



## Cox Green Pupil Premium Impact Evaluation 2016

### Pupil Premium Expenditure April 2015 to March 2016

Number of Learners and Pupil Premium Grant Received	
Total Number of learners on roll Yr 7 - Yr 11 - Jan 15 Census	785
Total Number of learners Eligible for Pupil Premium Grant - Jan 15 Census	132
Amount of Pupil Premium Grant received per learner 2015/16	£935
Pupil Premium Grant 2015/16	£123,420
Post Looked After Children	
<b>Total Amount of Pupil Premium Grant 2015/16</b>	<b>£123,420</b>

### Evaluation of Pupil Premium Expenditure

	Cost	Sutton Trust Indicator	School Evaluation of Impact
<b>Hub Support + Intensive Study</b>	57,105	£ +5	Highly effective for individual students (school has case studies).
<b>Alternative Curriculum</b>	1,457	£££ +4	Highly effective for individual students (school has case studies).
<b>Student &amp; Family Educational Workers</b>	26,592	£££ +3	Highly effective: attendance continues to increase, Persistent Absence continues to decrease and with fewer students.
<b>Achievement/Deputy Achievement Leader Time</b>	4,978	£££ +3	Effective as also contributes to attendance/Persistent Absence/behaviour. The number of students receiving rewards has increased and outcomes for students are now in line with national figures for non – pp students.
<b>Attendance</b>	18,299	£££ +2	Highly effective attendance continues to increase, PA continues to decrease and with fewer students. Actions are followed up re. attendance/punctuality.
<b>Careers Guidance</b>	9,461		Effective for KS4 and KS5 in terms of destination figures and keeping NEET% significantly low.
<b>Additional Maths Support</b>	8,354	£££ +4	Highly effective: outcomes for pupil premium students in Maths are strong.
<b>Education Welfare Officer Support</b>	3,947	£££ +3	Highly effective: Attendance continues to increase, PA continues to decrease and with fewer students.
<b>Education Psychologist</b>	2,754	£££ +4	Has had some impact with individual students (see Case Studies)
<b>School Counsellor</b>	1,228	£££ +4	Has had some impact with individual students (see Case Studies)
<b>Guidance to support transition - Y6 into Y7</b>	1,380		Effective in terms of developing positive student attitudes to the school.



<b>Food Tech / Catering - Financial assistance with ingredients</b>	<b>400</b>		Highly effective: Catering continues to be a high performing subject and the PP students that take it progress as well as their peers, e.g. 8 out of 9 Y11 PP students achieved their target grade.
<b>Financial Support for Trips/Transport/Other</b>	<b>1,615</b>		Effective: Students enjoy their trips and talk/discuss their experiences improving their cultural capital.
<b>Y11 Mentoring Programme</b>	<b>5,663</b>	<b>£ +8</b>	Highly effective: Outcomes much stronger than previous years and student voice is positive about the experience and feels it is having an impact.
<b>Managing Distractions &amp; Self Esteem groups</b>	<b>1,656</b>	<b>£££ +4</b>	Medium impact – Student voice indicates variability.
<b>Elevate revision programme</b>	<b>222</b>		Highly effective in terms of developing positive attitudes to revision and study. It was rated highly by students.
<b>Other Intervention</b>	<b>1,783</b>		Effective for those that attend revision classes, but numbers are small. Provision of revision aids, etc. supports students.
	<b>146,894</b>		

*Sutton Trust Indicator NB: £££ +3 indicates a moderately expensive intervention with the equivalent of 3 months added learning.*

#### Overall Evaluation of KS4 Outcomes and Progress 2016

65% of our disadvantaged students achieved 5A\*-C including English and Maths. This is 4% higher than the national figure for all students (61%.)

The school's figure of 65% is significantly higher than the national figure for disadvantaged students of 38% 5A\*-C including English and Maths.

In terms of progress 8 our disadvantaged students had a score of 0, indicating average performance against all students nationally.

The attendance gap within the school was reduced by 0.61% for disadvantaged students. The persistent absenteeism figure has also decreased by 0.79% for this group of students.

#### The Differences: Cox Green Disadvantaged Student vs National Averages

<b>% 5A*-C including English and Maths</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>
Non-Pupil Premium students nationally	64%	64.7%	61%
Cox Green School Pupil Premium students	30%	36%	65%
Difference	<b>-34%</b>	<b>-28.7%</b>	<b>+4%</b>



## In School Differences

Headlines		Student Numbers	Measure
Average Total Progress 8	ALL		0.21
	FSM Ever 6		0.00
	Not FSM Ever 6		0.25
Students with 5 x A*-C inc English & Maths	ALL	107	73.5
	FSM Ever 6	12	65.0
	Not FSM Ever 6	95	74.8
Progress Measures	FSM Ever 6	Total	Percent
Students making 3+ LOP in English	ALL	128	89.0
	FSM Ever 6	14	75.0
	Not FSM Ever 6	114	91.2
Students making 4+ LOP in English	ALL	71	49.7
	FSM Ever 6	7	35.0
	Not FSM Ever 6	64	52.0
Students making 3+ LOP in Maths	ALL	115	80.0
	FSM Ever 6	13	73.7
	Not FSM Ever 6	102	81.0
Students making 4+ LOP in Maths	ALL	58	40.7
	FSM Ever 6	6	31.6
	Not FSM Ever 6	52	42.1
Value Added Total Measure	FSM Ever 6	Total	VA figure
Capped8 +EM VA Score	ALL		1032
	FSM Ever 6		1028
	Not FSM Ever 6		1033

In terms of year on year trends, the 5A\*-C including English and Maths gap between Pupil Premium students and Non Pupil Premium students has closed significantly within the school. It was -12% this year (2016) in comparison to -38% in 2015. The National gap between Pupil Premium students and Non-Pupil Premium students has historically been 27-28%.

## Case Studies

There are a number of case studies within the school which show impact of spend.