

# Pupil Premium strategy 2018-19: Term 2 update

This document contains:

- An overview: pages 1-2
- Detail of spend: pages 3-6
- Appendices providing further detail: pages 7-9

It is reviewed termly

## Overview

1. Summary information for Wilmslow High School										
<b>Academic Year</b>	2018-19	<b>Total PP budget</b>	£252,000					<b>Date of most recent PP Review</b>	July 2018	
<b>Total no. of pupils on 31.12.18</b>	1997	<b>No. eligible for PP on 31.12.18</b>	Y7	Y8	Y9	Y10	Y11	Total	<b>Date for next internal review of this strategy</b>	April 2019
			58	65	65	52	39	279		

2. Current attainment	Pupils eligible for PP at WHS	Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)
Progress 8 score average	-0.47	0.1

### 3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)

We believe that the greatest barrier to the future attainment of our PP students is that they do not engage as fully in our Whole Curriculum (Formal, Wider and Wilmslow Way) as other students for the reasons below. Therefore our strategy is focused on increasing the engagement of PP students in the Whole Curriculum.

#### Barriers to the Whole Curriculum

1. Low attendance and therefore lack of engagement with the Whole Curriculum

2. Impact of High Needs e.g. SEN and social & emotional health

3. Lack of parental engagement and support with the Whole Curriculum

#### Barriers to the Formal Curriculum

4. Lack of effective learning habits within the curriculum in reading, writing, exam technique & self-belief/concept

6. Needs to continue to develop our expertise in teaching 'hard to reach' students

5. Lack of engagement with the Formal Curriculum: Homework

7. Lack of grasp of literacy and numeracy basics amongst low-prior attaining PP students

#### Barriers to the Wider Curriculum

8. Lack of engagement with the 8 components of the Wider Curriculum

9. Lack of engagement and aspiration within the post-16 curriculum

4. Intended outcomes		Success Criteria	Term 1 RAG	T2 RAG	T3	Barrier
A	Improvement in the attendance figures for PP students and reduction in the persistent absence figures	An overall attendance figure of 93.5% for PP students (2017-18 attendance for PP students was 91%).	Up from 91% last year at 92.4% and rising	Improvement to 92.7%		1
		Persistent absence of 17.5% for PP students (2017-18 PA figure was 27%)	Down from 27% last year at 20.7% and falling	Further fall to 20.4%		
B	PP students make better progress from their starting points as measured by GL assessments and GCSE performance	At KS4 performance of PP students is in Quintile 2 for English and Maths				2
		At KS4 performance of PP students is in Quintile 3 for E Bacc and Open subjects				6
		At KS3 performance in GL assessments shows PP students making expected or more than expected progress from their starting points	Based on GL performance in summer 2018			7
C	PP parents engage with our Whole Curriculum	Engagement with 100% of PP parents through parents' evenings and individual contact		Currently 81%		3
D	PP students have effective learning habits	Teacher feedback indicates that PP students are more engaged in lessons as a result of Classroom Learning Focus	Classroom Learning Focus piloted by MV and DJ	Self-evaluation sharpens focus for curriculum teams		4
		Students enrolled on Accelerated Reader make 10 months progress against reading age				5
		PP students engaging effectively with Study Base to support homework completion		Study Base in place		
		100% of PP students have equipment for learning	Delayed by absence of PP Family Liaison worker	Adjusted plans in place for Term 3		
E	PP students participate in our Whole Curriculum	100% of PP students engaging with an aspect of our Whole Curriculum through extra Formal Curriculum tuition or Wider Curriculum activities	Monitoring indicates 35.4% of PP students receiving Formal curriculum tuition	Weekly monitoring of Engagement Tracker in place		8
F	PP students demonstrate aspirations for their futures	100% of PP students with an aspiration for the future	98%			9
		Continued improvement in the proportion of PP students gaining places in our Sixth Form (2017-18: 44% of PP students – up from 25% of PP students in 2016.)	56% of PP students have applied for a place in Sixth Form compared to 25% of PP students gaining places in 2016			

#### 5. Planned expenditure for 2018-19 to address barriers (and current RAG of action on this)

Quality teaching for all	Targeted Support	Other approaches
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective grouping and staffing in English and Maths: in place</li> <li>Developing roles with a focus on teaching 'hard to reach' students: in place</li> <li>Leadership Classroom Focus by LG/ ELG: moving to Stage 2 in HT4</li> <li>Metacognition CPD programme: developing</li> <li>Accelerated Reader programme: in place</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Academic Catch Up Base: in place</li> <li>Year 11 Breakfast Forms: in place</li> <li>Key Group Leads: developing</li> <li>Appropriate academic provision for High Need students: developing</li> <li>Improving the homework habits of PP students: focus in HT4</li> <li>Ensuring that all PP students have access to equipment and resources: focus in HT4</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attendance action plan: in place</li> <li>Resourcing the school and business community to support PP family engagement: developing</li> </ol>

## Detail of planned expenditure 2018-19

i. Quality teaching for all							
Intended outcomes	Chosen action/ approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff Lead	When will you review implementation?	Cost	SIP link
B PP students make better progress from their starting points as measured by GL assessments and GCSE performance	<p>i. (a) <b>Effective grouping and staffing</b> to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create mixed ability English groups in key stage 3</li> <li>• Provide more effective HITS intervention in English &amp; Maths for low prior attainers</li> <li>• Reduce class sizes</li> </ul> <p><u>Deploying staff effectively</u></p>	<p>School self-evaluation suggested that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pupil Premium students were more likely to be in lower English sets</li> <li>• Staffing for intervention groups could be improved</li> </ul> <p><i>Social Mobility Report into Low income pupils' progress at secondary school, Feb 2017:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High quality teaching of SEND pupils is fundamental</li> <li>• Need to focus resources on transition and key stage 3</li> <li>• Impact of setting on low income students</li> </ul>	<p>EEF support literature in pink</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review of grouping across curriculum teams led by TM to ensure optimal staffing and grouping</li> <li>2. Increase of staffing in English and Maths</li> <li>3. Identification of HITS Phonics and non-Phonics cohorts</li> <li>4. HITS team to work collaboratively to produce 'joined up' curriculum sequences</li> <li>5. Investment in assessment tools to measure impact</li> </ol> <p>EEF research on reducing class sizes (+3 impact), reading comprehension (+6), oral language interventions (+5), phonics (+4), mastery learning (+5) and guidance report on KS3 Maths</p>	TM	TM to review implementation following summative assessment 1 in HT3 to compare PP with non PP performance across groups	<p>Contribution towards cost of 2 x FTE teachers in Maths and English (English with a focus on 'hard to reach' students) to allow additional classes in KS3-4. Linked to use of Catch Up spend to provide LSAs for HITS KS3 programme</p> <p>£55,000</p> <p>Spend A-D</p>	SIP 1.3

i. Quality teaching for all							
Intended outcomes	Chosen action/ approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice? Research in purple EEF support literature in pink	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff Lead	When will you review implementation?	Cost	SIP link
B: At KS3 performance in GL assessments shows PP students making expected or more than expected progress from their starting points	i. (b) <b>Developing teams with a focus on teaching 'hard to reach' PP students</b>  <u>Deploying staff effectively</u>	Social Mobility Report into <i>Low income pupils' progress at secondary school, Feb 2017:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Schools can develop expertise in teaching pupils from low income backgrounds</li> </ul> Work of Rubie-Davies on <i>Becoming a high expectation teacher</i>	1. Ensuring that collaborative planning time is built in e.g. Developing Subject Expertise Groups 2. Continuing to develop strategies for improving teaching of 'hard to reach' students e.g. trialling the SLANT intervention. 3. Use of HITS 'ra ra' to share good practice	TM	TM to review implementation following summative assessment 1 in HT3 to compare PP with non PP performance across groups	Contribution towards salary of HITs lead teacher  £33,000  Spend E	SIP 1.3
D: 100% of PP students are routinely engaged in learning across the curriculum	i. (c) <b>Classroom Focus on building effective learning habits of PP students</b>  <u>High quality teaching for all</u>	School self-evaluation in 2017-18, with which our 2018 Ofsted inspection agreed, found that there was still some inconsistency of teaching and use of information to set work that matches students' needs and abilities across and within teams.	1. A well-focused weekly calendar of Classroom Focus activities to monitor the learning habits of PP students. 2. Weekly review built into leadership meetings. 3. Focus on Knowing our Students Better across teams including all teachers using formative mark books	MV	Review of impact of Classroom Learning Focus in February 2019	PP Operational Lead on LG: £6,000  Contribution towards cost of Class Charts: £6000 Linked to use of Catch Up spend to develop assessment in KS3 Spend F, G & H	SIP 2.1  SIP 2.4  SIP 3.3
D: 100% of PP students are routinely engaged in learning across the curriculum	i. (d) <b>Metacognition course developed for roll out in 2019-20</b>  <u>High quality teaching for all</u>	See barrier 4 and <b>EEF guidance report on metacognition</b>	DH and KW to develop a high-quality metacognition and self-regulation CPD course for teachers (see action plan) based on EEF Guidance Report and developed in collaboration with Aspirer Research School and Whole Education's Classroom Lab's project	DH	Review in HT3	Time allocated from R&D Lead on LG  £6000 Spend R	SIP 3.2
D Students enrolled on Accelerated Reader make 10 months progress against reading age	i. (e) <b>Using the Accelerated Reader programme for targeted groups</b>  <u>High quality teaching for all</u>	See barrier 4	1. Appropriate cohort of students identified 2. Use of STAR tests at initial, midyear and end of year points to measure impact	DS KB	Review of implementation following midyear STAR test	Contribution towards cost of Accelerated Reader and Star Tests  £4000	SIP ?
Total budgeted cost						£110,000.00	

ii. Targeted support							
Intended outcomes	Chosen action/ approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice? Research in purple EEF support literature in pink	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff Lead	When will you review implementation?	Cost	SIP link
B PP students make better progress from their starting points as measured by GL assessments and GCSE performance	ii. (a) <b>Resourcing an Academic Catch Up Base</b> to provide 'catch up' interventions  <u>Meeting individual learning needs</u>	Impact of Reintegration Base and Tactical Drop Downs outlined in 2017-18 evaluation <i>Extra Time report (The Sutton Trust Sep 2017): non-PP students receive more extra tuition outside the normal school timetable than PP students</i> EEF research on small group tuition (+4), extending school time (+2) and promising projects	1. Suitable staffing to resource base 2. Ensuring that taught interventions are sharply focused e.g. SLANT (Lemov) intervention to drill students into more effective learning habits that improve attention span. 3. Effective architecture to 'join up' the base with whole school and curriculum teams	CB	Review of implementation following summative assessment 1 in HT3	Contribution to spend on staffing of Academic Catch Up Base (and Tactical Drop Downs)  £37,500  Spend I	SIP 2.1
B PP students make better progress from their starting points as measured by GL assessments and GCSE performance	ii (b) <b>Resourcing Year 11 interventions to provide additional tuition</b> including Breakfast Forms & intervention activities  <u>Being data driven and responsive to evidence</u>	Impact of Year 11 interventions outlined in 2017-18 evaluation	1. Appropriate identification of students 2. Use of Sixth Form support 3. Daily intervention form to minimise disruption 4. Sharply focused intervention activities	RP	Review of implementation following summative assessment 1 in HT3	£7,000 toward staffing cost of interventions  Spend J	SIP 2.3
B PP students make better progress from their starting points as measured by GL assessments and GCSE performance	ii (c) <b>Resourcing raising attainment and Key Group roles</b>  <u>Providing a whole-school ethos of attainment for all attainers</u>	Impact of Maths TLR role outlined in 2017-18 evaluation  <i>Supporting the attainment of disadvantaged pupils research (2015): more successful schools did not stereotype PP students as a group with less potential to succeed</i>	1. Use of Key Group meetings (group and individual) 2. Use of Key Group Impact Tracker to track impact 3. Use of RB to support Key Group infrastructure	RP	Review impact based on July 2019 performance/ attendance	TLR 3 posts focused on PP Improvement: Maths/ Science PP KS4 Science = £5500 Time to Key Group Lead 5: £3000 = £8500 Spend K, L, M	SIP 2.3
B Academic performance of PP students accessing Inclusion improves as measured by Inclusion measures	ii. (d) <b>Ensuring appropriate academic provision is in place for all High Needs students</b>  <u>Meeting individual learning needs</u>	<i>The impact of siblings, particularly for PP students, is also outlined in the research paper on Sibling spillover effects in school achievement</i>	1. 'Join up' of work by Head of Inclusion and SENCO 2. Greater link with curriculum team provision 3. Strategic use of staff 'light time' to support High Need students	DC	Review of implementation following summative assessment 1 in HT3	£32,500 towards staffing costs of inclusion  (Key Group Lead 1 & 4)  Spend N	SIP 2.3  SIP 4.6
D Wilmslow Way points indicate an improvement in PP homework habits for	ii. (e) <b>Developing our homework provision</b>  <u>Meeting individual learning needs</u>	See barrier 5  EEF research into Homework (+5)	1. Resourcing of homework provision e.g. use of LN 2. Development of integrated approach to homework across	MV	Termly monitoring of impact on homework points, the tracker and staff feedback	Cost of Homework Base (staff time, equipment and resources) £ 4000  Spend S	SIP 1.7

students accessing homework provision			whole school and curriculum teams 3. Tracking of homework concerns				
---------------------------------------	--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--

## ii. Targeted support

Action... and link to Supporting the attainment of disadvantaged pupils	Intended outcome	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff Lead	When will you review implementation?	Cost	SIP link
D 100% of PP students have equipment to access the Formal Curriculum	<b>ii. (f) Ensuring that all PP students have access to equipment and resources for learning</b>  <u>Meeting individual learning needs</u>	See barrier 4	1. Programme of form time equipment checks 2. Equipment checked through Classroom Focus 3. Family liaison 4. Conversations	MV	Review through Classroom Focus process and form tutor monitoring	Basic Needs (Formal Curriculum) spend cost £3000  Spend Q	SIP 1.2
Total budgeted cost						£92,500	

## iii. Other approaches

Action... and link to Supporting the attainment of disadvantaged pupils	Intended outcome	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff Lead	When will you review implementation?	Cost	SIP link
A The proportion of PP students with attendance above 96% rises and the proportion of Pupil PP students with attendance below 90% falls	iii. (a) <b>Improving the attendance of Pupil Premium students</b>  <u>Addressing behaviour and attendance</u>	See barrier 1	1. Weekly attendance meeting to monitor attendance across all students: using Attendance Super Tracker and mark sheet 2. Swifter escalation system to flag up persistently low attendance 3. Use of Key Group Lead meeting to focus on students with below 80% attendance	SM	Half termly review of attendance	£18,000 on additional staffing and capacity for tackling school refusal (see attendance strategy)  Spend O located in SIP 2.2 & 4.2	SIP 2.2  SIP 4.2
C PP parents engage with our Whole Curriculum	iii. (b) <b>Using the school and business community</b> to widen aspirational opportunities and encounters for students and engage Pupil Premium students in the Whole Curriculum.  <u>Providing a whole-school ethos of attainment for all</u>	2016 Fair Education Alliance report: "fewer, stronger school-business partnerships work best:"  EEF research into parental engagement (+3)	1. Focused deployment of the PP family liaison role PP Team in engaging parents. 2. Extension of Expectation Evenings with development of parental workshops and use of GM to support parent engagement with Fire Fly. 3. Use of Engagement Tracker to track student and parental engagement with the Whole Curriculum and record PP students attendance at IAG appointments and employer encounters 4. Partners Programme to develop parent and business partner contacts and opportunities for students	MV	Monitoring of attendance at parental evenings and student engagement on the tracker	£6,000 on IAG and Business Partners  £11,000 PP family liaison role  Spend P located in SIP 4.7, 5.2 and 5.5	SIP 4.7  SIP 5.2  SIP 5.5
F PP students demonstrate aspirations for their futures							
E 100% of PP students engaging regularly with an aspect of our Whole Curriculum through extra Formal Curriculum							
	iii. (c) Use of Basic Needs (Wider Curriculum) spend to	See barrier 8	1. Basic needs funding allocated through an online process, authorised and recorded by PP	MV	Half termly review	£ 14,500	



tuition or Wider Curriculum activities	support access to the Wider Curriculum  <u>Meeting individual learning needs</u>		family liaison 2. Parents/carers made aware by letter of the support available 3. Named people and 'X-tra' staff identify students where financial support is the barrier			
Total budgeted cost						£49,500

## Appendix 1: Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP): further supporting information

1. Low attendance and therefore lack of engagement with the Whole Curriculum	<p>Our analysis of attendance indicates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That attendance is lower for PP than non-PP students</li> <li>• The attendance for PP students falls off more sharply than for non-PP students after HT1 and does not recover as strongly from HT3</li> <li>• That attendance is particularly low for PP boys, and particularly in key stage 4</li> <li>• That PP attendance is affected by the higher proportion of PP students who are also SEN, and the higher proportion of PP students who are low prior attainers</li> </ul>																																			
2. Impact of High Needs e.g. SEN and social & emotional mental health	<p>Our high needs students are composed of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students who are SEN</li> <li>• Students who have difficulty engaging fully with lessons for medical, anxiety or school refusal reasons</li> <li>• Students who have difficulty engaging fully with lessons for behavioural reasons</li> <li>• Students who are 'mobile' and have attended more than one primary or secondary school</li> </ul> <p>Our analysis indicates that a significantly higher proportion of our PP students have a 'high need' than our non-PP students:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Year 7</th> <th>Year 8</th> <th>Year 9</th> <th>Year 10</th> <th>Year 11</th> <th>2017 Year 11</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>% of PP students</td> <td>43%</td> <td>34%</td> <td>37%</td> <td>22%</td> <td>34%</td> <td>61%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No. of PP students</td> <td>26</td> <td>24</td> <td>19</td> <td>9</td> <td>14</td> <td>28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% of Non PP students</td> <td>14%</td> <td>18%</td> <td>17%</td> <td>17%</td> <td>16%</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No. of Non PP students</td> <td>37</td> <td>42</td> <td>42</td> <td>47</td> <td>42</td> <td>23</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>In 2017, PP students filling all the Progress 8 elements, and without a High Need, gained a Progress 8 score of +0.7.</p>		Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	Year 11	2017 Year 11	% of PP students	43%	34%	37%	22%	34%	61%	No. of PP students	26	24	19	9	14	28	% of Non PP students	14%	18%	17%	17%	16%	10%	No. of Non PP students	37	42	42	47	42	23
	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	Year 11	2017 Year 11																														
% of PP students	43%	34%	37%	22%	34%	61%																														
No. of PP students	26	24	19	9	14	28																														
% of Non PP students	14%	18%	17%	17%	16%	10%																														
No. of Non PP students	37	42	42	47	42	23																														
3. Lack of parental engagement and support with the Whole Curriculum	<p>PP parents are less likely to engage with parental activities such as Expectations Evenings:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year Group</th> <th>PP</th> <th>Non PP</th> <th>Gap</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>59%</td> <td>86%</td> <td>27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>28%</td> <td>56%</td> <td>28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9</td> <td>8%</td> <td>44%</td> <td>36</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>17%</td> <td>47%</td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>11</td> <td>23%</td> <td>44%</td> <td>21</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year Group	PP	Non PP	Gap	7	59%	86%	27	8	28%	56%	28	9	8%	44%	36	10	17%	47%	30	11	23%	44%	21											
Year Group	PP	Non PP	Gap																																	
7	59%	86%	27																																	
8	28%	56%	28																																	
9	8%	44%	36																																	
10	17%	47%	30																																	
11	23%	44%	21																																	
4. Lack of effective learning habits within the curriculum in reading, writing, exam technique and self-belief/ concept	<p>Key foci for groups of students:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Issue</th> <th>All</th> <th>High prior attainers</th> <th>Mid prior attainers</th> <th>Low prior attainers</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Reading</td> <td>Engagement</td> <td>Wider reading</td> <td>Wider reading</td> <td>Vocabulary and cultural capital</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Issue	All	High prior attainers	Mid prior attainers	Low prior attainers	Reading	Engagement	Wider reading	Wider reading	Vocabulary and cultural capital																									
Issue	All	High prior attainers	Mid prior attainers	Low prior attainers																																
Reading	Engagement	Wider reading	Wider reading	Vocabulary and cultural capital																																

	Writing	Lack of confidence	Complex sentence structures, spelling and analysis	Spelling and punctuation/ lack of accurate terminology and fragmented sentences Homophone errors	Spelling and punctuation
	Exam Technique	Lack of confidence	Developed and detailed responses	Lack of retention of knowledge and overlearning so learning gaps build up	
	Self-belief/ concept	Low expectation of self and work, lack of confidence and responsibility for learning, fear of asking for help in lessons; students who are happy to blend into the background			Short attention span
	Organisation	Poor organisation/ lack of equipment, resources e.g. revision guides/ access to tutors/ difficulty in accessing Fire Fly/ difficulty in printing from computers.		Purchasing of the text for Year 10 low to mid prior attaining groups; therefore students cannot annotate their books	
5. Lack of engagement with the Formal Curriculum: homework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the summer term 2018, 29% of behaviour points given for missing homework (Y7-10) were given to Pupil Premium students who make up 18% of the Y7-10 cohort.</li> <li>PP students are more likely to experience problems accessing IT-based resources e.g. Firefly</li> </ul>				
6. Need to continue to develop our expertise in teaching of 'hard to reach' students	<p>Characteristics of teaching at Wilmslow High School:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extremely wide social composition (see details in additional information below)</li> <li>Extremely wide prior attainment range with proportion of EHCP and high prior attaining students well above national averages</li> <li>Large class sizes due to low Cheshire East funding and oversubscription of the school</li> </ul> <p>Team self-evaluation indicates that many teachers would like to gain further expertise in teaching of 'hard to reach' students in terms of low prior attainment and low engagement with learning.</p>				
7. Lack of grasp of literacy and numeracy basics amongst low prior attaining PP students	Our analysis of student performance indicates that PP students are more likely to have poor literacy and numeracy skills (in English both in terms of students with a weak grasp of phonics and students with a stronger grasp of phonics but who are still performing below expectation, and in Maths due to gaps in basic number work and times table.) In the 2018-19 key stage three HITS groups, PP students (approximately 18% of the total cohort) make up the following proportion: Year 7: 37%, Year 8: 30%, Year 9: 40%				
8. Lack of engagement with the 8 components of the Wider Curriculum	PP students are less likely to get involved in the Wider Curriculum. There are a number of reasons why, such as cost, lack of confidence/self-belief, lack of parental support and transport issues. For example, In 2017/18 approx. 15% of the PP students in Years 9/10 completed their D of E bronze compared to 40% of non-PP students				
9. Lack of engagement with aspiration within the post-16 curriculum	PP students are less likely to apply for our join our Sixth Form, though numbers increased over the past 2 academic years.				



	2016	2017	2018
Proportion of our disadvantaged students progressing into sixth form	25%	46%	44%
Proportion of our non-disadvantaged students progressing into sixth form	67%	67%	64%
<b>Gap between the two</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>20%</b>
Proportion of our high prior attaining disadvantaged students progressing into sixth form	46%	69%	80%
Proportion of our mid prior attaining disadvantaged students progressing into sixth form	23%	25%	34%

## Appendix 2: Additional Information about the school context

Taken from our self-evaluation document:

- **A school with an extremely wide social composition**

Cheshire East has the highest number of 'least deprived' Lower Super Output Areas in the northwest. Approximately 48% of the population are in the least deprived quintile, over double the English national average. Consequently, our percentage of disadvantaged students (16%) places us in the 2<sup>nd</sup> lowest quintile. According to our 2017 IDSR, social deprivation is in the lowest quintile, and the lowest IDACI scores in the school are 0.01; **however, there are significant pockets of deprivation around Wilmslow**, with 2 LSOAs (containing Spath Lane in Handforth and Colshaw) in the top 20% of most deprived areas in England. A Oneplace Report ranked these areas within the most deprived in England. Examination of the 2011 OAC data shows that, unlike nearby Bramhall, Poynton and Cheadle Hulme, our catchment contains significant pockets of Constrained City Dwellers and Hard-Pressed Living. Towards Handforth the balance shifts significantly with Constrained City Dwellers and Hard-Pressed Livers making up approximately half the population. Research by LKMco in 2014 identified these as the two groups most likely to have poor educational outcomes.

<https://www.lkmco.org/the-coastal-question-ofsted-and-the-new-frontiers-in-education-research/>

A significant minority of our students enter the school with an extremely low level of Academic Belonging, which is the greater for being within a mostly affluent community. The 2016 Sutton Trust Report: *Believing in Better*, points out that: "Students from schools with a higher proportion of students eligible for free school meals were found to have significantly higher academic self-concepts. Thus, it is important to consider the broader context when studying the complex relationship between academic self-concept and academic attainment."

## Appendix 3: Supporting documents and research

## Grouping and structures

Expecting our PP students to reach their academic potential

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/594363/Progress\\_at\\_Secondary\\_School\\_report\\_final.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/594363/Progress_at_Secondary_School_report_final.pdf)

<https://www.amazon.co.uk/Becoming-Expectation-Teacher-Christine-Rubie-Davies/dp/0415713374>

<https://www.amazon.co.uk/Leadership-Teacher-Learning-Creating-Teachers/dp/1941112269>

[https://www.suttontrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/Extra-time-report\\_FINAL.pdf](https://www.suttontrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/Extra-time-report_FINAL.pdf)

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/supporting-the-attainment-of-disadvantaged-pupils>

<https://www.iser.essex.ac.uk/research/publications/working-papers/iser/2014-40.pdf>

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/412638/The link between absence and attainment at KS2 and KS4.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/412638/The_link_between_absence_and_attainment_at_KS2_and_KS4.pdf)

<http://www.faireducation.org.uk/report-card/>

[https://www.lambeth.gov.uk/rsu/sites/lambeth.gov.uk.rsu/files/Raising\\_the\\_Achievement\\_of\\_White\\_Working\\_Class\\_Pupils\\_-\\_Barriers\\_and\\_School\\_Strategies\\_2014.pdf](https://www.lambeth.gov.uk/rsu/sites/lambeth.gov.uk.rsu/files/Raising_the_Achievement_of_White_Working_Class_Pupils_-_Barriers_and_School_Strategies_2014.pdf)