

Report on Projected Spending of the Pupil Premium Grant

Academic Year 2016-17

At The Castle School, we are committed to accelerating the achievement, progress and personal development of all disadvantaged students and diminishing the differences between their outcomes and those of their peers. The Pupil Premium is a fund, which comes directly into school from the government to help us achieve this aim. Funding is targeted at students who have received free school meals at any time in the last 6 years; been continuously looked after for at least 6 months; been adopted from care and children who have one or more parents in the British Armed Forces.

At The Castle School we work closely with our feeder Primary schools to ensure that every child transitions well to secondary school and continues to make good progress.

At The Castle School our aim is that **Every Child Achieves, Belongs and Participates** – these three values direct all that we do. We believe in educating the whole child through high quality teaching (Achieve) and high quality pastoral care (Belong and Participate). Our school priority is always to deliver the highest quality teaching by personalising our approach for every student, every lesson, and every day. We invest significantly in staff training both internally and externally to enhance our practice to secure the best outcomes for all students. We tailor our curriculum, our teaching and our approach to meet the needs of all students with clear targeting and funding allocated to those who come from disadvantaged backgrounds and those who need to catch up quickly when they join The Castle School.

PUPIL PREMIUM 2016-17

PUPIL PREMIUM 2016-17	
Number of pupils eligible	190
Amount received per pupil	£935 (Ever6) + £300 (Services) + £1900 (LAC/adopted)
TOTAL PP available (includes additional funding for service children & children adopted from care)	£178,818

1. Current Achievement of PP students 2016 (Leavers 2017)

Performance Measure	School Group	2015	2016	2017	Others Nationally	2015	2016	2017
5 A*- CEM	PP all	82%	65%					
5A*-C	PP all	89%	74%					
Progress 8	PP High Ability		0.04	-1.01	High Ability		0.07	
	PP Middle Ability		0.37	-0.74	Middle Ability		0.14	
	PP Low Ability		0.04	0.47	Low Ability		0.19	
	PP All		0.17	-0.66	Other All		0.43	
Progress 8 in English (English Element)	PP High Ability		-0.13	-0.7	High Ability		0.05	
	PP Middle Ability		0.29	-0.77	Middle Ability		0.11	
	PP Low Ability		-0.28	0.36	Low Ability		0.16	
	PP All		0.01	-0.56	Other All		0.46	
Progress 8 in Maths (Maths Element)	PP High Ability		0.32	-1.05	High Ability		0.06	
	PP Middle Ability		0.41	-0.71	Middle Ability		0.12	
	PP Low Ability		1.14	0.07	Low Ability		0.19	
	PP All		0.51	-0.73	Other All		0.50	
Attainment 8	PP High Ability		62.15	50.29	High Ability		65.12	
	PP Middle Ability		51.42	33.89	Middle Ability		50.77	
	PP Low Ability		28.08	27.64	Low Ability		31.32	
	PP All		51.44	39.98	Other All		52.72	
Threshold (English and Maths)	PP High Ability		92%	53%	High Ability		97	
	PP Middle Ability		58%	2%	Middle Ability		68	
	PP Low Ability		17%	0%	Low Ability		14	
	PP All		65%	25%	Other All		70	
% Achieved Ebacc	PP High Ability		100%	50%	High Ability		58	
	PP Middle Ability		67%	0%	Middle Ability		17	
	PP Low Ability		0%	0%	Low Ability		1	
	PP All		88%	33%	Other All		29	

2. Students Eligible for PP 2016-17

Year Group KS3	Cohort size	Number of PP students	High Ability	Middle Ability	Lower Ability	PP/SEND	No KS2 data	PP as % of Year Group
7	245	47	22 (47%)	18 (38%)	6 (13%)	8	1 (2%)	19.1%
8	235	43	17 (40%)	16 (37%)	10 (23%)	9	0	18.3%
9	236	28	13 (46%)	13 (46%)	2 (7%)	8	0	11.8%
Total	716	118	52	47	18	25	1	16.5%

Year Group KS4	Cohort Size	Number of PP students	High Ability	Middle Ability	Lower Ability	PP/SEND	No KS2 data	PP as % of Year Group
10	235	28	17 (61%)	5 (18%)	5 (18 %)	5	1 (4%)	11.9%
11	240	44	19 (43%)	17 (39%)	7 (16%)	11	1 (2%)	18.3%
Total	475	72	36	22	12	16	2 (%)	15.2%

NB- percentages have been rounded

3. Barriers to learning that current PP students face at The Castle School

Identified Barrier Letters reflected in sections 4 and 5	Issue
Progress of Disadvantaged MAPS	Progress 8 MAPS (14) -0.03, particularly Maths -0.14, Science -0.14 and the Open Element -0.25. (Raise Data Dashboard)
Attendance of FSM above NA	Attendance FSMs significant issue: 22.4% (21.6NA) Raise Data Dashboard)

4. Expenditure of Pupil Premium Funding 2016-17

Chosen Approach	Reasons for this Approach	Cost of PP contribution	Lead Staff	Review Dates (Governors Monitoring)	How the impact will be measured	Evaluation
Leadership						
Deputy Head (JL) focussed work on PP	SLT PP champion is dedicated to planning provision, monitoring provision and assessing impact on academic and pastoral achievement. Based on the 16% of JL salary equivalent to 16% students entitled to the Pupil Premium	£15176	J Lamb	Jan 2017 April 2017 September 2017	GCSE school measures for PP vs 'others' nationally (P8, English, Maths)	<p>Evaluation P8 Disadvantaged -0.89 compared to others -0.09. The cohort were given every support to be successful but ultimately did not achieve as well as previous cohorts. Significant issue was 22 Disadvantaged students who were PA, 8 of which had a Progress 8 figure of -1.5 or more. Key focus for next year to continue reduce the number of Disadvantaged students who are PA through the school Pastoral policies for attendance and challenge of absence.</p> <p>Impact variable Significant improvement for LAPS +0.63 (7)0.20 Data suggests HAPS-1.46 (20) and MAPS (16) should be a key focus next year.</p> <p>Recommendation to governors to continue with this next year.</p>
Heads of House time working with PP students	On average, one day per week spent working with PP students and their families	£70373	J Lamb and HOH (6)	Jan 2017 April 2017 September 2017	GCSE school measures for PP vs 'others' nationally (P8, English, Maths), behaviour	<p>Evaluation 2 Houses positive P8 Caernavon (3) +0.27 1 PA Sandringham (1) +0.28 0 PA 4 houses Balmoral (6) -0.96 3/6 were PA</p>

					<p>points and attendance by House</p>	<p>Windsor (7) -0.1.49 5/7 were PA Lancaster (14) -1.06 6/14 were PA Buckingham (13) -0.84 7/13 students were PA</p> <p>Impact variable We need to more sharply monitor the data at assessment points. Possibly focus on improving grades is stronger subjects than areas of weakness. We need to develop strategies to greater engage students and parents, further incentivise students with rewards, and focus on quality first teaching. Further, embed tutor non-negotiables. Key focus for next year to continue reduce the number of Disadvantaged students who are PA through the school Pastoral policies for attendance and challenge of absence.</p> <p>Recommendation to governors to continue with this next year.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---------------------------------------	--

Chosen Approach	Reasons for this Approach	Cost of PP contribution	Lead Staff	Review Dates (Governors Monitoring)	How the impact will be measured	Evaluation
Improve Literacy and Numeracy in Year 7 and KS3						
Breakfast club/morning intervention	<p>Students focus on areas of need that specific to them, for example, reading, spelling, handwriting, resilience</p> <p>19 students for 6 weeks, 1.5 hrs per week</p> <p>How many hrs per week? 1.5</p> <p>How many wks per year? 6</p> <p>How many TAs?1</p> <p>What no of PP children? 19</p> <p>What no of non PP children? 46</p> <p>29% PP</p>	£36	C Owen	Dec 2016 March 2017 July 2017	Impact will be measured against a baseline test appropriate to the intervention.	<p>Evaluation</p> <p>Strong impact</p> <p>Examples if impact include: (see termly overview)</p> <p>Resilience intervention focuses on 6 core areas 2 out of the 3 students improved in all 6 areas pre and post intervention.</p> <p>Maths intervention 3 students out of 4 hit their end of year target who were behind pre intervention.</p> <p>Comprehension intervention 1 student 43 months progress –remarkable impact.</p> <p>Recommendation to governors to continue with this next year.</p>
Year 8 Accelerated Reader	<p>Bespoke and targeted Literacy resource focusing on reading and comprehension – to support students achieve well in English and across the curriculum</p> <p>18.3% of Year 8 PP, therefore 18.3% of the cost of accelerated reader</p>	£237	N Whysall	Jan 2017 April 2017 September 2017	<p>% of PP students at reading age vs Non PP</p> <p>% of PP students achieving target grades in English compared to Non PP</p>	<p>Evaluation</p> <p>Strong impact</p> <p>Impact with Year 8 not as strong as Year 7 where Disadvantaged students reading ages improved faster than 'others'.</p> <p>Year 8 Disadvantaged made similar improvement of 4.7 months and 'others' 5 months. We should consider other strategies for boys e.g. reading on iPad to encourage reluctant readers.</p> <p>Recommendation to governors to continue with this next year.</p>

Chosen Approach	Reasons for this Approach	Cost of PP contribution	Lead Staff	Review Dates (Governors Monitoring)	How the impact will be measured	Evaluation
Corrective Reader	<p>30 week programme for 7 PP Year 7 students</p> <p>Corrective reading is used to find and close gaps in a student's reading skills. A ratio gain of 1.0 means that the child's skills are developing at a normal pace, but they will not be catching up with their peers. Brooks (2007) suggests that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratio gains of less than 1.4 are of 'doubtful educational significance', • Between 1.4 and 2.0 of 'modest impact', • Between 2.0 and 3.0 of 'useful impact', • Between 3.0 and 4.0 of 'substantial impact' and • Above 4.0 of 'remarkable impact' (Brooks. 2007, p. 289). • 3 hours a week, 7 students 	£2529	C Owen	Jan 2017 April 2017 September 2017	<p>Ratio gains of less than 1.4 are of 'doubtful educational significance',</p> <p>Between 1.4 and 2.0 of 'modest impact',</p> <p>Between 2.0 and 3.0 of 'useful impact',</p> <p>Between 3.0 and 4.0 of 'substantial impact' and</p> <p>Above 4.0 of 'remarkable impact' (Brooks. 2007, p. 289).</p>	<p>Evaluation</p> <p>Strong impact</p> <p>57% made 4+ 'remarkable impact'</p> <p>43% made 3+ 'substantial impact'</p> <p>Recommendation to governors to continue with this next year.</p>

Chosen Approach	Reasons for this Approach	Cost of PP contribution	Lead Staff	Review Dates (Governors Monitoring)	How the impact will be measured	Evaluation
Improve English and Maths in KS4						
Maths intervention - year 11s	PP students underachieving in year 11 receive additional teaching in tutorial 1 hour a week, 30 weeks, 5 students	£145	B Gee	April 2017 September 2017	Maths GCSE results PP outcomes against 'others' nationally	Evaluation Variable impact P8 +0.06 improved from -0.49 in the first assessment Autumn of Year 11. All students improved. 2 made at least expected progress 3 made below expected progress. Recommendation to governors to continue with this next year.
Year 11 Study group	1.5 hours after school of revision PP students who require support in school with revision. 1.5 hours per night x 4 nights per week x 25 weeks as proportion of JL salary	£11981	J Lamb	Jan 2017 March 2017 August 2017	PP GCSE measures: P8, Progress in English and Maths compared to 'others' nationally	Evaluation Variable impact P8 -0.66 48% 4+EM 25% 5+ Very disappointing impact. The group was large overall, and we need to carefully select which students this intervention will be most appropriate for to maximise its impact. A more bespoke approach needed such as a girls and boys group. Recommendation to governors to continue with this next year.

Chosen Approach	Reasons for this Approach	Cost of PP contribution	Lead Staff	Review Dates (Governors Monitoring)	How the impact will be measured	Evaluation
Pastoral Support: Attendance/ Attitude to Learning / Behaviour and Emotional Literacy/ Careers/Aspiration/Extra Curricular						
Pastoral support	15% of their time on PP children	£8578 contribution	J Lamb	Dec 2016 March 2017 July 2017	Impact measured by looking at reducing absence compared to 'others'	<p>Evaluation Attendance</p> <p>Disadvantaged Persistent absence Others 11.9 % 144/1202 pupils</p> <p>Persistent absence Disadvantaged 28.4 % 54/190 pupils PA has increased for Disadvantaged since 2015</p> <p>Summer 2017 data suggests next year's Year 11 and Year 10 should be the focus</p> <p>FTE Disadvantaged 72 'others' 40 Significant increase from 2015 Summer 2 data suggests next year's Year 8, 9 and 11 should be the focus.</p> <p>Variable impact (see case studies for actions)</p> <p>Recommendation to governors to continue with this next year...</p>

Chosen Approach	Reasons for this Approach	Cost of PP contribution	Lead Staff	Review Dates (Governors Monitoring)	How the impact will be measured	Evaluation
1:1 emotional literacy support	ELSA Emotional literacy support 3 students 1 hour x 35 weeks, 1 student for 1 hour x 20 weeks 12 students for 1 hour x 6 weeks	£103	Clair Owen	Dec 2016 March 2017 July 2017	Impact will be measured against a baseline test with 6 key areas around kind behaviour, social behaviour, concentration, behavioural difficulties, emotional distress and overall stress	Evaluation Strong impact Examples include 4 students out of 5 67% improvement from the baseline, 2 made over 80% improvement. Recommendation to governors to continue with this next year.

Chosen Approach	Reasons for this Approach	Cost of PP contribution	Lead Staff	Review Dates (Governors Monitoring)	How the impact will be measured	Evaluation
Individualised Emotional Literacy Intervention	Students are supported using the Individualised Emotional Literacy Intervention (ILI) 1 student, 4 hours a week for 6 weeks	£81	Clair Owen	Dec 2016 March 2017 July 2017	Ratio gains of less than 1.4 are of 'doubtful educational significance', Between 1.4 and 2.0 of 'modest impact', Between 2.0 and 3.0 of 'useful impact', Between 3.0 and 4.0 of 'substantial impact' and Above 4.0 of 'remarkable impact' (Brooks. 2007, p. 289).	Evaluation For 1 Disadvantaged student Ratio gain for reading 1.3 Doubtful impact for reading Ratio gain for spelling 4 Remarkable impact for spelling Of the 4 students taking the programme: Average Reading Age gain: 12 Months Average Spelling Age gain: 12 Months Ratio Gain for the group: Substantial Impact suggests it does have an impact. Recommendation to governors to continue with this next year.
RTL year 11 students	Targeted mentoring/intervention of Disadvantaged students and their parents to improve attendance, behaviour for learning and achievement 14 students, 5 Disadvantaged (35.71%)	£9608	S Marney S Thomas	Dec 2016 March 2017 July 2017	Reduction in behaviour points, improved attendance as a result of the support of RTL	Evaluation See case studies on individual students Recommendation to governors to continue with this next year.

Chosen Approach	Reasons for this Approach	Cost of PP contribution	Lead Staff	Review Dates (Governors Monitoring)	How the impact will be measured	Evaluation
RTL year 10 students	Targeted mentoring/intervention of Disadvantaged students and their parents to improve attendance, behaviour for learning and achievement 9 students 5 Disadvantaged, 4 others (55%)	£9608	S Marney S Thomas	Dec 2016 March 2017 July 2017	Reduction in behaviour points, improved attendance as a result of the support of RTL	Evaluation See case studies on individual students Recommendation to governors to continue with this next year.
RTL year 9 students	Targeted mentoring/intervention of Disadvantaged students and their parents to improve attendance, behaviour for learning and achievement 6 students, 4 Disadvantaged, 2 others (66%)	£7687	S Marney S Thomas	Dec 2016 March 2017 July 2017	Reduction in behaviour points, improved attendance as a result of the support of RTL	Evaluation See case studies on individual students Recommendation to governors to continue with this next year.
RTL year 8 students	Targeted mentoring/intervention of Disadvantaged students and their parents to improve attendance, behaviour for learning and achievement 8 students 4 Disadvantaged, 4 others (50%)	£7687	S Marney S Thomas	Dec 2016 March 2017 July 2017	Reduction in behaviour points, improved attendance as a result of the support of RTL	Evaluation See case studies on individual students Recommendation to governors to continue with this next year.
RTL year 7 students	Targeted mentoring/intervention of Disadvantaged students and their parents to improve attendance, behaviour for learning and achievement 1 student only who was Disadvantaged? (100%)	£1922	S Marney S Thomas	Dec 2016 March 2017 July 2017	Reduction in behaviour points, improved attendance as a result of the support of RTL	Evaluation See case studies on individual students Recommendation to governors to continue with this next year.
Counselling service	Providing support for PP students in difficult circumstances 38% of sessions by the counsellor are accessed by Disadvantaged students	£3577	Jo Arnold	January 2017 April 2017 July 2017	Improvement in behaviour and or attendance	Evaluation Anonymous case studies of individuals available. Recommendation to governors to continue with this next year.

Chosen Approach	Reasons for this Approach	Cost of PP contribution	Lead Staff	Review Dates (Governors Monitoring)	How the impact will be measured	Evaluation
Careers adviser	All Disadvantaged students have a Careers appointment 3 hours per year 11 PP	£1373	J Whatley	January 2018	% of NEETS that are PP 2017	Evaluation 100% of students had Careers Interview 4 students possible NEETS. Contact being made to offer further support. Recommendation to governors to continue with this next year.
REACH	11/17 students accessed alternative provision via REACH were Disadvantaged students	£22254	J Lamb/M Randall	January 2017 April 2017 July 2017	Improvement in behaviour and or attendance	Evaluation 11 students attended REACH. See separate reports. Recommendation to governors to continue with this next year.
Books and revision guides	To provide textbooks, revision guides and resources for students	£453	J Lamb	January 2017 April 2017 July 2017	Ensure all FSM students are supported with books and revision guides for GCSE courses.	Evaluation P8 Disadvantaged -0.89 compared to others -0.09 All FSM students provided with books and resources. Identify which Disadvantaged students need further support with revision and structuring their revision to enable this strategy to have more impact. Impact variable Recommendation to governors to continue with this next year.
Resources	To resources for students to access lessons such as ingredients for food lessons	£937	J Lamb	January 2017 April 2017 July 2017	All students are supported with resources to access their GCSE/BTEC courses	Evaluation P8 Disadvantaged -0.89 compared to others -0.09. Variable impact Significant improvement for LAPS +0.63 (7)0.20 Data suggests HAPS-1.46 (20) and MAPS (16) should be a key focus next year. Recommendation to governors to continue with this next year.

Chosen Approach	Reasons for this Approach	Cost of PP contribution	Lead Staff	Review Dates (Governors Monitoring)	How the impact will be measured	Evaluation
Extracurricular support funding	To provide financial support to enable students to benefit from educational activities and experiences. Motivational support to attend events such as the prom.	£5596	J Lamb	December 2016 April 2017 July 2017	PP Attendance, FTE compared to non PP and PP nationally	Evaluation 2 students supported with foreign trips. 10 students supported with a reduction on their prom ticket. Recommendation to governors to continue with this next year.
Musical tuition	To provide financial support to enable students to benefit from musical tuition	£3,060	J Lamb	January 2017 April 2017 July 2017		Evaluation Example of impact: 3 out of 5 students had improved attendance in Year 11 compared to Year 10. 4 out of 5 reduced behaviour points in Year 11 compared to Year 10. 5 students had music tuition. Recommendation to governors to continue with this next year.
Uniform	To provide support for families with school uniform needs to ensure they 'Belong' and have a sense of pride in the school	£304	J Lamb	December 2016 April 2017 July 2017	PP Attendance, FTE compared to non PP and PP nationally	Evaluation Support for 5 students enabling them to 'Belong'. Recommendation to governors to continue with this next year.