

TAVISTOCK COLLEGE

CLOSING THE GAP REPORTING

What is the Pupil Premium?

The Pupil Premium is an allocation of extra funds that the school receives. It was first introduced in April 2011. The school receives the Pupil Premium each financial year from the Department for Education, with the amount received determined by the number of students on the school's official list who receive free school meals (FSM), are "looked after" or have left local authority care and e.g. been adopted/ fostered or, are from military families. The funding is provided to ensure that these students are not disadvantaged in any way. The number of pupils included on the FSM list includes pupils who have been in receipt of free meals at any time within the preceding 6 school years. This is known as the "Ever 6" calculation. NB: Pupils can only be added to the FSM list if parents/carers have made a successful application for Free School Meals via the local authority claim systems. The school only received funding for claimants not those who would be eligible, but choose not to claim. The expected outcome from the extra funding is to ensure that all pupils, irrespective of socio-economic circumstances, achieve equally according to prior attainment.

Pupils Counted in the Ever 6 Calculation in 2015/16, by Year Group.

Y7 54

Y8 47

Y9 38

Y10 37

Y11 42

Sub Total = 188

Y12 26

Y13 28

Total = 237

Generic Pupil Premium Income

Funding per capita for 2014/15 and 2015/16 was/is:

FSM/Ever 6 **£935** per pupil.

Looked After Children or those leaving care in certain circumstances **£1,900** per pupil.

Services children **£300** per pupil.

Tavistock College Income

In **2014/15** the school received **£ 229,913**. The spend audit is reproduced in tabulated format, in 1, below.

In **2015/16** the school received **£ 228,520**. The action plan for 2015/16 setting out the rationale for, and outcomes desired from, the use of the funds is set out in 2 , below.

1. 2014/15 Pupil Premium Spend audit

Activity, intervention or other cost description	Number of Pupils Targeted/KS etc.	Cost £	Notes/Appendices
Salary + on costs – dedicated associate staff CTG support & achievement co-ordinators.	28 pupils	61,874	Primarily boys' achievement programme.
Rewards and incentives for PP pupils	Many pupils rewarded in multiple ways	1, 253	
Examination preparation and support including provision of materials, additional pre exam booster and coaching sessions etc.	40 pupils	16,801	Also includes personalised pathways and bespoke packages for PP KS4 pupils on and off site.
Ys 8 - 13 literacy & numeracy intervention, booster sessions, one to one etc. incl resources and online packages	97 pupils	3, 506	Includes e.g. TUTE, Accelerated Reader, educational games and dedicated ICT equipment. Separate from Y7 catch up.
Proportion of SLT lead personnel salary + on costs allowing dedicated CTG research, development and monitoring time to be safeguarded.	Taken as an average across all qualifying pupils	3, 829	Feeds in to SEF, SDP and CPD.
Proportion of SENDCo salary + on costs allowing dedicated bespoke in class support and boosting to take place.	All	5,221	Includes identification of specific need, audits, advice, guidance, screening and target setting/reviews.
Y7 PP team building and independent learning skills day (not charged to pupils)	45 pupils	8,902	

Pastoral Lead protected time for PP academic monitoring and liaison.	All Year Groups 7 – 13.	53,394	6 Year Groups.
Small animal care/therapy lead associate staff time + on costs. Programme costs.	14 pupils	1,949	Y7 & 8 have staff supervised access to and a programme including care of and for poultry, guinea pigs, a Shetland pony, a dog .
Impartial Information, Advice & Guidance bought in time.	20 pupils	950	In addition to whole school provision.
Additional Admin including staffing (+ on) costs.	Taken as an average across all qualifying pupils	11,487	Includes data combing and report compilation, parental contact and engagement admin support etc.
Attendance Officer protected PP monitoring, support and intervention time.	Taken as an average across all qualifying pupils	1,998	Includes daily PP vulnerable student tracking and monitoring plus follow up.
Dedicated TA in - class preparation and delivery time.	All	23,149	Specific focus on English & Maths across all years.
School library based homework support and curriculum catch up sessions.	14 pupils	1,200	Includes staffing and resources.
RAM time and facilitation costs .	KS4 English and Maths. 44 pupils.	4,904	Time and notional associated costs taken as an average.
Consumables	Taken as an average across all qualifying pupils	1,494	
Transport subsidy for PP students	All	8,949	
Staff CPD for CTG	All	6,850	Includes associate and teaching colleagues. Incorporates e.g. THRIVE practitioner CPD.
Curriculum Development Fund type additional capitation/top up into	96 students	12, 970	Includes AIMHigher HE type visits, peripatetic music tuition fees etc.

departments, faculties & Forest School for CTG			
TOTALS		£ 230,680	Spend = 100.3%

2. Intended & Current Use of the Pupil Premium/Action Plan 2015 – 2016 (minimally adapted from a document prepared by Sarah Jones, Principal)

Across many of the studies reviewed, a perceived lack of aspirations among students from low socio-economic backgrounds was identified as a key factor for underachievement. Engaging parents and improving parental involvement in school, and their aspirations for their children, emerged as some of the most important factors associated with improving low educational achievement. In school, the central theme across research findings with respect to narrowing the achievement gap between students in different micro-cohorts is that it is the quality of teaching that matters most. Changing instructional processes and teaching methods (e.g. co-operative learning, phonics instruction, meta-cognitive strategies) delivers the greatest improvements in learning outcomes for children from deprived backgrounds. Simply changing the mode of delivery, through ICT or new curricula, is much less effective.

Strategy One – Improve the quality of teaching and learning so the needs of students are met. (This is a key part of the CIP 2015-6). Quality First Teaching.

<i>Actions (Costings in parentheses)</i>	<i>Expected/Targeted Impact</i>
Line management meetings by SLT wherein student achievement (in micro-cohorts) is discussed alongside the performance of teaching groups. Allocation of time for meetings and for colleagues to prepare. <i>(£25,000)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased staff accountability of the students in faculties for underachievement. • Management and support for the teaching and learning programme (known as the ‘bottom- line’) to enable the highest standards to be met.
Teaching and learning reviews Allocation of time for planning, preparation and implementation. Time for quality feedback and on-going improvement planning. Externally commissioned advice, support and guidance. <i>(£25,000)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific targets and success criteria set from each review will be used as an in impact measure for the level of differentiation. • Raised staff awareness of our expectations on teachers to be delivering quality first teaching as well as intervention for students in receipt of the PPG and SEND.
Use of SENDCo in class support. Allocation of time via appointment of another TA to pick up duties sacrificed. Allocation of resources for MAST. Creation , preparation and production costs of EI/ESP resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of SENDCo expertise in the classroom will enable teachers to be coached to improve differentiation. • Creation of voluntary CPD opportunities for teaching staff – one member of each faculty to become the “Pupil Premium Champion” and work collaboratively with the SENDCo to disseminate, share and impact evaluate good practice. • Establishment of a Multi-Agency Steering Team (MAST) to further develop

(£12,000)	and enhance integrated frontline delivery of support and intervention and the wrap around inclusive ethos which impacts positively on pupil cognitive outcomes, including the use of Early Identification & Support Planning.
Use of Experienced teachers including UPS3 to coach others that require improvement Time; (£15,000)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All research examined shows on-site training – where coaches visit teachers’ classes, provide feedback, organise group meetings and discuss teaching strategies – are much more effective than external, one-stop courses.

Strategy Two - Rigorous monitoring of intervention and use of authentic data for tracking

Action	Impact
<p>Improve the reliability of the data that is used to track all students- all year groups</p> <p>N/A – part of the routine assessment calendar.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By disregarding ‘3’ fine grading in data; raising grade boundary scores and cross moderating the data becomes more reliable. The students in real need of intervention can then be targeted and tracked.
<p>Maintain a whole school database with a hyperlinked document per student mapped against all of their attainment and progress data after each data drop</p> <p>Time for a colleague to create, update and analyse. Resources to facilitate dissemination of information and sharing of good practice.</p> <p>(£8,000)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The hyperlinked document becomes a live, real time record and enables teaching staff to log their intervention at classroom level if a student is underachieving in that subject. Equally the whole school intervention is added on this. This also enables all staff to see what others are doing and share good practice as well a central tracking and monitoring system.
<p>RAM meetings for KS4</p> <p>Release time for relevant colleagues to meet. Resources for RAM including updating license and other costs relating to ICT and emerging technologies. Time for analysis of strategies and synthesis of good practice etc.</p> <p>(£25,000)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PP students and SEND students are identified and discussed with heads of En and Ma alongside data manager and VP. Records kept. Strategies used in class and in intervention for Y11 are evaluated for impact after each data drop. Ultimately generic In School Variation (ISV) reduces. (NCTL research identifies robust data analysis as a key to this).
<p>Implement catch up early e.g. TUTE, accelerated reader scheme for KS3</p> <p>Capital and ongoing costs to purchase, update/upgrade resources. CPD for staff to deliver and analyse. Planning time. Emerging technology costs associated with production of multi media evidence base.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learning activities can be tailored/personalised to the needs of the students and delivered by qualified teachers. Dovetail in with data led Early Identification & Support Planning to ensure that systems and processes are embedded, effective and appropriately evaluated for impact. Pupil

(£30,000)	<p>Voice to garner qualitative data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a number of case studies to demonstrate impact, including podcast/video testimony.
<p>Specific mentoring groups in Y11 run by Assistant Principals to raise achievement and aspirations</p> <p>Capital costs re; purchase of Assertive Mentoring materials etc and reprographics costs.</p> <p>(£5,500)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross- curricular diagnosis and support to reduce ISV generically. • Data driven mentoring that avoids/averts “soft” foci to include motivational assemblies, tutor led sessions with pupil evaluation to measure qualitative impact. • Parental links are strengthened. Seen in increased engagement with entire parental programme. • Pupil Mind Sets become growth mind sets, not closed mind sets.

Strategy Three – improve CPD so that it is focussed on students needs

Actions	Impact
<p>Use outcomes of teaching and learning reviews to plan workshops on training days</p> <p>Planning time</p> <p>(£3,500)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of a ‘common language’ of high aspiration and ‘going the extra mile’ for each and every student across the College as well as raising staff awareness of the students in receipt of PPG and SEND
<p>Introduce co-operative professional development centred on design and research model.</p> <p>CPD costs and cost of resources.</p> <p>(£2,800)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased staff accountability of the students in their classes for underachievement. • Promotion of self-evaluation, through approaches such as Assessment for Learning that have large effect-sizes eg feedback and marking

Strategy four –raising student aspirations using engagement and aspiration programmes

Actions	Impact
<p>Make effective use of specialist staff employed through PPG</p> <p>Salaries + on costs)</p> <p>(£70,000)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses the perceived lack of aspirations among pupils from low socio-economic backgrounds as this is a key factor for underachievement.
<p>Engage parents and raise parental aspirations through improved communication and parent voice forums.</p> <p>Costs of facilitating and resourcing meetings.</p> <p>(£3,000)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular communication with parents will aid links with ‘hard-to-reach’ families) • Use of ‘parent forums’ as a means of gaining parental feedback and enabling participation that provides a sense of engagement and control.
<p>Use of “Thrive” and ensure extra-curricular</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses the perceived lack of

programmes designed for SMSC are targeted to PPG students CPD costs. Materials and resources. (£4,600)	aspirations among pupils from low socio-economic backgrounds as this is a key factor for underachievement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thrive is a specific way of working with all children that helps to develop their social and emotional well-being, enabling them to engage with life and learning. It supports them in becoming more self-assured, capable and adaptable. It can also address any troubling behaviours providing a firm foundation for academic attainment.
Behaviour supported by a clear approach to discipline (All notional)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultivation of values of respect, good behaviour and caring for others
Total Intended Spend £229,400	Spend = 100.4%

How Do Ofsted Measure “Success” in relation to Pupil Premium impact?

The Government monitor how well Pupil Premium pupils achieve at school, compared to their non - Pupil Premium peers. They have outlined three indicators that they expect to see demonstrated in relation to the attainment of pupils for whom Pupil Premium payments are made;

- a) **“Impact Indicator 7”** – this relates to the attainment gap at age 11 between FSM and non-FSM pupils. In order for a school to be judged to be effectively using the premium, their pupils must not do less well than pupils nationally. (Please also see the information relating to Year 7 “Catch Up” funding, below). The attainment benchmarks in 2012/13 and 2013/14 & 2014/15 are:

	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
FSM achieving at least L4 in Y6	59.9%	63.6%	Not yet available
Non FSM achieving at least L4 in Y6	78.7%	81.6%	Not yet available
GAP (must not be greater than)	(18.8%)	(18%)	TBA

- b) **“Impact 8 Indicator”** – this is a judgement based on pupil achievement at the age of 16 (end of Key Stage 4) in English and Mathematics GCSE. SEE COMPARITIVE TABLES, BELOW.
- c) **“Impact Indicator 9”** – this is a measure based on how many learners achieve *at least one* Level 3 (“A” level equivalent) by the age of 19 (end of Key Stage 5, Y13). The pupils included in the calculation are those who attracted Pupil Premium Funding at the age of 15 .The national rates of attainment are as follows:

YEAR	NON FSM	FSM	GAP
2010/11	56.7%	31.7%	(26%)
2011/12	58.2%	34.1%	(24.1%)
2012/13	59.5%	35.2%	(24.3%)
2013/14	TBA	TBA	TBA
2014/15	TBA	TBA	TBA

TAVISTOCK COLLEGE IMPACT 8 INFORMATION (from the unvalidated Dec 2015 RAISEONLINE)

2014/15

Number of pupils in Y11 208. Number included in Pupil Premium calculation **44**.

Number as an equivalent % age of Y11 cohort = **21%**

Attainment measure	% of all pupils who achieved this	% of FSM pupils	% of non- FSM pupils	SCHOOL GAP	NATIONAL GAP
English GCSE Grades A* - C	69 (Nat 67) Male = 61 (Nat 61) Female 78 (Nat 74)	48 (Nat 51)	75 (Nat 73)	(27)	(25)
Made at least 3 levels of progress in English from KS2 – KS4	69 (Nat 69) Male = 62 (Nat 64) Female = 75 (Nat 75)	48 (Nat 58)	75 (Nat 74)	(27)	(16)
Mathematics GCSE Grades A* - C	63 (Nat 67) Male = 69 (Nat 67) Female = 58 (Nat 68)	37 (Nat 49)	71 (Nat 74)	(34)	(37)
Made at least 3 levels of progress in Mathematics from KS2 – KS4	63 (Nat 66) Male = 65 (Nat 64) Female = 61 (Nat 68)	41 (Nat 49)	70 (Nat 72)	(29)	(23)
**Achieved grades A* - C in at least 5 GCSE's including English & Mathematics.	52 (Nat 56) Male = 51 (Nat 51) Female = 53 (Nat 60)	20 (Nat 36)	61 (Nat 63)	(41)	(27)

Although both male and female pupils generically are attaining in line with the national picture in English, and indeed girls are slightly outperforming their national counterparts, in Mathematics girls underperform whereas boys' attainment is slightly better than that found nationally. Boys are also making good progress across both English and Mathematics whilst girls are not making the expected progress in either subject. Free School Meals pupils' attainment in both English and Mathematics is close to the national picture. Progress in Mathematics for these pupils is closer to the national picture than it is in English. The school achievement gaps are close to and/or in line with those found nationally in the basics. In progress terms the progress gap in English is much wider than it is in

Mathematics and it significantly exceeds the national benchmarks in the 5 GCSE's at Grades A* - C Including English & Mathematics measure.

** (The 5 A* - C EM measure will cease to be counted with effect from 2015/16 and "Attainment 8" will be substituted alongside "Progress 8")

NB; Figures in red, in parentheses, represent negative outcomes.

Impact Analysis (with reference to Ofsted's "The Pupil Premium Analysis & Challenge Toolkit").

ENGLISH GCSE 3 LEVELS OF PROGRESS %				
	2012	2013	2014	2015 (National)
FSM			100%	48% (58%)
No FSM			100%	75% (74%)
LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN (CLA)			100%	100% (38%)
No SEND			100%	72% (74%)
SEN School Action			100%	
SEN School Action +			100%	
SEND with support 2014/15 et seq			N/A	36% (36%)
SEND Statement or (2014 et seq) with an Education & Health Care Plan			0%	33% (29%)
MATHEMATICS GCSE 3 LEVELS OF PROGRESS %				
	2012	2013	2014	2015 (National)
FSM			87%	41% (49%)
No FSM			93%	70% (72%)
LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN (CLA)			95%	100% (30%)
No SEND			94%	68% (72%)
SEN School Action			25%	
SEN School Action +			50%	
School with support 2014/15 et seq			N/A	21% (42%)
SEND Statement or (2014 et seq) with an Education & Health Care Plan			50%	0% (21%)

SIXTH FORM/POST 16 DATA

YEAR	TAVISTOCK COLLEGE NON FSM	TAVISTOCK COLLEGE FSM	NATIONAL NON FSM	NATIONAL FSM	NATIONAL GAP	TAVISTOCK GAP
2010/11			56.7%	31.7%	(26%)	
2011/12			58.2%	34.1%	(24.1%)	
2012/13			59.5%	35.2%	(24.3%)	
2013/14	90.8%	9.2%	TBA	TBA	TBA	(81.6%)
2014/15	90.3%	9.6%	TBA	TBA	TBA	(82.7%)

Learners achieving at least 1 L3 qualification with FSM calculated for those learners who were Pupil Premium equivalent at age 15.