributed with confidence.

The pupils identified the following as their favourite subjects: PE, History, Music, Geography, Drama, Dance and Food technology. The reasons were that the lessons are not boring but fun, some are outside and they enjoy learning (in History) about different cultures.

The pupils identified as their least favourite subjects: RE, languages, physics and maths. They felt that the work in these lessons was hard so some were unable to remember everything and that RE was not relevant to their experience.

The pupils were positive about the help and support they receive from teachers and from friends who they felt helped them to learn. They valued support in terms of groups in English including the 'float' group and counselling sessions. Pupils liked some of the trips such as Menai and Spain though none had attended these. Finance did not seem to be an issue with regard to this and pupils were aware that funding was available to support pupils where families might struggle financially.

The pupils felt that what makes a 'good' lesson is not writing too much, interactive activities, involvement, humour and banter, work broken down in to chunks and teachers who uses behaviour system to maintain good order.

The pupils did know their target grades which were stuck on books and written in planners. They were aware that they could be changed and one pupil in Y9 said that his target had been changed mid-year from 6a to 7c.

In general, the pupils did think that in the last two years behaviour had improved, that there was less litter and that they could now get on with their learning in lessons.

Governors

A new GB was formally reconstituted on 3rd June 2014. An external review of governance was carried out by Dr Harry Ziman, National Leader of Governance, in June 2014. This resulted in recommendations being made and a strategic training plan being put in place and a new committee structure was established.

The governor responsible for the Pupil Premium is recently in post and has been unable to access training first hand. The previous governor lead has passed on all information and training resources. The governor has met with the school's PP Lead and is beginning to familiarise himself with PP issues.

Governors recognise the issues relating to disadvantaged PP pupils. The PP governor indicated that the proportion of pupils eligible for PP funding was very small because of the nature of the school's catchment and that there was limited funding because of this. However, he acknowledged that provision for these pupils did need to be addressed and that they should be supported to make expected progress and more than expected progress given the high prior attainment of pupils in the school. He felt that financial implications were 'not a major issue'. He recognised that the responsibility for managing provision lies with school leaders and felt that governors were unable to understand or assess the role of the class teacher in meeting the needs of PP pupils.

The PP governor stressed the importance of the institutional framework required to facilitate the management of pupil premium provision. This framework does exist within the school. Governors receive reports, including data analysis. Each Head Teacher's Report contains a full review of PP and is presented to the governing body. In addition, data is presented to governors following every data trawl. Whilst governors understand the headlines they probably do not understand 'the nitty gritty' of provision in the school. They are aware that monitoring is strong at a senior level but not by governors. There is awareness of improvements in 2014. The PP governor believes that the English results were better than maths and science.

There was an understanding that the PP governor could improve his knowledge and specific focus on the pupil premium by a further meeting with the Assistant Headteacher and PP Lead to look more closely at the specific PP related sections of the school's latest RAISEonline document. This could possibly be followed by a meeting with the heads of core subjects to gather a fuller picture of PP progress and interventions in the school.

Data Analysis and Findings

Data analysis and target setting are much sharper and more rigorous than in the past. Senior and middle leaders use data with confidence to inform their self-evaluation and to ensure that interventions occur at the earliest opportunity in order to facilitate progress for PP pupils. As a result, the school has narrowed the gaps in 2014 between disadvantaged and other pupils both within school and compared to other pupils nationally with significant improvements on threshold measures in all three core subjects, English, mathematics and science.

Given the high prior attainment of pupils, are pupils leaving the school showing more than expected progress?
- 2014: English at 32% was close to national proportions of 35% of pupils achieving more than expected progress
- 2014: maths at 21% was below national proportions of 33% of pupils achieving more than expected progress
- 13/19 PP pupils achieved level 4/5 in English and 15/19 achieved level 4 in maths (no level 5)

The percentage of other pupils achieving more than expected progress is lower than national percentages at levels 4 and 5 in English but above national % in maths. Disadvantaged pupils perform better than other pupils nationally achieving more than expected progress at level 5 in English and at level 4 in maths.

Previously, the school had not given a high profile to foundation students who, in the past, did not contribute to what was the all-important A* - C figure. It now appreciates the importance of these students, especially given Progress 8 and Attainment 8 measurement figures. Consequently, there has been a shift of focus within school to measuring levels of progress and targets have been made more challenging based on the national attainment of the top 25% of schools. All students now have targets of 3, 4 or 5 levels of progress.

Are expected levels of progress in line with prior attainment of pupils?
- 2014: 13/19 achieved expected levels of progress in English and maths. Why did 6 pupils not reach targets?
- 2014: 6/19 in English and 4/19 in maths achieved more than expected levels of progress

The school has introduced more specific targeting for pupils with more than expected levels of progress being targeted for more able pupils. Prior attainment levels of pupils (L, M, H) are recorded on SIMS and shared with staff to ensure an appropriate focus at classroom level. In addition, the school now has Case Studies which make analysis more personal so when there is a case of less than expected levels of progress, there is evidence of the intervention that was put in place prior to this result and reasons for the underachievement in the same way that there is for students who made more than 3 levels of progress.

What is the school doing in maths and science to improve value added performance in maths and science in line with English?

Although maths and science figures are below 1000, they are above National VA figures:
- Nat. En 998.5 PHS 1001.8
- Nat. Ma 998.3 PHS 999.3

- Nat. Sc 998.6 PHS 999.6

Maths and science (as well as other subject leaders) hold progress to target meetings following assessments to interrogate pupil progress including a focus on most able pupils who are now set aspirational targets leading to more than expected progress.

Response to issues raised in the school's Pupil Premium Action Plan

1. **Pupil Premium Action Plan Aspect: Teaching & Learning**

Have 80% of PP in English float made expected progress and 50% more than?
<u>2015</u>
5A*C EM gaps: Forecast - 24% Target - 15%
3LP EN gaps: Forecast - 23% Target - 10%
3LP Ma gaps: Forecast – 19% Target - 7%

Numbers of disadvantaged students in the 2015 cohort are small, at 13, which means that 1 student makes nearly 8% difference to figures. Approaches have been individualised to address the specific needs of each pupil in the cohort and case studies will profile each student's progress. Approaches have been modified in English with setting introduced to year 8 and 9 to further impact on the performance of disadvantaged pupils.

Do personal profiles exist for all PP students?

Personal profiles do exist for all PP students but with different levels of detail according to need. Profiles for year 11 students are available to all staff in the Strategy room which forms a working hub for PP progress. The school's Rapid Improvement Plan recognises the need to embed the use of profiles as normal practice by all.

How is progress being tracked and evaluated for PP students?

Tracking is now very focussed and regular informing decisions about current and further intervention. Every data trawl is followed by analysis that measures gaps for key cohorts. This is passed on to Welfare and Pastoral Year Leaders to follow up. Intervention meetings held every week for KS4 with view to introducing them for KS3. This needs to be part of established practice for school monitoring and intervention from September 2015. Work scrutinies have been carried out for the PP cohort, then adapted to compare PP students with non-PP students from similar attainment at KS2 with most impact when students have responded to green feedback and targets from teachers, and when this was re-visited.

Have Teaching eBook work packs been set up in English, maths and science?

The Teaching eBook is used well in pockets but could be used better and to more effect across all faculties. Leaders need to ensure that this is established

practice in 2015/16.

Environment for completion of HL tasks? Use of LRC?

The interviews and questionnaires that were used to complete the PP profiles collected this information and students have been provided with resources where they were lacking such as laptops, printers, USB sticks or travel costs have been covered. Pupils are being supported to complete work in school and after school.

Do all KS4 students have a 6th form mentor?

All Year 11 students have had a mentor from the pastoral/intervention team or from SLT. This is being transferred now to Year 10. Some students from KS3 have been allocated mentors from the sixth form as appropriate and the Erasmus+ project links Most Able Year 10 male students to disadvantaged boys from Years 7 and 8 to raise aspirations. The raising boys achievement programme in Year 9 is used in a similar way.

2. **Pupil Premium Action Plan Aspect: Monitoring and Intervention**

Appointment and impact of Intervention Managers?

Intervention Mentors have been appointed and allocated annual foci based on analysis of the previous year's results. Weekly meetings have ensured that pace is maintained with students and concerns are acted on quickly.

Staff training on monitoring progress and setting targets?

Staff have accessed training sessions on levels of progress data provided after each data assessment trawl. There is now greater understanding of RAISE data through link work with senior leaders. Individual members of staff have appraisal targets linked to the progress of disadvantaged pupils in their classes and use data to set, monitor and adapt targets for these pupils. Staff access information in the Strategy Room established for Year 11 students in key cohorts. Access to profiles supports staff in the targeting of specific interventions and enables them to share information in order to give a more holistic approach for each PP pupil.

3. **Pupil Premium Action Plan Aspect: Governance, Accountability & Leadership**

Appoint Governor Lead on PP?

A newly established governor has taken over from previous lead. Powerpoint of Cheshire East training has been passed on and new PP Lead governor has been reading key pieces of research through Sutton Toolkit and by John Dunford (National Pupil Premium Champion). The new Lead could benefit from additional training on to strategy related to the Pupil Premium. Appendix B - Ten point plan for spending the Pupil Premium effectively – and Appendix C -

Pupil Premium Q/A Lead Governor - could prove useful as governors consider further the allocation and impact of Pupil Premium funding.

Do Governing Body minutes evidence PP challenge?

The Head Teacher Report contains a full review of PP and is presented to the Governing Body. Data is presented to governors following every data trawl. Additional familiarisation with RAISEonline information would help governors to a greater understanding of the progress and attainment of disadvantaged pupils in relation to other pupils.

Has there been an external review of governance?

An external review was carried out by Dr Harry Ziman, National Leader of Governance, in June 2014. This resulted in recommendations being made and a strategic training plan being put in place. A new committee structure was established.

4. **Pupil Premium Action Plan Aspect: Engagement & Enrichment**

Relaunch rewards system to staff and students.

Praise postcards have been sent out based on staff recommendation. There needs to be analysis of the rewards points received, comparing disadvantaged pupils with other pupils and rewards received over time and before and after interventions. This will ensure that the PP cohort is receiving incentives and will complement the evaluation of PP interventions in terms of attitudes to learning.

Introduce student support grants.

More money has been allocated to spending on individual students than previously. Impact can be seen through social and emotional development as well as measured through progress made. Again, comparisons between disadvantaged pupils and other pupils in the school will be of benefit.

Monitoring and tracking of PP pupils attending the summer school.

All disadvantaged students are tracked and feedback was collected from the 7 students who attended this. They reported feeling ready to start at high school and more confident about it. Subsequent comparison between attendees and non-attendees within the PP cohort could indicate impact on progress.

Analysis of PP gaps on entry.

The new role of Intervention Mentor for Year 7 Disadvantaged Students involves going into primary schools before the summer break to populate profiles based on meetings with Year 6 teachers. The role will also involve considering KS1 data to analyse progress made from then to KS2. This data will be used

to check that targets set are appropriate for KS3 and KS4. Targets need to be aspirational, take account of prior ability and link to pupils achieving more than expected progress.

Response to issues raised in the previous Pupil Premium Review conducted in February 2014.

'mixed ability teaching in English is not a way forward to help PP students'

The English department has targeted PP pupils through extra staffing of a 'float' group. In year 9 setting has been introduced which will be extended to year 8 from September 2015.

'lack of understanding of exactly what to do to improve the academic performance of PP students'. 'Staff need to understand precise next steps analysis in order to craft intervention that will have impact'

There has been extensive study of and reference to research including the Sutton Trust Toolkit and writings of John Dunford (National Pupil Premium Champion) to inform strategies that might have most impact. Academic progress is now measured through levels of progress data and strategies that are evaluated as ineffective are removed or replaced with more appropriate interventions. For example, revision and interventions sessions which had previously run as drop-in clinics were not felt to be reaching the students who needed them the most. They have since been re-launched with key topics targeted at individual students who are invited personally. Their attendance is monitored and chased up with a telephone call, or e-mail, where a cause for concern exists. The extensive use of the Pupil Premium Profiles by staff enables them to use the most appropriate Quality First Teaching Strategy for the individual and make use of the feedback that has come in from the student and parent or carer.

'intervention programme in Year 11 maths .. its focus on PP students is unclear.'

The focused use of strategies is closely monitored for impact and and discussed in weekly review meetings led by the Deputy Headteacher and with a specific focus on disadvantaged PP pupils reinforced by the Intervention Manager for Pupil Premium.

'presentation of progress data for each year group was unhelpful'; 'staff feel they need more training about data and data analysis'

Levels of progress data training has been offered and positively received. Data informs intervention and is used to measure progress.

'lack of robustness in tracking/monitoring/intervention for PP students'

The school now has a heightened focus on pupil progress reinforced by clear systems (including use of strategy room, meetings between key staff, use of mentors, direct input from senior staff) that have ensured senior leaders have a clearer picture of student progress, share and consider information, and are beginning to evaluate the impact of interventions through effective data analysis.

'they were unsure if they were targeting all students or PP students'

Intervention is offered to all students who are considered to be vulnerable but there is greater awareness of cohorts (and of disadvantaged PP pupils within cohorts). There is improved use of transition matrices and filters to allow for more useful analysis.

'none of the students mentioned any additional support that had been offered to them'

Although the meeting with students did not reveal widespread awareness of targeted funding for PP pupils, pupils were aware of the offer of financial support for extra-curricular provision, trips and equipment based on family circumstances. Pupil Premium Profiles detail the support offered and spending of PP fund for individual PP pupils. Students are aware of the fund and their eligibility for it (through whichever criteria are relevant to them).

'Governors need a clear and unambiguous picture of the state of play'

Detailed reports and the new sub-committee structure ensure greater understanding in general and more information is available. Governors are in a stronger position to challenge school leaders although governors would benefit from further training and familiarisation with senior leaders in relation to PP intervention and impact on the performance of disadvantaged PP pupils.

'Appraisal targets 'should include PP outcomes'

All teachers have appraisal targets in relation to the disadvantaged pupils that they teach.

'Liaison with primary schools to sharpen up transition information about PP students' needs to be developed'

The new role of Intervention Mentor to Year 7 Disadvantaged Students will be going into primary schools before the summer break to populate profiles based on conversations with Year 6 teachers. There is a need to assess, for each disadvantaged PP pupil, how far s/he is behind other pupils (especially in terms of reading, literacy and numeracy development) and to devise interventions to address the shortfalls. The information gathered needs to be used in tandem with baseline testing of year 7 pupils to inform the setting of aspirational targets for disadvantaged PP pupils.

'lines of accountability are blurred'

Clear systems and structures are in place to focus on disadvantaged PP pupils. Senior roles are clear. New posts with specific PP responsibility have been introduced. Middle leaders are carefully managed and monitored by senior leaders. Middle leaders are now confident in the use of data and in their roles in managing and monitoring pupil premium progress. Class teachers have appraisal targets related to PP and understand their accountability for the performance of disadvantaged pupils.

APPENDICES

<u>Appendix A</u>   Recommendations for Schools to consider re. Pupil Premium Intervention

Pupil Premium Review
The concept of the Pupil Premium is something that is central to the ethos of the school. The recommendations below are a collection of approaches gathered from Pupil Premium visits to other schools and are not specifically aimed at any one school. They are not intended to be an exhaustive list but we believe could be considered within the school's future planning and financial constraints/limitations. The school could view the recommendations as a menu from which interventions may be selected that you feel are most appropriate to the needs of your students. Indeed, many of the interventions are already in place so the list will serve as a tick list to re-affirm the school's existing good practice.
Some of the approaches which are beneficial, such as one-to-one or small group tutoring, are remedial, in the sense that they attempt to fix a problem when it is identified. They do not necessarily ensure that the pupil will succeed back in class, nor do they necessarily build capacity in the school to develop teachers' expertise which must be the long term objective.

Recommendations for Action Plan for PP students	**Impact of recommendations**
Strategic Leadership Member of SLT with specific responsibility and accountability to HT/GBody SLT i/c PP leads Focus for Improvement Action Plan All Department plans have impact statements for PP All meetings (Governors / SLT / HoD and Department) have PP as standing agenda item. Specific PP Performance Management objectives for all staff. Link Governor's role defined SEN Review to include PPs (not just transition)	Improved outcomes for PP students Clear and unambiguous 'line of sight' for the accountability for the progress of PP students Governors and SLT have a strategic plan in place that address the key issues to raise PP standards All staff understand the challenge and the support in place to address KPIs Progress monitored regularly and robustly to intervene earlier – *no compromise on high standards*
Transition Early identification and continuity planning through… Year 5/6 PP Programmes Ensure Transition Co-ordinator for Y7 shares specific PP focus with	Build on good practice in feeder schools Capitalise on CPD / sharing resources Consistent approach to transition that supports families

primary partners	No dip in outcomes from Year 6 to Year 7
Adopt a 'system led' data (MIS) tracking that is independent of staffing (# ref CPD) eg. SIMS / SISRA	Greater autonomy (and accountability) for individual teachers (+TAs) Improved ability to analyse trends and impact on programmes and react quickly to intervene with the appropriate intervention to address the issue identified
Monitoring Establish clear 'line of sight' and accountability (SLT/Curriculum Leaders) • Tracking of data • Learning Walks / lesson obs • Scrutiny of work • Questionnaires • Focus groups • In-class interventions	Established review points in year that demonstrate impact of interventions and progress – relentless focus on PP Action Plan adapts to review in real time throughout the year
Target setting Year 7 / 9 Base line data - Stretch targets (#ref Dave Hollamby's RADY Project) Ensure PP target setting in departmental RAPs or plans	PM Objectives clear for all staff Students meet or exceed their levels of progress
Continue to utilise the additional resources : http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/pupil-premium-analysis-and-challenge-tools-for-schools http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/pupil-premium-how-schools-are-spending-funding-successfully-maximise-achievement http://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/toolkit/ formerly Sutton Trust toolkit	
KS3 - Strategies Develop the whole school literacy programme with Accelerated Reader (Reading Recovery / Boosting reading potential) Yr 7 Co-ordinate Catch-up and PP – develop Literacy and numeracy work by SENCo Develop clear PoS for PP for Literacy and Numeracy engaging families	Clear (evidence based) action plan in place to 'close the gap' All strategies have key 'milestones' (KPIs) that demonstrate progress. PP standard improve ↑Reading age ↑Spelling age ↑2 sub levels per year

Middle leadership role – plan for best teachers leading – consider PP Champions	↑parental/student engagement
KS3 - Strategies Y9 options – continue to ensure personalised and bespoke courses available for PP students Evaluate success of PP students in existing subjects to inform option choices RCRC – Right Course for Right Child (as above) Introduce 'Futures' meeting	Full Review of KS4 Option process (curriculum) to ensure that each PP student has the potential to be successful PP students directed to known 'success' subjects and away from potential failure
KS4 - Strategies Y9 options – greater coordination between KS4 courses and outcomes Review course / exam entry policy to ensure each student can contribute to Progress 8 measure SLT i/c PP coordinates Intervention / mentoring programmes (En / Ma) + 3 and +5 for Progress 8	The gap is closed between the No. of courses taken for PP and non PP (Bucket 5 / Bucket 8!) Improved VA in RoL for disadvantaged students Clear exam entry policy that is led by SLT i/c PP to ensure no (PP) child left behind
CPD SLT to visit schools with track record of closing the gap in similar contexts Create WoW (watching others work) CPD opportunities for PP teachers Review role of TAs (SEN Review) especially accountability of HLTAs in En/Ma/Sc (# ref Sutton Trust) Ensure extended CPD that gives all staff confidence in handling data	Every teacher a teacher of special needs implicit throughout the SDP Whole school CPD programme in place to support each individual member of staff Staff know PP students really well and have clear strategies in place to raise attainment Staff are confident in use of data to target PP students and devise appropriate interventions
Attendance Review impact of EWO on PP Review role of HoYs and Tutors and support for PP Review Rewards (and sanctions) for attendance of PP	Close the attendance gap between PP and non PP students

Schools need to

Step 1. Set an ambition for what you want your school to achieve with PP funding. Some of the schools aiming high express this ambition in terms of becoming one of the 17 per cent of schools in which those on free school meals (FSM) do better than the average for all pupils nationally.

Step 2. The process of decision-making on PP spending starts with an analysis of the barriers to learning for PP pupils.
Barriers to learning might include poor parenting, limited access to language, poor literacy levels, poor attendance, low aspirations, low expectations, narrow experience of life outside school. Each school will want to make its own list.

Step 3. Decide on the desired outcomes of your PP spending.
Schools should decide for themselves what outcomes they are aiming for with PP funding, but these might include: raising attainment of PP-eligible pupils; closing the gap between PP pupils and others in the school; closing the gap between the school's PP pupils and all pupils nationally; improving attendance; reducing exclusions; accelerated progress by all PP pupils; increasing the engagement of parents with their children's education and with the school; increasing opportunities for PP-eligible pupils and broadening their experience.

Step 4. Against each desired outcome, identify success criteria.
Against each of the desired outcomes which the school decides to pursue, school leaders should set one or more success criteria. This could be expressed as a number – 'closing the gap between the attainment of PP-eligible pupils and that of all pupils nationally by x per cent this year and by y per cent the following year'. For outcomes such as parental engagement, there are no easy metrics, so schools need to discuss what success looks like for them against these aims.

Step 5. Evaluate your current PP strategies.
Having set out a range of desired outcomes and put success criteria against them, schools can evaluate their current strategies and assess how successful each of the strategies is in pursuit of the stated outcomes.
Consider how much of your PP spending is on year 6 or year 11 pupils and how much on younger pupils. What are the percentages?
Consider how much you are spending on the needs of individual pupils and how much on whole-school strategies. What are the percentages?
There are no 'right answers' for the proportion of PP funding spent on different groups, but it will help your evaluation to know these figures.
A lot of PP funding is spent on additional classroom assistants, so schools should use the research report on the deployment and impact of support staff (http://fdslive.oup.com/www.oup.com/oxed/primary/literacy/osi_teaching_assistants_report_web.pdf?region=uk) to help them evaluate the effectiveness of learning assistants and ensure that they are working in the most effective way.

Step 6. Research the evidence of what works best.

Schools need to look outwards for evidence of what works well elsewhere. I recommend three places to look initially.

First, seek out excellent practice in other schools, using http://apps.nationalcollege.org.uk/closing_the_gap/index.cfm and http://www.pupilpremiumawards.co.uk and consider how you might adapt their successful PP strategies to the context of your school.

Second, use the excellent Education Endowment Foundation Toolkit http://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/toolkit/, looking first at the strategies that make the most difference (feedback, metacognition, peer tutoring, etc) and think about how these could best be used in your school.

Third, study the Ofsted report on pupil premium, published in February 2013, where there is a list of successful approaches on page 3: http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/pupil-premium-how-schools-are-spending-funding-successfully-maximise-achievement. Evaluate PP strategies in your school in the light of the points made in this report.

Step 7. Decide on the optimum range of strategies to be adopted.

Using the evidence gathered from other schools and through your research in the EEF Toolkit and elsewhere, involve the leadership team, staff and governing body in deciding on the best strategies to use in the context of your school.

These should not be seen as separate from your other efforts to raise attainment and accelerate progress. Make sure that the PP strategies are embedded in your overall school improvement plan.

Consider too how you can adapt the curriculum to benefit disadvantaged pupils. The question 'What curriculum does most for disadvantaged pupils?' promotes rich discussion among staff and governors about the knowledge and skills that will maximise the life chances of young people from less well-off backgrounds. See the Whole Education website (www.wholeeducation.org) to learn about how Whole Education Network schools are developing a fully rounded education for their pupils as part of their 'closing the gap' and raising achievement strategies.

Don't forget the needs of bright PP-eligible pupils. You can spend funding on them to push them further and also to broaden their expectations and opportunities. Oxbridge visits and music tuition are fruitful examples.

Another group that especially needs additional help and support is the group of looked-after children, who have historically generally obtained very poor qualifications. Each school may have few of them, but heads need to work with the local 'virtual head' to deploy resources effectively for these children with their varied backgrounds and needs.

And, don't forget, excellent teaching can be the best strategy of all for raising the attainment of PP-eligible pupils and closing the gap.

Step 8. Staff training.

There are no short cuts to success with the strategies you adopt. If they are to be successful, in-depth training for all staff must take place

Step 9. Monitor the progress of PP-eligible pupils frequently.

Collect, analyse and use your data to maximum effect in monitoring the progress of every PP-eligible pupil. This should be done frequently, so that interventions can be put in place quickly, as soon as a pupil is starting to slip.

Step 10. Put an audit trail on the school website for PP spending.

The school needs to put in a prominent place on the website an account of PP spending. The head and governing body are held to account for the impact that the school is making with PP funding. This can be done in tabular form, listing each strategy, its cost, evaluation reports on its effectiveness, and its impact. In addition, schools can use anonymised case studies of the difference that PP funding is making to the lives of pupils.

This also fulfils the governing body's legal obligation to report to parents on how the PP is being spent and the impact that is being made with it.

- Is your Pupil Premium spending planned in isolation and part of the school development plan
- clarity about the intended impact of the spending
- audit trail for where the funding had been spent
- do you feel you are involved in making decisions about the Pupil Premium, or challenging the way in which it was allocated
- How do you monitor the quality and impact of interventions? teaching assistants, with little impact
- How do you analyze which pupils were underachieving, particularly in English and mathematics
- How do you ensure that all day-to-day teaching meets the needs of each learner, rather than relying on interventions to compensate for teaching that is less than good?
- Do you have good performance management system for teaching assistants and other support staff?
- Do you have any focus on the pastoral work on the desired outcomes for pupils? If so, do you have any evidence to show whether the work had or had not been effective

The best Governing Bodies…
- carefully ring-fenced the funding so that they always spent it on the target group of pupils
- never confused eligibility for the Pupil Premium with low ability, and focused on supporting their disadvantaged pupils to achieve the highest levels
- thoroughly analysed which pupils were underachieving, particularly in English and mathematics, and why
- drew on research evidence and evidence from their own and others' experience to allocate the funding to the activities that were most likely to have an impact on improving achievement
- understood the importance of ensuring that all day-to-day teaching meets the needs of each learner, rather than relying on interventions to compensate for teaching that is less than good
- allocated their best teachers to teach intervention groups to improve mathematics and English, or employed new teachers who had a good track record in raising attainment in those subjects
- used achievement data frequently to check whether interventions or techniques were working and made adjustments accordingly, rather than just using the data retrospectively to see if something had worked
- made sure that support staff, particularly teaching assistants, were highly trained and understood their role in helping pupils to achieve
- systematically focused on giving pupils clear, useful feedback about their work, & ways that they could improve it
- ensured that a designated senior leader had a clear overview of how the funding was being allocated and the difference it was making to the outcomes for pupils

- ensured that class and subject teachers knew which pupils were eligible for the Pupil Premium so that they could take responsibility for accelerating their progress
- had a clear policy on spending the Pupil Premium, agreed by governors and publicised on the school website
- provided well-targeted support to improve attendance, behaviour or links with families where these were barriers to a pupil's learning
- had a clear and robust performance management system for all staff, and included discussions about pupils eligible for the Pupil Premium in performance management meetings
- thoroughly involved governors in the decision making and evaluation process
- were able, through careful monitoring and evaluation, to demonstrate the impact of each aspect of their spending on the outcomes for pupils.