

+



Hyde Community College
Pupil Premium Funding 2015-16
(Academic Year)
Review – Measuring Impact

Review and Tracking Process

We fully appreciate that no single intervention provides a complete solution to the complex educational issues in any school and it is therefore important that we operate a multi-faceted approach. We feel that this offers the best opportunity for pupils to succeed. However, we do believe that one key to the narrowing difference between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students is the careful and thorough monitoring and tracking of individual pupils. At Hyde Community College this is done on a daily basis by our teaching staff. Daily tracking enables teaching staff to report progress and attainment through our process of **half termly tracking** which in turn allows middle and senior leaders to make informed choices.

Half termly tracking forms the basis of many of our conversations surrounding the impact of our Pupil Premium spending.

The following pages measure the impact of the interventions put into place across the school and curriculum.

Measuring Impact:
Summer 2016 GCSE Results:
PROGRESS 8 (DATA TAKEN FROM RAISE ONLINE)

ENGLISH

	ALL	DISADVANTAGED
COHORT	168	73
SCORE	0.2	0.1

Sig + and top 10%

The figure of +0.1 for disadvantaged students at HCC is a very positive one as it is in line with non-disadvantaged nationally. The comparator used for disadvantaged students is the national figure for non-disadvantaged students.

This means that the disadvantaged students at Hyde Community College are being compared to non-disadvantaged students nationally. To have a score of +0.1 (and in line with 'Others') is a positive achievement for PP students at Hyde.

MATHS

	ALL	DISADVANTAGED
COHORT	168	73
SCORE	0.3	0.2

Sig + and top 10%

As with the English scores, the scores for maths are pleasing. The figure of +0.2 for disadvantaged students is a very positive one. The comparator used for disadvantaged students is the national figure for non-disadvantaged students.

This means that the disadvantaged students at Hyde Community College are being compared to non-disadvantaged students nationally. To have a score of +0.2 is a positive achievement for PP students at Hyde especially as this is above the national 'Others' figure.

EBACC

	ALL	DISADVANTAGED
COHORT	168	73
SCORE	-0.2	-0.4
CI +/-	0.2	0.3

Sig- not bottom 10%

	LOW		MIDDLE		HIGH	
	ALL	DIS	ALL	DIS	ALL	DIS
COHORT	29	16	93	41	46	16
SCORE	0.28	0.09	-0.31	-0.62	-0.38	-0.37
NATIONAL	0.00	0.21	0.00	0.18	0.00	0.09
DIFFERENCE	0.28	-0.12	-0.31	-0.81	-0.38	-0.45
CI +/-	0.50	0.68	0.28	0.42	0.40	0.68
RANK				86		

The number of students opting for EBACC at HCC is very low. As a result of this, when comparing performance, the small cohort size must be taken into account. Middle ability and, in particular, disadvantaged students performed significantly below national averages. The school is undergoing a full curriculum review in order to address the low uptake of EBACC.

OPEN ELEMENT

	ALL	DISADVANTAGED
COHORT	168	73
SCORE	-0.1	-0.3
CI +/-	0.2	0.3

Sig- not bottom 10%

Sig- and bottom 10%

	LOW		MIDDLE		HIGH	
	ALL	DIS	ALL	DIS	ALL	DIS
COHORT	29	16	93	41	46	16
SCORE	0.20	0.08	-0.10	-0.36	-0.37	-0.68
NATIONAL	0.00	0.18	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.06
DIFFERENCE	0.20	-0.10	-0.10	-0.49	-0.37	-0.74
CI +/-	0.45	0.61	0.25	0.38	0.36	0.61
RANK				86		

The 'Open Element' takes into consideration those subjects not already counted in the EBacc.

These figures from Raise Online identify a further key group for analysis. That is the higher ability students and, in particular, the disadvantaged students. The difference in the school's performance data and the national average for this group is -0.74. This is significantly negative (within the bottom 10% of the country).

PASS BOTH ENGLISH AND MATHS GRADE C OR ABOVE

	ALL	DISADVANTAGED
COHORT	176	78
SCHOOL %	71	63
NATIONAL %	62	69 **
DIFFERENCE %	9	-6

** The Raise Online tables that show progress for prior attainment groups or show attainment contain national comparators. The comparator used for disadvantaged students is the national figure for non-disadvantaged students.

This means that the disadvantaged students at Hyde Community College are being compared to non-disadvantaged students nationally.

Put simply, of the 78 HCC disadvantaged students, 63% achieved a grade C or above in both English and maths. This is a very positive achievement. The comparison that is drawn here is against the 69% national figure for non-disadvantaged students.

The school continues to work on eliminating this gap.

GRADE C OR ABOVE IN BOTH ENGLISH AND MATHS

	LOW		MIDDLE		HIGH	
	ALL	DIS	ALL	DIS	ALL	DIS
COHORT	29	16	93	41	46	16
SCHOOL %	31	31	72	63	98	94
NATIONAL %	11	13	62	68	95	97
DIFFERENCE %	20	18	10	-4	2	-3
DIFFERENCE NO. OF STUDENTS	5	2	9	-1	1	0



1 OR MORE GRADES ABOVE NATIONAL

Significance tests for disadvantaged students in school are compared with national figure for 'Other' pupils.

Across all ability bands the gap between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students at HCC is exceptionally small. We are very proud of this.

EXPECTED AND GOOD PROGRESS MEASURES

Although this is a legacy measure and, in future years, will be phased out, as much of our tracking for five years has been based around progress measures, we felt that it was important to include it in our analysis.

The figures in brackets are those from 2015 for comparison.

ENGLISH	EXPECTED PROGRESS % (2015 figures)	GOOD PROGRESS % (2015 figures)
ALL	80 (63)	32 (22)
PUPIL PREMIUM	74 (56)	21 (12)
NON PUPIL PREMIUM	84 (67)	40 (28)
GAP BETWEEN PP AND NON PP	10%	19%

MATHS	EXPECTED PROGRESS % (2015 figures)	GOOD PROGRESS % (2015 figures)
ALL	76 (69)	40 (31)
PUPIL PREMIUM	70 (56)	36 (20)
NON PUPIL PREMIUM	81 (76)	44 (37)
GAP BETWEEN PP AND NON PP	11%	8%

INTERNAL DATA USED FOR THE FOLLOWING ANALYSES:

2016 SUBJECT BREAKDOWN
(SORTED BY BEST % PUPIL PREMIUM EXPECTED PROGRESS)

SUBJECT	COHORT (PP)	% PP EXPECTED PROGRESS	% PP GOOD PROGRESS	% NON PP EXPECTED PROGRESS	% NON PP GOOD PROGRESS
MUSIC TECHNOLOGY	7 (4)	100	75	67	0
BUSINESS	38 (16)	81	44	91	64
FRENCH	10 (6)	80	40	75	0
ENGLISH LANGUAGE	176 (78)	74	21	84	40
CATERING	17 (8)	71	29	50	25
MATHS	176 (78)	70	36	81	44
ADDITIONAL MATHS	17 (6)	67	33	91	73
MUSIC	14 (3)	67	3	82	27
HEALTH AND SOCIAL	36 (19)	63	37	82	65
GEOGRAPHY	40 (13)	62	31	67	44
ENGLISH LITERATURE	176 (78)	59	31	73	42
ICT	25 (12)	58	33	77	62
GRAPHICS	14 (9)	56	44	100	40
PRODUCT	47 (24)	52	26	50	27
ART	40 (20)	50	25	74	42
BIOLOGY	50 (14)	50	29	75	33
CHEMISTRY	50 (14)	50	21	72	39
HISTORY	51 (25)	44	20	46	31
SCIENCE	126 (64)	44	16	48	12
ADDITIONAL SCIENCE	101 (50)	41	12	43	14
EXPRESSIVE ARTS	14 (5)	40	0	67	22
SPANISH	12 (5)	40	20	43	43
GCSE PE	36 (15)	36	14	55	25
PHYSICS	50 (14)	36	21	78	36
ICT COMPUTER SCIENCE	38 (17)	18	6	55	25

The table above compares the different curriculum areas within school and is ordered by the highest percentage of PP achieving expected progress. There is a clear difference between a subject such as music technology (100% PP EP) and ICT computer science (18% PP EP). As such, this leads the school to investigate further the sharing of good practice between departments and subject leaders as to strategies to raise the achievements of the disadvantaged students.

2016 SUBJECT BREAKDOWN
(SORTED BY BEST % PUPIL PREMIUM GOOD PROGRESS)

SUBJECT	COHORT (PP)	% PP EXPECTED PROGRESS	% PP GOOD PROGRESS	% NON PP EXPECTED PROGRESS	% NON PP GOOD PROGRESS
MUSIC TECHNOLOGY	7 (4)	100	75	67	0
BUSINESS	38 (16)	81	44	91	64
GRAPHICS	14 (9)	56	44	100	40
FRENCH	10 (6)	80	40	75	0
HEALTH AND SOCIAL	36 (19)	63	37	82	65
MATHS	176 (78)	70	36	81	44
ADDITIONAL MATHS	17 (6)	67	33	91	73
ICT	25 (12)	58	33	77	62
GEOGRAPHY	40 (13)	62	31	67	44
ENGLISH LITERATURE	176 (78)	59	31	73	42
CATERING	17 (8)	71	29	50	25
BIOLOGY	50 (14)	50	29	75	33
PRODUCT	47 (24)	52	26	50	27
ART	40 (20)	50	25	74	42
ENGLISH LANGUAGE	176 (78)	74	21	84	40
CHEMISTRY	50 (14)	50	21	72	39
PHYSICS	50 (14)	36	21	78	36
HISTORY	51 (25)	44	20	46	31
SPANISH	12 (5)	40	20	43	43
SCIENCE	126 (64)	44	16	48	12
GCSE PE	36 (15)	36	14	55	25
ADDITIONAL SCIENCE	101 (50)	41	12	43	14
ICT COMPUTER SCIENCE	38 (17)	18	6	55	25
MUSIC	14 (3)	67	3	82	27
EXPRESSIVE ARTS	14 (5)	40	0	67	22

The table above compares the different curriculum areas within school and is ordered by the highest percentage of PP achieving good progress. There is a clear difference between a subject such as music technology (75% PP GP) and expressive art (0% PP GP).

As such, this leads the school to investigate further the sharing of good practice between departments and subject leaders as to strategies to raise the achievements of the disadvantaged students.

AVERAGE NUMBER OF GCSES ACHIEVED

		AVERAGE NUMBER OF GCSE A*-C
AVERAGE NUMBER A*-C PER NON PP STUDENT	623 / 98	6.36
AVERAGE NUMBER A*-C PER PP STUDENT	393 / 78	5.04
DIFFERENCE		1.32

		AVERAGE NUMBER OF GCSE A*-G
AVERAGE NUMBER A*-G PER NON PP STUDENT	835 / 98	8.52
AVERAGE NUMBER A*-G PER PP STUDENT	647 / 78	8.29
DIFFERENCE		0.23

The difference between non PP students and PP students achieving A*-C grades was, on average, 1.32 GCSE grades.

The difference between non PP students and PP students achieving A*-G grades was, on average, 0.23 GCSE grades.

The school continues to work on eliminating this gap.

2015-16 ACADEMIC YEAR - ATTENDANCE BY YEAR GROUP

YEAR GROUP	NON PP STUDENTS %	PP STUDENTS %	DIFFERENCE
7	95.45	94.56	0.89
8	96.58	93.03	3.55
9	93.80	93.39	0.41
10	94.52	90.12	4.4
11 (2016 leavers)	93.42	92.01	1.41

There are clear differences in the attendance of the different year groups. The largest difference was in Year 10 with 4.4% difference in favour of the non PP students.

This is in contrast to the Year 9 data where the difference, at 0.41% in favour of non PP students, is minimal.

A school attendance officer has been appointed in the last number of years to focus on increasing attendance across all school groups and also to reward those students who have high attendances.