

Pupil premium: 2012-13

Bury Church of England High School receives a Pupil Premium grant for each Looked After Child and for any child who has received or been entitled to receive free school meals at some point during the last six years. The Pupil Premium grant for Bury Church of England High School for 2012 – 13 was £38.626

With the support and authorisation of the Governing Body, it was agreed that this grant was to be allocated in the following ways:

- Resources to support the education of the pupil premium recipients, including the support of the funding of school trips and educational experiences, extracurricular activities and learning booster provision and resources to support learning.
- Assessment materials to develop knowledge of reading skills and levels and also to obtain Cognitive Ability scores and projections so that we can identify underachievement and monitor core literacy skills amongst pupils, particularly in the Pupil Premium cohort.
- To support the cost of the part-time employment of an intervention teacher to offer small group or individual tuition programmes.
- To partially support the employment of a special needs teacher to deliver support programmes as appropriate to the pupil premium recipients.
- To partially support the cost of the employment of a Learning Mentor whose role it is to provide support to pupils to overcome barriers to learning resulting from their deprivation.
- To partially support the cost of employment of subject teaching assistants to provide individual and small group intervention in specific subjects.

We have also used the grant and intend to continue to use some of it to develop improved monitoring systems that can ensure that pupils in receipt of the Pupil Premium are making good and sustained progress. This has been effected by the use of a technical consultant and the employment of a ICT manager designated for the first time as responsible for monitoring systems and their development.

Retrospective Analysis and Evaluation.

Although future statements from academic year 2013/14 will include interim analyses, because of the method of the introduction of pupil premium and its accountability measures and the release of data pertaining to it, our 2012/13 report is solely a retrospective analysis and evaluation. We include in it discussion of attendance, pupil attainment and progress.

Attendance.

The figures for attendance for the school year 2012/2013 for pupil premium pupils and for non-premium pupils were as follows:

Attendance Statistics Summary for 2012/13 Academic Year	Attendance	Unauthorised absence
Year 7 PP pupil	94.26%	0.11%
Year 7 Non-PP pupil	93.96%	0.24%
Difference	0.30 %	-0.14%
Year 8 PP pupil	94.34%	0.24%
Year 8 Non-PP pupil	95.78%	0.08%
Difference	-1.45%	0.16%
Year 9 PP pupil	94.34%	0.42%
Year 9 Non-PP pupil	95.26%	0.19%
Difference	-0.92%	0.24%
Year 10 PP pupil	95.06%	0.62%
Year 10 Non-PP pupil	93.03%	0.16%
Difference	2.03%	0.46%
Year 11 PP pupil	77.81%	0.38%
Year 11 Non-PP pupil	80.77%	0.23%
Difference	-2.96%	0.15%

Pupil attainment and pupil progress.

The point scores comparison for pupil premium pupils 2012/13 was as follows:

Average Points Score Analysis

	Average Point Score per student for their top 6 results	Average Points Score per subject for students' top 6 results	Average Point Score per subject for Eng & Maths	Average Point Score per student for their top 8 results Inc Eng & Maths	Average Point Score per subject for students' top 8 results inc Eng & Maths	Average Point Score per student for their top 8 results
School	262.10	43.68	83.38	345.47	43.18	346.21
Females	279.27	46.54	86.55	365.82	45.73	366.61
Males	242.03	40.34	79.66	321.69	40.21	322.37
Ability						
High Ability	303.58	50.60	95.36	398.93	49.87	399.95
Medium Ability	252.76	42.13	81.92	334.68	41.84	335.24
Low Ability	174.75	29.13	53.50	228.25	28.53	228.85
Pupil Premium						
Pupil Premium	242.00	40.33	76.00	318.00	39.75	318.67

We await and will publish the Raise online figures when they are available.

Evaluation.

We welcome the funding to support our pupil premium eligible pupils and to ensure their achievement compared to other groups in school. We continue to work through the anomalies in the system to effectively support these pupils; there is an issue regarding a lack of cohesion between school years and the arrival of funding and the process of identification. We also have more work to do on understanding the role of the virtual head when the one for Bury is appointed and how that will direct funding, and over the identification of service children. However, we warmly welcome the new notification system presented to us this Summer and believe it will aid our work significantly.

In terms of attendance, the figures clearly identify some individuals for us that need improved mentoring and support but indicate no significant general discrepancies between pupil premium and non-pupil premium groups. The differential is explicable in every case by the impact of one or two pupils on relatively small cohorts.

In year 7 pupil premium pupils (10 pupils) had on average a higher attendance than non premium pupils (94.26% as opposed to 93.96%) and their unauthorised absence was also lower (0.11% to 0.24%). There were two children with unauthorised absences but there was one (different) child with an attendance rate significantly lower than the average who would benefit from individual support. In year 8 the rates for pupil premium pupils (10 pupils) in both categories were slightly worse than non-pupil premium pupils (94.3 compared to 95.7

and 0.24 compared to 0.8) but the figure for unauthorised absences was generated by just one child and the context was a figure for the whole year which was exceptionally low. The year 9 pattern followed that of year 8 – three pupils with lower than average attendance brought the figure for pupil premium attendance (10 pupils) below the non-pupil premium pupils (94.3 compared to 95.2) and the unauthorised absence of one pupil who spent time on holiday was significant in bringing the average down (0.42 compared to 0.19). There were 6 pupil premium pupils in year 10 and their attendance was better on average than non-premium pupils (95% compared to 93%) but their unauthorised attendance was worse (0.62% compared to 0.16%). This figure, however, was solely generated by one pupil. In year 11 there were 9 pupil premium pupils and both figures for attendance relating to pupil premium pupils were lower than the average for the rest of the cohort, perhaps by the most significant amount in attendance (2.96% lower for attendance although only 0.15 higher for unauthorised absence); however, once again, the results were significantly affected by a small number of the pupil premium cohort, in this case two of the pupil premium pupils who had very low attendance and who also were the only pupils with unauthorised absences.

We conclude that our response this year should be more effectively targeted monitoring and support for individuals identified through the process whilst we keep a continued and careful watch on the overall situation.

In regards to attainment, the pupil premium pupils performed below school average for points aggregate and in the key performance indicators; 4 of the 9 (44.4%) achieved 5A* - C including English and Maths, 2 of the 9 achieved both 3 and 5 or more A*/A grades and 2 of the 9 (22.2%) obtained the English Baccalaureate subjects. Obviously, this attainment summary needs to be evaluated through the lens of prior learning data. Four of the pupils were in the lower ability grouping, four in middle ability and one in the higher ability group. The higher ability pupil exceeded the attainment of the average higher ability child by a significant amount (342 points top 6 scores at average of 57 compared to 303 and 50). The middle ability pupils told no simple story. Two exceeded the average points score for the top 6 by a significant amount – 56 and 54 respectively compared to 42; one pupil was exactly equivalent (42) and one was significantly lower (29). Here, attendance patterns coincided. In the lower ability group of four, three were above the average points score for the top 6 (41, 33 and 30 compared to 29) and one was significantly lower (21).

We conclude that the pupil in the higher ability range did equally well with peers but that the pattern was slightly more mixed in the other two sections and the disadvantage showed significantly for 18% of the pupils – although in reality in such a small group this involved only two individuals. Our future focus must be to intervene and fund effective interventions for those pupils on the pupil premium register who fall into the middle and lower ability ranges and who are underachieving.