



Society for Educational Studies

Surname: DURRANT

First name(s): IAN

Title: MR

Position and employer: SENIOR LECTURER, CANTERBURY CHRIST CHURCH
UNIVERSITY

Title: **Measuring the impact of the Pupil Premium in relation to alternative learning**



Society for Educational Studies

Copyright

© Canterbury Christ Church University 2014

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, modified, amended, or stored in any retrieval system, or transmitted by, in any form or by any means, without prior permission of Canterbury Christ Church University.

**North Holmes Road
Canterbury
Kent
CT1 1QU
United Kingdom**

Tel: 01227 767700

Fax: 01227 470442

Website: www.canterbury.ac.uk

Contents

Executive Summary	4
1. Introduction	6
2. The Research Project.....	11
3. Findings	15
3.1 Understanding Of The Purpose Of The Pupil Premium	15
3.2 Claiming And Auditing	16
3.3 Pupil Premium And Additional Funding	17
3.4 Person(S) Responsible For Allocation Of Funds	17
3.5 Uses Of The Pupil Premium.....	18
3.6 Auditing.....	22
3.7 Measuring The Impact	23
3.8 Reporting The Pupil Premium	35
3.9 Further Comments	38
4. Conclusions & Recommendations.....	41
References.....	43
Appendix 1 - Interview Questions	46
Appendix 2 – Questionnaire	49

Measuring the impact of the Pupil Premium in relation to alternative learning **Executive Summary**

1. The project was conducted with support from the Society for Educational Studies, (SES). The society, established in 1951, provides support for the advancement of scholarship, debate, and research in Educational Studies in the United Kingdom.
2. A research proposal was submitted to the SES in January 2013 and a small grant of £5k was awarded in February 2013
3. The aims of the project were;
 - To investigate how schools in the South East are using the pupil premium funding allocation to address the needs of targeted pupils.
 - To investigate how these schools are measuring the impact of this in terms of the schools' effectiveness measures of pupils' attainment, achievement and attendance, and the schools' improvement measures of pupils' behaviour, self-esteem and community relations.
 - To investigate if the schools are able to estimate what the return is of the investment of the pupil premium.
4. The objectives were;
 - To identify the differences in how the schools are using the funding they receive as the pupil premium.
 - To identify how the schools measure the impact of the pupil premium funding.
 - To make recommendations about the areas in which it is demonstrated that the most impact or highest return on investment appears.
5. The research was conducted by a combination of case studies (five schools were visited) and an online questionnaire was distributed between May-June 2013 (N=80).
6. Most respondents understood the purposes of the pupil premium, although some felt that the measures of its impact should be more holistic.
7. In all cases, the largest proportion of children for which the pupil premium was claimed was those receiving Free School Meals (FSM) and those who were Looked After Children (LAC, that is those in the care of the local authority).
8. The member of staff that was assigned to the task of claiming and allocating the pupil premium funding varied between the schools however, in the majority of cases, the ultimate responsibility lay with the respective Senior Management Teams.
9. Use of the funds also varied, although the largest proportion of the schools reported using it directly for the identified groups of children (those in receipt of

FSM and those that are LAC). For the most part this was to work with individual children/specialist projects.

It was also used to improve behaviour, motivation, aspiration and engagement, which respondents felt in turn, would improve attainment. Staffing costs accounted for a large amount of the expenditure; using or employing Teaching Assistants (TAs) or other specialists.

10. When asked about measuring the impact of the funding, the majority achieved this through reporting progress. For a number of participants this was a comparative measure of expected progress. However, many did feel there were weaknesses in their chosen method. These perceived weaknesses ranged from a lack of robust measures and insecurity about their chosen comparisons, to a lack of ownership by the staff. One school did seem to have developed a robust method; using Average Point Score (APS) and tracking mechanisms, but this appeared to be an exception.
11. When asked how the method of measuring impact was developed, most respondents had used internal expertise, attended commercial seminars or training or looked online for help. However, respondents did ask that more central guidance and examples of best practice be published.
12. Similarly, schools felt that awareness amongst their stakeholders varied. For example, some reported that parents were unaware of the pupil premium, whereas others felt that their parents were overly demanding in asking how the funds were used. Likewise, although the schools' governors were aware of the pupil premium, they varied in the extent to which they held their respective schools to account for the expenditure and impact.
13. The findings of this research have led to a number of recommendations. They centre on the need for more guidance to be published. Schools are aware of the need to use the funding as efficiently and effectively as possible, however they often feel that they lack the expertise to do this to the extent that stakeholders (including parents and Ofsted require) and that the pupils deserve.

*Mr Ian Durrant,
Senior Lecturer, Department of Professional Development
ian.durrant@canterbury.ac.uk
June 2014*

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The pupil premium was introduced by the Coalition Government in April 2011. This is extra funding given to publicly funded schools, paid by their Local Authority and with the express intention of raising the attainment of disadvantaged pupils. Initially, this was set at £430 per pupil, per year, for those who were in receipt of free school meals (FSM) and those who had been 'looked after' (under the care of the Local Authority) for a minimum period of 6 months. Also for the period 2011-2012, those pupils that were children of armed services personnel, were also considered to be under many stresses and challenges, were awarded a premium rate of £200 per pupil (this to be spent on pastoral care in particular).
- 1.2 For the period 2012-2013, this was extended to all children that were eligible for FSM, or had been eligible (as recorded on the school census in January 2012) on any of the termly school censuses since Summer 2006 (for the funding purposes, these pupils are known as "Ever 6 FSM"). The rate per pupil, both Ever 6 FSM and LAC, increased to £623 for this period and to £250 for Service Children.
- 1.3 In 2013-2014, funding was increased to £900 per Ever 6 FSM and LAC pupil at secondary school level and to £953 to those at primary level. The premium for Service Children was raised to £300 per pupil (the service premium).
- 1.4 It has been reported that the total for the pupil premium budget for the 2014-2015 financial year will be increased once more to £2.5 billion (DfE, 12th December 2013).
- 1.5 The government's commitment to "narrowing the gap" and now "closing the gap" in school attainment between those pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds and those that are not, has resulted in these phrases becoming ubiquitous in relation to British education for both the Labour and the Coalition Governments. The 'gap' refers to the link that research suggests is related to pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds consistently underperforming, as compared to pupils from more affluent backgrounds that do not. Although there are a number of elements by which "disadvantage" may be measured, one that is most commonly used is the pupil's eligibility for Free School Meals (FSM) because this factor appears to equate to both a state of disadvantage and an unsatisfactory performance in school.

"Children from disadvantaged backgrounds are far less likely to get good GCSE results. Attainment statistics published in January 2014 show that in 2013, 37.9% of pupils who qualified for free school meals got 5 GCSEs, including English and Mathematics at A to C, compared with 64.6% of pupils who do not qualify."*

- 1.6 Although it can be argued that eligibility for FSM is a crude measure of disadvantage, it is commonly used as a proxy (DfE 2010b) since it is based on being in receipt of means tested benefits.

FSM are awarded to families in receipt of:

- Income Support
- Income-based Jobseekers Allowance
- Income-related Employment and Support Allowance
- Support under Part VI of the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999
- the guaranteed element of State Pension Credit
- Child Tax Credit (provided you're not also entitled to Working Tax Credit and have an annual gross income of no more than £16,190)
- Working Tax Credit run-on - paid for 4 weeks after you stop qualifying for Working Tax Credit
- Universal Credit
- Children who get any of the above benefits in their own right, (i.e. they get benefits payments directly, instead of through a parent or guardian,) can also get free school meals.
- Children under the compulsory school age who are in full time education may also be able to get free school meals.

www.gov.uk March 2014

- 1.7 The desire of the Coalition Government to raise the attainment of disadvantaged pupils also includes the achievement and wellbeing of children with Special Educational Needs (SEN). Equally, they recognise that the ethnic group and gender of pupils has an impact on attainment; these factors can also contribute to the attainment of pupils. Those pupils recognised as having Special Educational Needs, have additional funds allocated to them in a different funding formula; the Local Authority orchestrate assessments of those pupils that have been flagged as needing additional support and assign funds according to the level of support required. This is intended to provide provision for their specific needs as well as to raise their attainment. Although ethnic origin and English as an Additional Language (EAL) may also correlate with relatively poor achievement, the funding for those so identified pupils is not always consistent or part of the pupil premium allocation; *“From April 2013, whether or not schools in a local authority area get extra money to support EAL learners will be decided by the local Schools Forum. An 'EAL' factor can be included in the local funding formulae for schools but this factor is limited to bilingual pupils who have been enrolled in English schools for a maximum of 3 years”.*

(NALDIC

2011)

- 1.8 The Coalition Government's Education Strategy in relation to what it perceived as underachievement has a number of parts.

Firstly, it aims to give schools and their senior leaders greater freedom and autonomy; chiefly through allowing those schools that wish to, obtain Academy status and by extending the Academies Programme. Secondly, to ensure that the quality of teaching is raised through expanding existing strategies such as Teach First, revising teaching standards and ensuring that teachers receive effective professional development throughout their careers. Also, by altering the Ofsted Inspection Framework and, *“Reform Ofsted inspection, so that inspectors spend more time in the classroom and focus on key issues of educational effectiveness”* (DfE 2014c) to ensure greater accountability for pupils’ progress and will monitor how funding is being utilised, as outlined in The Importance of Teaching: The Schools’ White Paper 2010.

- 1.9 The requirement to demonstrate the impact of funding is a radical departure from the Disadvantage Subsidy Fund, which was a system instigated under the previous Labour Government. Like the pupil premium, the Disadvantage Subsidy Fund was intended to improve the quality of outcomes for pupils in schools, but under the more holistic Every Child Matters (2003) agenda.
- 1.10 Under the current government’s policy, Raising the Achievement of Disadvantaged Children, *“The Department will set out higher standards which focus on raising attainment (both overall and in relation to each child’s progress), teaching a broad and balanced curriculum. The system will set ambitious and rising expectations in floor targets at Key Stage 2, 4 and 5, with a focus on essential building blocks, breadth, and progress and clear expectations on the achievement of disadvantaged pupils”* (DfE, Accountability and Governance, April 2014).
- 1.11 In conjunction with these very clearly stated aims, the Coalition Government has put an end to the ‘contextual value added’ (CVA) measure. As such, schools can no longer claim that poor attainment was a result of external factors like the catchment area from which their pupils are drawn. Indeed the government see this as both a political and moral issue:
“It is morally wrong to have an attainment measure which entrenches low aspirations for children because of their background”.
“We do not think it right to expect pupils eligible for free school meals to make less progress from the same starting point as pupils who are not eligible for free school meals.”
In 2011, a spokesperson from the DfE commented, *“The old CVA score was absolutely meaningless to most parents - and unions know this. We want to make sure that schools’ hard work is recognised and understood - the new floor targets include progression specifically to do this.”*

(from the Times Educational Supplement,
League tables to ignore race and poverty,
William Stewart, 3/6/11)

- 1.12 This has led not surprisingly to The School Information (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2012 (SI 2012/1124) which came into force in September 2012, requiring schools to not only report on how the pupil premium is spent, but also to report on specific details, including the impact of their funding and publish them online. Prior to 2010, many schools were using Extended Services (DfES 2003) and Disadvantage Subsidiary funding, to close the attainment gap of those pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds. However, prior to 2012 schools were neither required to report on how these additional funds were spent nor on the impact.
- 1.13 Given the recent amendments to School Regulations and Ofsted Framework 2012, schools find themselves in a historically unique position. They are required to improve not only pupil achievement and attainment, but also, the behaviour and the engagement of their pupils, regardless of prior ability or social circumstance. In addition, they are being held accountable for the financial choices they make.
- 1.14 The DfE have made their expectations clear;
We hold Head Teachers and schools' Governing Bodies accountable for the impact of pupil premium funding in the following ways:
- *performance tables, which show the performance of disadvantaged pupils compared with their peers*
 - *requiring schools to publish details online each year of how they are using the pupil premium and the impact it is having on pupil achievement*
 - *the Ofsted inspection framework, where inspectors focus on the attainment of pupil groups, and in particular those who attract the pupil premium*

The level of detail you include in the information you put online is for each school to decide, but you must include the following:

- *your pupil premium allocation for the current academic year*
- *details of how you intend to spend your allocation*
- *details of how you spent your previous academic year's allocation*
- *how it made a difference to the attainment of disadvantaged pupils.*

*Updated: 25 March 2014 (DfE
2014b)*

- 1.15 However, the DfE have not supplied a format for the publication of this information, or detailed guidance to explain such phrases as, “*how it made a difference to the attainment of disadvantaged pupils.*” It is then

for schools to decide how best to measure the impact of the funding and subsequently, how best to report it.

- 1.16 Although, there are no specific restrictions on what the pupil premium can or should be spent on, the Department for Education present a number of examples in which the pupil premium funding has been successfully used. Some of these case studies include;
- *Pupil mentoring*
 - *Cognitive approaches*
 - *Effective and regular feedback*
 - *One-to-one tuition*
 - *Engaging hard-to-reach parents*
 - *Pastoral care workers*
 - *Nurture groups*
 - *Employment and training of strong support staff/ additional specialist teaching staff*
 - *Gifted and talented programmes*
 - *Extra teaching beyond school*
 - *Summer schools*

(DfE 2014)

- 1.17 In some of these cases, research on the impact of the funding has already been completed. For example, a rich diet of study support has been shown to play a significant role in increasing pupils’ attendance, behaviour, relationships with others, attitudes to study, achievement and attainment (MacBeath et al 2001, Taylor 2007, Collins 2010, Sharp et al 1999-2007). Further, the impact of the funding has also already been shown on pupils’ motivation and self-esteem (Cummings et al, 2007, Ofsted 2006,) and on the community (Cummings et al, 2006, 2007, MacBeath et al, 2007).
- 1.18 To support schools in deciding how to use this funding to the maximum effect, the Education Endowment Foundation, funded by government at a sum of £135 million and administered by the Sutton Trust and Impetus-PEF, has produced a toolkit which estimates the return of this financial investment from a variety of interventions; it is called the Pupil Premium Calculator. Further, its research suggests that after school programmes can add two months of learning to a pupil’s progress, but these can be relatively expensive (averaging at £10 per session, per pupil and totalling £1000 per year). However, collaborative learning can add five months to pupils’ progress and is relatively inexpensive (estimated at just £20 per pupil per year, or at £500 for 25 pupils). More controversially, their research suggests that teaching assistants add

- only one month of additional learning, but can also be relatively expensive (their annual salary averages at £18k per support assistant).
- 1.19 Given that the funding available for the pupil premium is set to double to £2.5bn in the financial year 2014-2015, whilst overall school budgets are likely to fall or be redistributed, schools are clearly keen to explore ways in which this money may be used in the most effective way possible. In answer to this and in addition to the toolkit, The Sutton Trust has released some detailed guidance, *How to Spend the Pupil Premium* (Higgins, 2011). Ofsted have also undertaken a recent review of practice in 68 schools (Ofsted 2013).
- 1.20 However, further empirical research is still needed, investigating not only what is happening in schools from different contexts, with different intakes and subsequently differential levels of pupil premium funding. But also exploring how the funding and its requirement are perceived and what lessons have been learned two years on. Stakeholders; the DfE, schools, parents, pupils and taxpayers, have vested interests in learning how this money is being used and the impact that it is having. Moreover, whether these methods used are robust and whether they will achieve a reasonable return on this substantial investment.
- 1.21 The research detailed below is a small but timely contribution to these questions and as such, thanks goes to the Society for Educational Studies for funding it.

2. The Research Project

2.1 Design

The research design consisted of 5 elements:

- i. Desk based research: collated current guidance, tools and commentaries in terms of the pupil premium (e.g. DfE, the Sutton Trust); participant data (e.g. Ofsted and self-assessment reports).
- ii. Semi-structured interviews: themes derived from step 1 above (see Appendix 1)
- ii. Visits to schools to collect primary (interview) and secondary data (schools' pupil premium policies and impact measurement data). (May-June 2013)
- iv. Analysis of secondary data, thematic analysis of interviews, statistical analysis of secondary data.
- v. Distribution of an online questionnaire to school in the South East (London and Kent). (This was conducted in addition to the funding supplied by SES, as part of the researcher's own scholarly activity). (May-June 2013)

2.1.1 This design was initially accepted by SES as condition for the research funding. In addition ethical clearance was applied for and granted by Canterbury Christ Church University, Faculty of Education Ethics Committee.

2.2 Types of schools

2.2.1 Sample - Interviews

2.2.2 The interviews were conducted in in 5 schools, 4 from Kent and 1 from London. These represented:

- two primary schools - one from London, one from rural Kent
- a junior school
- a secondary academy
- a special school (see table 1 for more information).

These were an opportunity sample, approached as representative of different types of schools and because they were known to the researcher through other research and thus a mutual relationship of trust was already established.

SES

Society for Educational Studies

The Schools' Identifier, (for the purpose these findings.)	The Type of School	The Percentage of Pupils in the School, for which the Pupil Premium has been claimed and under which Qualifying Condition.
School A	Primary	42.9% 35 pupils have FSM and 1 pupil is LAC
School B	Junior	2.9% (FSM/+6), 0.3% are LAC 1.3% currently have FSM
School C	Secondary Academy	30% of cohort has pp on average
School D	Primary	43% FSM 2 pupils are LAC and 2 are service children
School E	<p>A Special Educational Needs School, which also includes provision for pupils with profound and multiple learning difficulties.</p> <p>The school encompasses; nursery, primary, secondary; key stage 3 and 14-19 year olds</p>	<p>26% FSM 19 pupils are LAC, however 5 pupils are discounted as they are over 16 and do not qualify for the pupil premium. This leaves 14 LAC out of a school roll of 266 pupils.</p> <p>£45k in total funding, (next year £70-80k, which will include Every 6)</p>

Table 1: The characteristics of each of the case study schools

2.2.3 Sample - Questionnaire

2.3.4 An invitation and electronic questionnaire link was distributed to those on a database of Special Education Need Coordinators (SENCOs) since it was reasoned they would either be likely to use the pupil premium or be aware of those who did in their school (N=825). Of these, 80 valid returns were supplied. This was a low response rate (9.7%), but not unusual in relation to online surveys. Of those who indicated a region, the majority of these came from the South East (27.5%, 22) and London (22.5%, 18) Note in all the following tables only valid responses are reported, in many cases answers were left blank).

Region	% (N)
East of England	1.3% (1)
East Midlands	2.5% (2)
London	22.5% (18)
North East	0
North West	2.5% (2)
South East	27.5% (22)
South West	2.5% (2)
West Midlands	1.3% (1)
Yorkshire & Humberside	2.5% (2)

Table 2: Number of questionnaire respondents

2.3.5 The type of school questionnaire respondents worked in varied. The largest proportion came from primary comprehensive schools (28.8 %, 23) followed by secondary academies (12.5%, 10) (see table 3).

Type of School	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)
Academy	1.3% (1)	12.5 % (10)*
Comprehensive	28.8% (23)	5% (4)*
High School	1.3% (1)	(0)
Free School	(0)	(0)
Grammar	(0)	3.8% (3)
Independent	(0)	1.3% (1)
Special	1.3% (1)	1.3% (1)

Table 3: Type of school for questionnaire respondents. *one respondent identified themselves as coming from a comprehensive which was also an academy in the secondary school sector

3. Findings

Note: In the following presentation of findings. Information and quotes taken from the 5 case studies are outside of tables and designated as school A-E, quotes in italics. Figures and quotes within tables represent responses to the questionnaires.

3.1 *Understanding of the purpose of the pupil premium*

3.1.1 The interviewees were asked what they felt the purpose of the pupil premium was. Respondents understood that the stated aim was to close the gap for those children who were disadvantaged.

School D - *The purpose: children who have free school meals or looked after children or service children or children who received free school meals within the last 6 years will be allocated a percentage or money, for that we have to show progress and attainment for those children with closing the gap we have to show progress for those children for closing the gap as it were, but also showing of, all children can make that ground to succeed and achieve.*

School C – *The purpose of the pupil premium in this school, the idea of the funding is to narrow the deprivation gap between free school meals and non-free school meals children and as well as those LAC and service children.*

School E: *To close the gap, to raise attainment for those vulnerable groups... Especially free school meals, children in care, also known as looked after children and children from um services.*

However there was also acknowledgement that it could be used to achieve more:

School D: *We have such a high percentage of deprivation and children from low income backgrounds, that people just write them off immediately and the thing aboutit's not just deprivation it's the social and emotional needs that come with that and whilst we always think about attainment and progress and we want our children to succeed in life, actually there is so much more to it and I think as we do though and we start identifying where our money goes and our need lies, it's not always in that. It's not progress and attainment at the start, we have to deal with a whole range before that before we can even tackle...*

However, there was also an acknowledgement that it is not quite as simple as this, since the assumption that there was an attainment gap could be challenged:

School B (Senco & Child Protection Officer): *To have an allocation of money that will help those children who have been identified as... from a poor economic background, yeah, who, um are, do not have the opportunities that other children could have and the money, the money could be spent to help with that. Here that notion doesn't actually work, because some of our children are making more than age expected progress in their education, so for us it is looking how we can spend that money to further them in a different way. Be that an extracurricular*

activity, a must lesson, more access to ICT or internet at home, access to clubs, things like that.

3.2 **Claiming and Auditing**

3.2.1 **Categories of children claimed for**

3.2.2 In terms of the questionnaire; the most common category of pupil premium claims were for children who currently qualified for FSM (97.5%, 78) or who had claimed over the last 6 years (85%, 68). These proportions were also mirrored in the 5 case study schools.

Category	% (N)
Free School Meals (FSM)	97.5% (78)
Looked after children (LAC)	71.3% (57)
Children from military families	21.3% (17)
Children currently not on FSM, but who have registered in the last 6 years.	85% (68)

Table 4: Categories of children pupil premium claimed for (questionnaire)

3.2.3 Although schools usually claimed in multiple categories, there were variations. However, it is not possible to ascertain if this was due to a lack of awareness of which categories of child could be claimed for or if they were not present in their school. The interviews do however suggest that some parents may be reluctant to identify themselves as entitled to claim FSM for their child, whilst others are proactive.

In School B, for example, a school in an affluent area, parents appeared reluctant to be identified as FSM.

School B: *We could probably have more children that received the pupil premium, but there is a bit of a stigma in this area attached to claiming for free school meals.* (Although interestingly, School B saw no need to inform parents that money was being claimed for their pupils and therefore none of their parents would know).

However, in School C interviewees suggested that some parents there saw the pupil premium as their right and were proactive in asking how it was spent.

Restricted categories	% (N)
Only claimed for FSM/FMS+6	21.3% (17)
Claimed only for FSM+6	1.3% (1)
Only claimed for LACs	1.3% (1)
Also claimed for children from military families	17.5% (14)

Table 5: Limited category claims (questionnaire)

3.3 *Pupil premium and additional funding*

3.3.1 When asked what proportion of eligible pupils also receive additional specialist funding, estimates (questionnaire) ranged from 3% to 100%. 27.5 % (22) indicated that the pupil premium is used in conjunction with other revenue streams (e.g. the specialist literacy fund for Year 7s), whereas 70% (56) indicated that it was not. Similar variations occurred in the interviews ranging from School E which did use the pupil premium in conjunction with other funding (as a special school) to School C (a secondary academy) which used multiple funding streams.

3.4 *Person(s) responsible for allocation of funds*

3.4.1 When asked who was responsible for deciding how the pupil premium funds were allocated, the most common response was the Head teacher or the Head teacher with one or two other members of senior staff 47.5% (38), although in some cases this was with the approval of the governing body. Interestingly, only one respondent indicated they had a specialist pupil premium coordinator, one indicated the SENCo (which in many schools is a member of the SLT) and one of the staff. Therefore in nearly all cases respondents indicated this decision was made by a member of the SLT in some form 93.8% (75) (see table 6).
 School D (Executive Head teacher): *however as a team we will look at the needs, at the end of the day J is in charge of the budget. As a team we can come up with strategic thoughts and plans...well come up with ideas and suggestions for moving forward and then J will look at how much money we've got and if I'm completely honest J will respond to need regardless of how much it costs because she's very passionate about [School D] and that every child can achieve at whatever cost.*
 School D (Assistant Principal): *my remit is narrowing the gap so pupil premium AEN, its community cohesion. There is a strong element of community cohesion with narrowing the gap, getting the parents involved and that perception of what the school does for pupil premium students. I think that is the first priority, breaking down that stigma about what pupil premium is and free school meals.*
 School D: *we try and promote from a different angle, that the money is not for the free school meal. The funding for the free school meal is separate to the pupil premium, so we promote it to our parents and that's where we find it's the barrier at the moment with regards to supporting their education.*
 School C: *Assistant Principal makes decision (interviewee)*
 School A: *The Head teacher decided how it was spent, costing out interventions per pupil.*
 School E: *the decisions were completely controlled by the senior leadership team (SLT). Finance department claims it. SLT decide how funds are allocated. Primary and secondary deputy looks at data in meetings with key stage leaders and classroom teachers.*

Person(s) responsible	%(N)
Assistant Head teacher / assistant principal (inclusion)	5% (4)
Business/Finance Manager / School Bursar	5% (4)
Borough Bursar	1.3% (1)
Deputy Head teacher / Vice Principal	3.8% (3)
Director of Every Child Matter faculty	1.3% (1)
Head teacher	28.8% (23)
Head teacher with one or more others specialist (Deputy Head, Bursar, SENCo, Inclusion leader, amp, Director of Learning, FSM group)	18.8% (15)
Head of School and Pupil Premium Coordinator	1.3% (1)
Inclusion Manager	1.3% (1)
SENCo	1.3% (1)
SEN team in collaboration with LA social workers and carers	1.3% (1)
SLT (Senior Leadership Team) (with Governors)	17.5% (14)
SLT with other specialists (SENCo, InCo)	5% (4)
SLT member with responsibility for attainment and progress	1.3% (1)
Staff	1.3% (1)
Vice principal	1.3% (1)

Table 6: Person responsible for allocating funds (questionnaire)

3.5 Uses of the Pupil Premium

3.5.1 In terms of uses, the most common response was for individual children / groups of eligible children / specialist projects (47.5%, 38). Special projects included: group activity e.g. High School Musical production; Lego Club and Homework Club and some out of school subsidies to support funding of residential trips for vulnerable children, learning mentors, after school activities. One gave details of more whole school activities: reduced class sizes, additional classroom support, intervention classes, specialist therapists.

Uses of PP	%(N)
For individual children/ groups of eligible children/ specialist projects	47.5% (38)
For individual children/ groups of eligible children & whole school projects	6.3% (5)
For individual children/ groups of eligible children & whole school & specialist projects	23.8% (19)
For individual children, Mixed support groups which include PP pupils and non PP pupils.	1.3% (1)
For groups of eligible children & specialist projects	1.3% (1)
For groups of eligible children & whole school projects	1.3% (1)
For groups of eligible children & whole school projects & specialist projects	1.3% (1)
For whole school projects	1.3% (1)
For whole school projects & specialist projects	2.5% (2)
For specialist project	2.5% (2)

Table 7: uses of the pupil premium (questionnaire)

Respondents in the interviews were able to go into more detail about the uses of the pupil premium in their school.

In School C the funding was used on general school resources (TAs) and it was not targeted specifically to the eligible pupils.

SES

Society for Educational Studies

School C: *in the past it has just gone on TAs [who made that decision?] that was made by the business manager. ...TAs in the classroom, going into the pot for salaries.*

However they were aware of the need to target funding:

School C: *SO Primary just down the road from us, less than half a mile, have just recently had Ofsted and their biggest failing was that they could not show accelerated progress based on their pupil premium children.*

and the need to change their method:

School C: *I think we need to change it. I think we need to really look at the children who we receive the pupil premium for and target those children and if there is a side of that, if it helps X amount of other children in the class or in the school then fantastic, but actually the primary need is for these children and the impact to be measured for it.*

School D used the funding in a range of ways, to reflect their diverse student body:

School D: *a range of things, it could be school journeys it could be support in the classroom. We have a particular child currently with social emotional needs, on the verge of being excluded, we are an inclusive school we want him here. We are paying currently for a one to one for him..., yeah a TA....We have children who need support in after school clubs for one reason or another..... Staff training, at the moment our focus has been on assessment for learning, feedback marking....additional TAs..... School uniform, children who don't have school uniform we will find that, they are pupil premium children..... Whole school early intervention, so our learning mentor runs a nurture group for vulnerable children and they are identified as pupil premium children. ..It is pupil premium money that is used. We fund her to come in early.*

But they were also aware that currently they were not as coordinated and strategic with the use of this and other funding as they would like to be:

School D: *We're more strategic in our thinking where we are going to put our money, the children's money, because it is about them. But I do believe until we can nail down their social and emotional need in their development, driving attainment is really tricky. You know if you have a disruptive child who comes with this label and comes with this money, if he's not performing in class then we have to put a TA next to him to keep him directed and focused and it's frustrating for us as a school. We do use teaching assistants well. So read the Sutton Trust and they say it is high cost, low impact, where actually in our setting it's not the case at all. Because using TAs to help with behaviour in the classroom, not to deal with behaviour, but as support, we have to have TAs for that reason.*

Interviews revealed how some schools use it for children who are not eligible, but still needed support, the case of children of illegal immigrants for example was highlighted:

School D: *Families that are illegal that can't get subsidies from the local authority, we will top that up. we, you know there are families that can't claim.... two or three might be able to claim that subsidy for one reason*

SES

Society for Educational Studies

or another, so as a school we make sure that family get that subsidy so we will top it up.

School B (Business Manager): Up until recent months the pupil premium, was just set aside, or used as part of the teaching assistant's salaries allocation if you like. .. It actually coincided pretty much with decisions that were made after we converted to academy status. .. We sort of decided that any additional funding as a result of converting would be put back into the classroom.

School E: Looking at individual pupil need and how we could raise attainment for children who, not just our vulnerable groups, but those children who aren't attaining or making the progress at the level we would like to see.

School E (new Head teacher): Maybe we can adopt a more creative outlook, about maybe grouping the free school meals, maybe seeing all their profiles on the table and first of all asking what are their emotional ages and then maybe starting from them, looking at their needs. ... These kids have got money allocated to them we need to spend this properly. Possibly one of the things we can look at is how we congregate all the free school meals students say on this table, in profiles and then say irrespective of age are there match profiles we've got, which in turn, we got have groups that aren't age relevant because of the nature of their needs.

School A was perhaps the most strategic in its thinking, which was maybe a result of the Head teacher whom was involved in the pupil premium pilot.

In School A, a large proportion was used to pay for a 0.5FTE intervention teacher, with a particular focus on reading. This was decided since the families of the children at the school don't promote reading. The money was also spent on SALUS – a project aimed at developing emotional resilience in children. The funding also contributed to paying for transport to improve pupil attendance and some toward the cost of an Educational Psychologist (of this approximately half on academic development, half on confidence building/emotional well-being).

- 3.5.2 When asked to indicate the area of the school the pupil premium was used, most of the respondents to the questionnaire indicated multiple areas. However the most common was '*Improved behaviour/motivation/aspiration/engagement*' (66.3%, 53), followed by '*Extracurricular activities/extended services*' (65%, 52) and '*Use/employment of specialist (e.g. FLW, TAs)*' (62.5%, 50) (see table 8).

Areas of school funded	% (N)
Early years – helping children prepare for school	5% (4)
Transition from primary to secondary school	22.5% (18)

Improved behaviour/motivation/aspiration/ engagement	66.3% (53)
Use/employment of specialist (e.g. FLW, TAs)	62.5% (50)
Teacher training or development	17.5% (14)
Extracurricular activities/extended services	65% (52)
Summer school	16.3% (13)
Improving feedback between teachers and pupils / providing more feedback that is effective	22.5% (18)
Meta-cognition	13.8% (11)
Specific classroom practice.	23.8% (19)
Specific curriculum areas e.g. e.g. phonics, numeracy etc.	57.5% (46)

Other/Additional comments	% (N)
Academic interventions & pastoral team	1.3% (1)
Improving well-being of pupils (nutrition)	1.3% (1)
PE activities to improve gross motor co-ordination	1.3% (1)
Philosophy	1.3% (1)
School uniform/equipment	1.3% (1)
Targeted intervention classes	1.3% (1)

Table 8: Areas of the school funded, at least in part, by the pupil premium (questionnaire)

In terms of specific uses, interviewees all used the funding in very specific and targeted ways, with clear aims in mind.

School C: *In year 9 we have a dedicated person that's employed for pupil premium students that goes round and supports. We can qualify that, because they register what the intervention has done, so you can map it against their academic profile. So you can identify value for money.*

School C: *You talking about well-being? We've used pupil premium funding for LAC kids to go to horse riding lessons. Where do you quantify the value for money for that? One of our members of staff came up to me the other day and said, you know that person who has had horse riding lessons? I was out jogging on Saturday and I've seen her continue with the lessons. So has it had an impact? Yes. That child's well-being is improved because they have continued with those lessons.*

School C decided on interventions based on the 6-week cycle review for progress and achievement, looking at 5 A*-Cs, looking at specific subjects and seeing if they have achieved in the 6-week cycles.

School B: *I think our biggest challenge is identifying what we are going to spend it on, so it has an impact for those children. Because say 5 of those 11 aren't on the SEN register, their levels, their attainment levels are either at age expected or above age expected so when then look at it from an academic point of view, do they need any interventions, do they need TA support, whatever it is? Or actually do they need something else that we can give them, using that money?*

School E used the money in a variety of ways; a key school priority was raising the attainment of those pupils whom the funding was claimed for. In particular to raise attainment in maths, (shapes, space and measure) as identified in their last Ofsted inspection. Thus they trained staff in Numicon. Another example was funding for an iPad pilot

project. In some classes an iPad was supplied to each pupil and teacher. The focus was again on raising attainment, in this example through a personalised approach to ICT, moving away from ICT suites. In addition they employed a physiotherapy assistant and Occupational Therapist and supported some pupils in terms of residentials and out of school activities. These last two following the withdrawal of input from health (PCTs).

School A saw their main priority in the use of the pupil premium in raising attainment, including that of high ability students.

- 3.5.3 Questionnaire respondents also reported spending the pupil premium on a variety of additional resources. The most common were 'Early intervention schemes' (61.3%, 49) and 'Buying resources e.g. books' (46.3%, 37). A large number also used the funding to pay for staff; teaching assistants (40%, 32) and teachers (30%, 24). 7.5% (6) also reported using it to 'Offset budget cuts elsewhere'.

Additional resources funded	% (N)
Reducing class sizes	21.3% (17)
Additional teaching assistants	40% (32)
Additional teachers	30% (24)
Buying resources e.g. books	46.3% (37)
Early intervention schemes	61.3% (49)
Extending the breadth of the curriculum	18.8% (15)
Improving the classroom or school environment	12.5% (10)
IT equipment VLE	12.5% (10)
More one-to-one tuition	57.5% (46)
Offsetting budget cuts elsewhere	7.5% (6)
Peer-to-peer tutoring schemes for pupils	15% (12)
Other/Additional comments	%(N)
After school club access	1.3% (1)
Buying resources e.g. books, active kids (before school) school trips, parents given £163.50 towards an activity of their choice e.g. music lessons	1.3% (1)
Employment of dedicated learning mentor	1.3% (1)
Homework club	1.3% (1)
Music lessons	1.3% (1)
Pastoral support	1.3% (1)

Table 9: Additional areas funded, at least in part with the pupil premium (questionnaire)

3.6 Auditing

- 3.6.1 When asked if they audited the use of these funds, at first interviewees were not sure. But most schools indicated that senior leaders, in some cases teachers, had the responsibility to keep records. This was most clearly articulated in School D:

School D: *Senior leadership again... myself and B [Deputy Head and Inclusion Manager] do the ground work in the sense we have progress checks, termly progress checks, we will monitor all children across the school, but with a focus on ensuring that pupil premium children are making progress, the accelerated progress in some circumstances. But*

SES

Society for Educational Studies

then we'd come together as senior leadership and look at whether we need to do for those children.

School D: All staff have been given a list, this exact list I've been given here, all staff have been given them for their classes and they are highlighted on their tracking grids..... Every teacher has a progress folder which contains all the data, assessment data for their class. At the front of that it will have pupil premium children all children who haven't made progress.....we made the decision as an SLT to highlight the pupil premium children, so visually we can see. So at the start of the year we have identified them, they can highlight them, the next phase then is to highlight them so we can see where they are going and acknowledging the progress checks and now what we are doing is converting their data to APS so we really monitor tightly where we are, now that is for all children, but throughout the pupil premium children will be highlighted.

3.7 Measuring the impact

3.7.1 When asked whose responsibility it was to measure the impact, 50% (40) of questionnaire respondents, indicated it was the responsibility of a group/team. Whilst 17.5% (14) indicated that it was the responsibility of an individual, 1.3% (1) responded that it was being reviewed, or that it is a group /team responsibility (the SLT). In the schools interviewed the responsibility for measuring the impact was shared between the senior leadership and class teachers. In the case studies, School C and A perhaps have the most integrated systems. In School A, the Head teacher and classroom teachers were responsible for measuring the impact, as well as the 0.5 intervention teacher funded by the pupil premium. In school C, children were assessed in terms of baselines (obtained from RAISEonline) and then their improvement against these was used.

In School C a number of integrated systems were used together, a dashboard, and the use of a central spreadsheet maintained by a senior leader to ensure that progress was easily identified by class teachers and SLT.

School C: There is a dashboard. It indicates the categories of pupil premium, free school meals, LACs and broken down again into SEN needs, for each of those we have comments apart from the five A-C, accepted grades against national benchmarks or national averages. That dashboard is then reported online under its respective cohort. For Key stage 3, we report on English, Maths and Science level 5 where they are, for key stage 4 in this school year 9 and 10 and 11, year 9 is GCSE or BTECs that's reported on 5 A*-C English or Maths, expected progress and then we've split the expected progress down again into upper and lower category, so we have those who are meeting the 5 A*-C that are upper and those who have five A-C/D D/E borderline . Then you start looking at the conversion rates, per cohort.*

School C: I can tell exactly which kids are pupil premium and their progress. Each cohort gets one of these [colour coded spread sheet] and a report, and the report indicates our objectives, good practice, so

what Ofsted are looking for in classrooms and what heads of department should be looking at, the heads of faculty and what heads of house should be looking and monitor it. Get an overview of that particular cohort, this is year 8, this is percentages, this is year 8, this is English, this is maths and this is science and then we have all the pupil premium students in that group, this is by subject. So subjects like English, Maths, Science, should be able to see what percentage of pupil premium students are achieving level 5 or above, what the gap is, for that subject, and then they're broken down into different categories OK? So then you've got, this is a comparison between one cycle to the next cycle to indicate progress made so you've got, this is cycle 2, cycle 3 data, these are the pupil premium students for that one and this is what the headlines for this, this particular. ..Then we look at LAC students then SEN students, then EAL, because a lot of free school meal students are EAL, so we report on that. We then look at pupil premium students that are within each, we break that down by, so this is maths, by teacher so we can see which of the pupil premium students are meeting targets here by teacher. We break it right down to see where an intervention can take place and then we break it down by house, so each member of house is aware of who their students are, how many of their students are meeting it and whether there has been any improvement or no improvement from one cycle to the next. A cycle is every six weeks.

School C: We know that the pupil premium is making a difference because from their initial first benchmark, the first term, they are not based on that, they are on an even playing field so to speak, so we can get an idea of how severe the intervention is needed for that year group. If they are on that even playing field for that cycle, then there's your benchmark, if they weren't on that intervention.

The manager interviewed, did understand the need to respond to the demands of external scrutiny.

School C: Based on RAISEonline to be honest...we looked at exactly what we needed to report upon. Which is obviously the first call for Ofsted... we looked at RAISEonline, we looked at where our gaps were, cos you get that don't you were, you get this is the gap to narrow from the RAISEonline report. So from that then we create the dashboard and then we narrow that down, we look at how we report on those students.

School C: It's very difficult to say this child has benefitted from this unless you have a count by count by student. If it's a grey area, as long as you can show that you are spending the money efficiently to support them then you're not going to get that are you [funding removed].

- 3.7.2 However other schools seemed for the most part used pupil progress as an indicator of impact, without a comparator.

For example School B acknowledged they had a system which would allow a variety of information to be collected and progress tracked, but currently use was crude:

School B: We have three assessment points through the year, autumn, winter, summer, data for all children are put into our tracking system

which is PPIT, from that I'll then pull out the pupil premium children, which has to be done manually, because it doesn't do it for us...then I will track their data across the year and just colour code it for when they have gone up since their last assessment, gone down or stayed the same.

3.7.3 Whereas in other schools it was still a work in progress:

School D: I think it is a collective responsibility, but ultimately it will be the senior leadership team who will be accountable.

School D: APS [Average Point Score] but it's an aspiration. We are currently looking at their level, national curriculum levels. Those children not at national curriculum, it will be P levels. But also those children we are tracking for social-emotional needs they are P levels as well, Pivot scores..... We're intending to use APS to measure more than progress, that would happen anyway. When the staff are looking through their tracking grids they are seeing that their children are moving nicely and that is a nice feeling and a nice picture, but we want to get into it more and as senior leadership we decided looking at APS you can really look at it and split it, because it outlines how many points a child should be making across a year and across a key stage.

[Ofsted are expecting them to exceed APS scores]..... We are doing a good job if not an outstanding job for these children, but we are not very good at measuring how good we really are, because we don't have time!

3.7.4 In developing their approach, the largest response from the questionnaires was based on internal expertise (51.3%, 41) in current use, followed by published documents (23.8%, 19) (see table 10). In the schools interviews, most schools used internal expertise, although School D decided on advice from LA in terms of using APS.

	Currently use % (N)	Used in developing approach % (N)
Tool kits e.g. Educational Endowment Foundation & Sutton Trust	13.8% (11)	11.3% (9)
Commercially available software	15% (12)	1.3% (1)
Services of an external consultant	5% (4)	2.5%(2)
Internal expertise	51.3% (41)	7.5% (6)
Published documents, e.g. Premium Policies: What schools and teachers believe will improve standards for poorer pupils and those in low-attaining schools	23.8% (19)	2.5% (2)

Table 10: Sources used to develop impact measurement strategy (questionnaire)

School C used the Dashboard to highlight across the school. This was developed in house after discussing what we would like to report to parents. Next year they plan to report by cohort every 6 weeks in terms of progress and interventions. They based some of their reporting decisions on suggestions from a conference attended.

3.7.5 In terms of the primary metrics used by the school to measure impact, the vast majority of respondents talked of quantitative measures,

focusing particularly on achievement and attainment (including GCSE grades), progress in individual subjects (e.g. reading and Maths). Where other measures were acknowledged, they still revolved around these, including punctuality and behaviour. On occasion, ‘therapeutic measures’ were mentioned, but again in terms of their impact on attainment.

	% (N)
Academic progress, attainment and achievement, where relevant attendance, punctuality, but also qualitative measures such as engagement, behaviour etc. narrowing the gap	61.3% (49)
All linked to child identified need & best use of PP to narrow the gaps	1.3% (1)
All of the above to try to capture the range of impacts	2.5% (2)
Good question! I guess attendance and behaviour though difficult to measure behaviour in whole school.	1.3% (1)
I use a variety of methods, depending on the type of intervention. For therapeutic interventions I use B/GSTEEM with pupils, parents and class teachers. For Jumpahead I use published impact measurements. Reading Recovery has clear entry and exit data and the additional 1:1 phonics intervention has clear entry and exit data.	1.3% (1)
Pupil tracker and pupil conferencing, attendance. They are good measures of interventions and measure the sustainability of interventions through year groups	1.3% (1)
Three strands - academic, pastoral including SEAL and in developing links with families to remove barriers to learning and achievement.	1.3% (1)
Tracking System - commercial whole school, school tracking system	1.3% (1)

Table 11: Metrics used to measure pupil progress (pupil premium) (questionnaire)

3.7.6 35% (28) indicated that the pupil premium was used to ‘some extent’ to meet key priorities. 31.3% (25) felt it was used ‘a great deal’ and only 2.5% (2) felt it was not used ‘at all’ for that purpose.

3.7.7 When asked how key priorities are identified, the largest group of respondents indicated this was from Ofsted and the SLT 21.3%(17), followed by school SEFs (11.3%, 9).

	% (N)
Analysis of achievement data/by our own pupil progress system or RAISEonline data	7.5% (6)
By SLT the key priorities are the same as for the whole school, based on floor targets.	7.5% (6)
I don't know, it seems to me that it is being used to pay to cover for teacher's PPA! Not my decision I may add.	1.3% (1)
Ofsted / SLT / governors, Ofsted and school improvement plan. Ofsted reports, SLT, governors, all staff, parents, achievement levels.	21.3% (17)
Pupil premium analysis	1.3% (1)
School self-evaluation and data analysis, College Improvement Plan; SEF; ALT, School self-evaluation. School self-evaluation, school development plan, professional targets for teachers and teacher assistants. HT reports to	11.3% (9)
Staff and pupil consultation	1.3% (1)
We are a 50%+ FSM school. Our whole culture is about narrowing the gap therefore the premium fitted in perfectly with our ongoing key priority of high attainment	1.3% (1)
Website, termly report to GB	1.3% (1)

Table 12: How key priorities were identified in terms of the pupil premium

3.7.8 When measuring the impact 37.5% (30) indicated they 'report any improvement'. 18.8% (15) again 'a set criteria'. In terms of what this criteria was;

- *National standards for FSM and non-FSM children.*
- *NC levels RWM*
- *Progress rates- sub levels over identified period, attendance % over set period*
- *We set expectations for APS progress termly, therefore we can benchmark classes, year groups and pupil premium children against these expectations*

3.7.9 Schools used a variety of ways to show 'comparative' impact, the most commonly reported being 'performance of eligible against non-eligible pupils & Improvement against predictions/targets' (13.8%,11) and 'comparisons of performance of eligible against non-eligible pupils & Improvements compared to previous cohorts & Improvement against predictions/targets & 'other indicators' (e.g. behaviour, motivation)' (10%,8). Only 1.3% (1) indicated using a different method: 'Attendance in clubs. Wellbeing reports by and for pupils'. (However, only 15%,12, answered this question).

Comparisons used to measure progress	% (N)
Comparisons of performance of eligible against non-eligible pupils.	13.8% (11)
Comparisons of performance of eligible against non-eligible pupils & 'other indicators' (e.g. behaviour, motivation)	1.3% (1)
Comparisons of performance of eligible against non-eligible pupils & Improvement against predictions/targets	13.8% (11)
Comparisons of performance of eligible against non-eligible pupils & Improvement against predictions/targets & 'other indicators' (e.g. behaviour, motivation)	5% (4)
Comparisons of performance of eligible against non-eligible pupils & Improvements compared to previous cohorts	2.5% (2)
Comparisons of performance of eligible against non-eligible pupils & Improvements compared to previous cohort & Improvement against predictions/targets	2.5% (2)
Comparisons of performance of eligible against non-eligible pupils & Improvements compared to previous cohorts & Improvement against predictions/targets & 'other indicators' (e.g. behaviour, motivation)	10% (8)
Improvement against predictions/targets	2.5% (2)
Improvement against predictions/targets & 'other indicators' (e.g. behaviour, motivation)	1.3% (1)
Improvements compared to previous cohorts & Improvement against predictions/targets & 'other indicators' (e.g. behaviour, motivation)	2.5% (2)
'other indicators' (e.g. behaviour, motivation)	2.5% (2)

Table 13: Comparative methods measuring impact

3.7.10 When asked a similar question in the interviews, the schools did report progress but for the most part this was not a comparative impact:

School C: *we report on each intervention that takes place. We run a review on it.*

School B: When asked if they had success criteria, they did not, but thought having a new Head teacher would lead to that.

School E (Business Manager): *Our success criteria would be if our free school meals children and our children in care achieved at least as well as our school population as a whole. If they're falling behind it's not working... because we don't have anything nationally [benchmarks].*

3.7.11 In relation to cost benefit analysis, 15% (12) indicated they did undertake a cost benefit analysis, 36.3% (29) indicated they did not and 16.3% (13) were unsure. (32.5%, 26) did not answer this question. In relation to the interviews, again reports were mixed.

School B (Business Manager): *we are moving toward that now, and on-going achievement of the pupils that should be benefitting.*

School A and School D noted they were not doing a cost benefit analysis, however they would be interested in conducting one and seeing a model.

3.7.12 When asked about the perceived advantages of the method used, the most common response was that it was practical and showed a difference. Other advantages included demonstration of expenditure and even that it is what Ofsted are looking for.

Perceived advantages of method measuring impact	% (N)
Clear, easy to calculate, measurable workable, It is measurable and comparable nationwide. Fairly easy to administer and keep track of. It isn't additional work for the teachers. Straight forward, in line with school's assessment procedures. (Looks at literacy and maths results only). It is easy to see progress and attainment across the group and to compare it to the non-eligible pupils.	12.5% (10)
Data is measurable, hard data in form of results and attendance percentage	3.8% (3)
Gives a whole school overview, Holistic so address our priorities as well as external ones. It allows a deeper understanding of the children's needs and if they are being meet	3.8% (3)
It provides governors with a clear picture of pupil premium expenditure and impact, Simple and shows effect of spending in relation to school development plan.	3.8% (3)
Full analysis of the needs of each cohort allows us to be strategic in the use of pupil premium. An innovative approach to individual use of the pupil premium that will infiltrate teaching at all levels therefore developing staff, raising awareness of those who receive the PP and ensuring accountability of impact at all levels.	2.5% (2)
Using Target Tracker & Data Dashboard we can clearly see the progress of our Pupil Progress children and compare them to national	2.5% (2)
Detailed and provides excellent feedback	2.5% (2)
We are able to show year on year comparisons with how our FSM children are doing by keeping them to the same standards of measurement. As we compare with national standards it aids us in knowing what the OFSTED inspectors may be thinking when they come in. Makes OFSTED happy (ish)	3.8% (3)
All staff are involved with the discussion of pupil results and therefore individual children are the focus of pupil progress	1.3% (1)
Focus on achievement and progress for all children	1.3% (1)
Improved achievement in learning will lead to increased life chances for vulnerable children	1.3% (1)
It follows what we already have in place for monitoring progress of ALL groups within the school cohort	1.3% (1)
It is clear and if we don't succeed there is no hiding place for us.	1.3% (1)
It is bespoke to the pupil	1.3% (1)
It reflects the reality of our age range rather than a national approach designed for older children	1.3% (1)
Pupils returning to M?S	1.3% (1)
Quantitative and qualitative measures equally important	1.3% (1)
Measure against aspirational targets - the key indicator is that pupils achieve	1.3% (1)
Meets school needs	1.3% (1)
The number of eligible pupil premium children at our school is small. We are able to match the impact against the other children in the cohort	1.3% (1)
They reflect improvements in pupil outcomes for SEN LAC pupils which local authorities expect to see when financing PPG	1.3% (1)
We aim to target who needs help. Not all our FSM children are necessarily in need of this	1.3% (1)

Table 14: Perceived advantaged of the methods used (questionnaire)

In terms of the interviews, strengths ranged from a clear student centred approach, although this was somewhat reactive;

School D: What we do well is respond to need.... We have a strong inclusion team which lead on a lot of this... providing support, which is all internal then, providing supporting, sign posting, monitoring, we are good at knowing our children, where they are, where they are getting to and how to get there. Our limitations, we find it hard to put them on paper and monitoring closely enough so they don't fall through the net because we are busy doing.... We respond to a need rather than react. It's putting on paper and showing impact, we don't do enough of that.

To clarity of measurement; for example School B: felt its strengths are that it is very clear to see straight away whether they have made academic progress or not in a cost effective manner;

And a positive impact on attainment: School E (Business Manager) strengths: *it is targeted on raising attainment that's where the money is being spent, it is not just being absorbed into the general budget, so we can analyse expenditure and some of the interventions that we have planned we will actually be able to track specifically on data, whereas something like subsidising residential is a bit woolly.*

3.7.13 When asked about the perceived disadvantages of their chosen method, a variety of answers were given. However the most common disadvantages highlighted related to practical issues of it being time consuming, simplistic or missing some crucial element. Other issues mentioned included identifying single causes and the lack of analysis of 'softer impacts'.

Perceived disadvantages of method measuring impact	% (N)
At present this is done in general terms. We need to become smarter at this. Also difficult to say one thing that has had the impact Difficult to prove that pupil premium is the factor that has made the difference, broad brush. It is not possible to say that pupil premium has had impact, there are too many variables in a child's life, so many initiatives put in place at school, I can't unpick which is effective.	5% (4)
Does not take into account softer targets from data which is gathered from students concerning aspirations, self-esteem etc. Looks at literacy and maths results only. Needs more effective ways to measure impact from social/nurturing interventions. Motivation is difficult to quantify.	5% (4)
It does not really address the pupil premium spend directly. Not as yet statistical enough and cost analysed. Only recently begun to track effect of pupil premium.	3.8% (3)
It doesn't really tell how we have improved the life chances of these children outside of exam results; this is particularly annoying where some of these children make great strides in areas that the government and OFSTED simply don't recognise. Some of these children come to us with barely any	2.5% (2)

recognisable ability to operate in society. The improvement in these children is incalculable and it is for that very reason the good that we do often with pupil premium groups, will not be recognised.	
Time consuming, can be overly simplistic, missed some important less measurable impact	6.3% (5)
Complete picture for 150+ students is unwieldy and time-consuming	1.3% (1)
Delay in government produced data	1.3% (1)
Difficult to know if the progress is due to the pupil premium or improved teaching	1.3% (1)
Difficult to show closing the gap in attainment	1.3% (1)
It is dependent on the quality of teacher assessment.	1.3% (1)
Don't know if it is recognised by Ofsted.	1.3% (1)
not as detailed as we would like	1.3% (1)
Not being measured against comparable groups yet. Small number of FSM pupils in our school make it difficult to make comparisons over time	1.3% (1)
Some things are hard to quantify	1.3% (1)
That there are many children with similar needs who are not entitled to extra funding or just miss the mark for this extra funding and this is inequitable	1.3% (1)
We do not have the analytical evidence to move our children on or evaluate current practice	1.3% (1)
Very diverse group of pupils spread across the school. It is hard to monitor, track all indicators	1.3% (1)
You can't measure the impact of just pupil premium as it is always in conjunction with quality first teaching and other interventions.	1.3% (1)

Table 15: Perceived disadvantages of the methods used (questionnaire)

In relation to the interviews, perceived weaknesses varied. Some felt they did not collect or use the data they did collect sufficiently:

School B: I don't think we do enough with the data once we've got it. So what I've actually done is just put it in a file and not really looked at it again, until I knew you were coming in and then looked at it.

School B: Limitations... I am not sure whether it has enough information on it or I haven't got an appendix or something like that which goes into further detail about what we are doing with the children. ... It's hand-written but I haven't formalised that in any way that would tack onto this or added an extra column onto the spreadsheet or something like that we could type or put the information in about what we have used it.

Whilst others felt it is still perceived as owned and required by the SLT. This was particularly a concern expressed in School E:

School E (Business Manager) weakness: it needs to be more owned by class teachers (as opposed to SLT). The culture of the school here is very much on individual pupil need and the children who are perhaps free school meals or children in care are not really seen as a distinct group that needs, you know, particularly different treatment because we are so much about meeting every child's needs.

SES

Society for Educational Studies

School E (Head Teacher): *I think where we are is, the management... is very aware of needing to measure this, the bit we need to step into next, is the next group of adults inside the class who need to a) identify that free school meals students are in their class and then how they move them on. I think that across the school, we would be honest with you and say that cultural shift is yet to occur at a classroom level.*

School E (Head Teacher): *A cultural change will be as well, equally you'll have a TA going 'so I've got a kid in front of me with four complex needs and you want me to worry about that they're free school meals. Actually what we've got to do is not beat people up with this, but say look we're actually getting funds in, so we're going to be asked. ..That's what I mean by a cultural change, about getting to people to understand that they do deserve to be seen as a group... but we could be in the danger that we've got a problem we're trying to find an answer to. We've got this school here, that's got this money for kids with free school meals so there we are we've got an answer but actually we've never thought across the piece, is this a huge impact on the student, because it's a fourth division impact, perhaps? What we've got to do is cope with someone who comes in who presumes that there isn't a fourth division impact, but someone who'll say we've given you X thousands of pounds and they're not interested, they're not interested, they'll say the government thinks all free school meal kids no matter what their disability aren't going as well.*

School E (Business Manager): *The danger could be that you only spend it on things that are easy to track and not the things that have the best outcome.*

School E, also acknowledged there may be an inherent limitation in focusing on achievement:

School E: *Not all impact can easily be measured, so that is the difficulty.*

Although some schools saw this as a strength of their chosen method, School A thought the strengths of their chosen method was the range of academic and non-academic impacts they focused on. This included encouraging their pupils to have a 'love of school'. They also use a range of funding to facilitate this.

School E and D also acknowledged that the fundamental assumption that poor performance may be linked to deprivation may be flawed:

School E (Business Manager): *The problem we'll come back to is, is, you know child H's attainment low because he has free school meals or is it low because he has really challenging ASD and hearing impairments?*

School D: *A lot of the challenges within the school are socio-emotional anyway and once we can get past that, then the actual education become easier.*

3.7.14 When asked if respondents plan to make any changes, 21.3% (17) indicated they would not and 11.3 % (9) that they definably would, whilst 11.3 % (9) were unsure or it was under review. In addition some more specific examples of proposed changes were provided, although these did vary somewhat in terms of detail:

Proposed changes to method measuring impact	% (N)
As SENCo I am researching how other schools spend and evaluate pupil premium in the hope that I can address the issue with my Head teacher.	1.3% (1)
Be cleverer about it!	1.3% (1)
Employ one person to oversee all 1:1 progress meetings as of next year - currently done by different members of staff	1.3% (1)
Linking existing systems to PP measures	1.3% (1)
More individual surveys of students and parents	1.3% (1)
Use school data in January and July	1.3% (1)
We have been focusing on quality effective feedback and what this looks like within the classroom setting - the impact of this is more difficult to measure in isolation.	1.3% (1)
We plan to cross reference pupil premium children with other groups	1.3% (1)
We will look into methods of cost benefit analysis	1.3% (1)
Yes, using student interviews to develop case studies to identify progress towards 'soft' targets	1.3% (1)
Yes. Pupil premium funding will be much more channelled and accountability of the spend easier to track. This does mean changing our existing tracking processes because the money is not additional, just a replacement of other funding streams.	1.3% (1)

Table 16: Proposed changes to method measuring impact (questionnaire)

In relation to the interviews, School E was the most reflective about the next steps to take. This may be due to having a relatively new head teacher:

School E: *There is a level of analysis we do for all of our children who receive pupil premium in terms of all of their learning and where their learning might not be at acceptable levels so perhaps those children who are lower quartile in terms of their progress we need to look to see what we can put in there, which might not only be things that are funded through pupil premium...it's about raising standards for all of our children.*

School E (Head Teacher): *Should we move this position we are in and actually what is the opportunity to do some ground breaking work here in either proving people wrong that free school meals in this setting is not the inhibitor, it is in main school settings.*

School E (Head Teacher): *Until we've gone out and done a fairly rigorous bit of research, that we can confidently say, 'in our opinion in here, free school meals is not an inhibitor to students making progression'.*

SES

Society for Educational Studies

School E (Head Teacher). *The reports I'm reading at the moment on pupil premium...at the moment they have not gone into special schools to look at the impact, they've looked at primary schools and they've looked at secondary schools and what I'm thinking is... is that the rhetorical question is do free school meals students in special school setting have less progress than non-free schools meals nationally, I don't know where I'd go to find that bit of analysis?*

3.7.15 When asked what other support they would like, 10% (8) indicated they did not want any, and 2.5% (2) were not sure. 25% (20) indicated they would appreciate more support. The range of support requested varied, the most common responses around 'what works best', the need for more time and expertise. Similarly when asked for specific detail responses varied:

Support and Advice requested	% (N)
Advice on what works best, any support would be welcome! Clearer guidance on how the money can be spent in relation to whole school improvement. Ideas of how best to do this would be great.	5% (4)
Internally have expertise - need to get time to do it. More time! I am a full time class teacher with 0.5 per week for SENCo time which is mostly spent chasing up paperwork and trying to get hold of outside agencies. Time and resources - a package to input data etc. Perhaps some help to reduce the paperwork!	5% (4)
Training on an age appropriate approach. Training with LEA. Considering good practice in other schools etc.	2.5% (2)
A great data manager!	1.3% (1)
An area that is in its infancy at the school. Impact with the data manager has only recently started to be looked into. This is an area of development.	1.3% (1)
I am comfortable with the way that we measure them in so far in that at least it is measurable. If the powers that be recognise anecdotal references to improvement we will use them.	1.3% (1)
I'd like a scientific approach, but seeing as Gove ignores any research there isn't much chance that will happen.	1.3% (1)
If you wanted to get in touch and support us in measuring impact, as we are at an early stage of really embracing the effective use of the pupil premium then that would be great. To truly establish this we need to support effective and accurate use of data across the whole school - how can interventions be planned if there is questionable data been published	1.3% (1)
I'm not sure what support is offered.	1.3% (1)
Incorporation of this year's statistics and next year's	1.3% (1)
More information on available resources and possible impact e.g. Sutton Trust toolkit	1.3% (1)
Statistical toolkit, suggestions of methodology through teacher INSET	1.3% (1)
To be kept up to date with national expectations	1.3% (1)

Table 17: Support and advice requested (questionnaire)

3.8 Reporting the Pupil Premium

3.8.1 Interviewees were asked the extent to which they felt key stakeholders were aware (parents and governors). Responses indicated this varied a great deal, from very little awareness to detailed knowledge and even expectations that they were would be involved in decisions about allocation of funds.

Parents:

School D: *Some parents do, we have a looked after child's family who are fully aware of the legalities and almost feel that that money is theirs, which is really hard actually. And I'm not underestimating how intelligent our families are, but stuff like that would pass them by.*

School E (Business Manager): *We've had a couple of parents, mostly been parents of looked after children, so foster parents who've said, I understand that you've got this amount of money and I want you to get a computer.*

Reporting to governors:

School B: *To governors, I report it to governors, I sit on the senior management team, within the senior management teams, there would be reporting in that way.*

On website:

School B: *On our website is just a very generic, standard, what the pupil premium is. In fact I don't even think at the moment our pupil premium statement says what we spent the money on.*

School E – used what they always used in terms of pupil progress and more specifically targeted interventions.

- 3.8.2 In terms of how information was reported on the website (a statutory requirement), one said *'We calculated the cost of additional inputs that PP were already receiving and showed how the proportions of money were spent'* and another said *'we just have a brief description of what it is and a breakdown of how money is spent'*. In terms of the other respondents the most common response was *'Advice from external source & member of staff discretion'* (17.5%, 14) and another schools website (16.3%, 13).

	% (N)
Advice from external source & member of staff discretion	17.5% (14)
Another school's website	7.5% (6)
Another school's website & Advice from external source	8.8% (7)
Another school's website & Member of staff discretion	6.3% (5)
Another school's website & Member of staff discretion & Advice from external source (including governors, Ofsted guidance)	7.5% (6)
In consultation with governors	5% (4)
In consultation with parents	1.3% (1)
Member of staff discretion	7.5% (6)
Used another school's template	1.3% (1)

Table 18: Sources used to decide how to publicize impact (questionnaire)

The interviewees were aware of the need to improve their method of publicising the impact and were frustrated by the lack of central guidance.

School B: *Our internet information is not as good as it needs to....it is not detailed enough it is just a general pupil premium comment and that is because before Easter no one was looking at pupil premium...So it's been since I took on the SENCo role that I've picked up the pupil premium role....I don't think it had been identified as an area that needed to be looked into before I brought it up.*

SES

Society for Educational Studies

School C used a conference, posted questions on a forum, looked at DfE website, email update link, information from finance (school).

School C: *There is no clear definitive of how this should be spent. My own opinion this needs to be the case because, because... being pushed to parents in one way and it is being given to the academies and schools in another. Saying you can spend it on this, but they are not saying the same thing to the parents. Parents are now saying, that's my money, I'm entitled to that... the policy will indicate that 30% of the uniform can come out of it, so not the full uniform.*

School B [in response to questions about how they report]: *'it's definitely been the case of muddling along' 'if it was actually standardised it would help because then you could compare schools which were alike'.*

School B focused reporting on reading, writing and maths because as a school they focused mostly on these. Because they had very high achieving pupils, parental pressure was perceived to be high for those subjects and all the year 6 children will take the 11+.

For school E the format was decided somewhat informally:

School E (Business Manager): *What I've specifically done is look at special schools that I know have had outstanding under the most recent framework, Ofsted framework. Because I'm assuming that if they've got outstanding then they've got their compliance right in terms of their website?*

- 3.8.3 Respondents felt that parents only understood the aims and use of the pupil premium to some extent (45%, 36) or not at all (20%, 16), whilst none of the respondents felt they understood it 'a great deal'. A similar finding was evident in the interviews:

School D: *Some of our families do know and think it their money....like it's their right to have for them...one of our looked after families...want us to buy their children lap-tops...We have some families that are aware and point blank refuse to pay for after school clubs, so we do have parents who will never pay because they expect us to pay.*

School C: *Parents are becoming more aware because of the press about, my child is entitled to £900... the bigger picture is that is not always the case, that money is spent, the full £900 for that child might be because the budget is used to support all pupil premium children. For instance the LAC children, we have a designated person that is employed to support all well-being and the academic progress of LAC children in the school and that particular salary is obviously going to take up more than that one. So we have a system (E8 solutions) where a person can log that activity and that offsets a proportion of their salary to that child.*

By contrast, in School B, parents appeared unaware or indifferent to the pupil premium.

School B: *I would think that they know about the pupil premium, but they would have left it down to the school to have decided on it.*

This could be a reflection of the school's ethos or the school's catchment, i.e. it is located in a relatively affluent area (School B) with a low percentage of eligible pupils, as opposed to a more deprived area

(School C) where perhaps parental networks share information about the pupil premium.

School B (Business Manager): *We were at a governors meeting last night where the focus was on accountability, particularly re the pupil premium and how much the governors should now be involved in monitoring where the pupil premium is being spent and the outcomes.*

School B (Business Manager): *I think the parents are aware of the ever 6 formula and I don't think I would be in a hurry to broadcast it, would you?*

School B: *I think for us, that fits into what we've been saying about teachers and teaching assistants as part of that team, it is not just my responsibility as the pupil premium person, it's not just the teachers as an SEN, it is not just the teachers, it's everybody working together to have the impact.*

School B: *[for next year] actually itemise the money and what it's spent on and what impact that's had but still in mind that it's probably going to impact a lot more children than those 11 [eligible] on that list.*

3.9 Further comments

3.9.1 When the questionnaire asked for further comments a range of views were expressed. One responded thought that it was having a negative effect in terms of parents, since they felt that some children were receiving more than others.

One noted frustrations with having to report it and keeping up to date with the requirements to report as well as the focus on closing the gap. Concern was also raised over reporting where small numbers of children were involved as they could be easily recognised. There was also concern raised over equality as some children are not eligible and therefore it is a challenge for the school to provide the same level of support.

Two respondents were very positive noting the impact on attainment and their innovative approach.

Further comments (questionnaire)
Comments related to parental involvement
By giving the amount received per child in the blurb about pupil premium, parents of individual children are beginning to ask for a breakdown of how all of the money has been spent on their child. They find it difficult to comprehend that the school can spend the money on the lowest 20% and on other pupils. This is starting to have a negative effect on school-parent relationship in some cases. Also for a school with a very small number of pupils on pupil premium we must be careful to ensure that those pupils can't be identified.
Intend to get parents on board more fully this year and to make staff more aware of its importance in driving progress.
We inform parents of all that we do as a school - however, there many parents who do not engage with the data despite our best efforts - which are many!
I know we need to report it but it moves so quickly and we change things regularly so reporting is always out of date
Comments related to reporting
It is very bureaucratic and we don't really know if we have got it right. We have looked at sources of research such as the Sutton Trust but they mainly reported on the PP with older children. Also much is said about closing the gap but how long does it take - we feel that we have the children for too little time – 3 years. There needs to be research on this aspect.
It would be useful to receive guidance nationally as to what the pupil premium reporting should look like, as there seems to be varied opinions on this.
It's hard! Would like to see some best practice
The change in reporting for pupil premium is huge. We already monitor progress and attainment but now have to create an additional line of tracking pupil premium funding rather than other funding we have been using as a school.
Reporting publically is inappropriate for small numbers of children who are easily identifiable. Some pupil premium funding is used to refocus the use of existing staff because of cuts in the budget elsewhere.
Its aims are commendable but historically our pupil premium children achieve well so it tends to be used as a useful bit of extra money for whole school projects.
Schools with a small amount of pupil premium have less flexibility in how it can be used and each pupil is statistically important in the reporting of percentages of attainment and progress.
Concern over equity
The philosophy behind the funding is wonderful and based on equality but in ensuring this equality we are producing an inequitable system that ensures children who may not be on FSM but have much the same emotional or educational needs are not receiving adequate funding to meet their needs - this also applies to the children who just miss out on the funding due to their parents being over the measure for FSM eligibility by a few pounds - this whole system needs to be rethought and funding for all children in areas of high deprivation should be equal - all children experience the same external environment and those who do not qualify for FSM may face severe emotional experiences within the parental home.
Comments that were Positive & emphasised innovation
Use of pupil premium funds has affected children's attainment for the better.
We will be developing an innovative whole school approach over the coming year. If you wanted to conduct some research at our school you would be more than welcome.

Table 19: Further comments (questionnaire)

In relation to the interviews, similar issues were evidence, but they did express a lack of confidence in relation to lack of information, but potential for future developments.

SES

Society for Educational Studies

School C: *When I went to that conference the clear message that was given across was that the buck stops with the teacher, and that the teacher are responsible for identifying their students and have they narrowed the gap for that child? Which runs into differentiation doesn't it, it's that effective use of differentiation.*

School C: *I have conversations on the vice principals' forum about pupil premium; 'I tried this literacy strategy and it worked or I tried these external providers and they're really good'. The forums are a really good way of sharing best practice. I think there is scope for localised schools to get together more and look how they support pupil premium through some generic projects.*

School C: *Lessons learned? I would say ensure that you attack pupil premium from a classroom basis, not from a top down. So it needs to be bottom up. So you need to get on board those teaching members of staff and train and support them with what their responsibilities or what the schools expectations are for pupil premium.*

School C: *Getting the parents on board is one avenue we need to develop on, there is a lesson to be learned.... bringing those pupil premium parents on, they know what we do now.*

School B: *I think there is not enough guidance or, as you say, there is no standardised thing we're given that we can put the data in and we can track it that way.*

School B (Business Manager): *We were able to bring in a TA for a child that actually isn't entitled to benefit from pupil premium, but he now gets one to one for 12 hours a week... because of that money.*

School B also used the pupil premium to pay for free school meals for some children who had not claimed it or had not had breakfast.

School B (Business Manager): *it is a Govism isn't it, you know, we will do this but we'll tell you what to do with it later, it's you know and how to handle it later you know. Then you're criticised for not doing it differently [said in relation to the lack of guidance about reporting and measuring the impact].*

School B (SENCo): *Only that and we've said that in the past, the whole idea works on that those children who get pupil premium are not achieving academically... whereas actually, for us, that isn't necessarily the case so it's identifying that fact and working out what we're going to spend on those children. Whether it is having an impact on those children and whether we need to look at how else we are going to spend their allocation*

School B (Business Manager): *I think it's important that we are allowed to reallocate the money to the children who do actually need it whether they have had free school meals or not.*

4. Conclusions & Recommendations

- 4.1 There is a clear desire to review and change the method of measuring the impact, but uncertainty on how to do this for the best. Many respondents were aware that their current method only focused on a narrow range of outcomes and often ignored 'softer' indicators such as motivation and behaviour.
- 4.2 There was also a request for more support and information. This ranged from advice, to packages, to more time and less paperwork.
- 4.3 It would seem schools need to have a clear policy in relation to pupil premium. This should include how it is spent and audited and how the impact is measured, received and reported.
- 4.4 In terms of reporting the pupil premium, respondents appeared to largely rely on other schools' websites and staff discretion. There is then a worrying lack of consistency in the reporting.
- 4.5 Respondents clearly did not think that parents had a full grasp of what were the aims or uses of the pupil premium. This perception was supported in the interviews.
- 4.6 It does seem that schools, both in the survey and interview, felt somewhat isolated and in need of clearer guidance from central government/Ofsted about what they are being asked to report and how, in addition, the best ways to utilise the pupil premium funding. This could be achieved through dedicated forums or websites or the establishment of localised projects that are then published for all to learn from.
- 4.7 In the interviews schools did raise the issues of parental awareness which can be a double edge sword. It does allow a conversation between the school and parents about ways their child can be supported and given access to things like school trips they might otherwise be denied. However, some parents felt they were entitled to dictate how the money was spent. In response, School C are developing a spending policy which limits what the pupil premium can be spent on, so for example a maximum of 30% of the school uniform or school trip funding can be bought with it.
- 4.8 Some schools noted that their eligible pupils were not underachieving and one asked that they be allowed to reallocate the funding to those who need it, rather than FSM. Although currently there is nothing to

prevent this, if the reporting mechanisms ask solely for impact on eligible pupils there is not a mechanism for schools to report wider impacts or for research to investigate such wider impacts. Thus there is the potential danger of funding being removed not for lack of evidence of impact, but due to lack of evidence of impact on a predefined range of groups. A somewhat ironic situation given that one supposed advantage of the academy/free school system is the freedom to make financial decisions.

- 4.9 It was felt by some respondents that the current emphasis on FSM was too simplistic. This was shown when discussing SEN. The respondents from the Special School were very concerned to know if children on P level or statemented students are making less progress than those who are FSM.
- 4.10 Very few schools did any form of investigation into a return on investment. However, they were open to the possibility, but unsure about how to go about it. Further guidance might therefore be useful. Schools asked for return on investment information to be sent to them if available.
- 4.11 Similarly the schools interviewed would welcome good practice in terms of website. One school in the case studies asked for a set of descriptors of what is excellent and outstanding practice in pupil premium look like.

References

- Althricher A., Feldman 2008, Posch P., Somekh B. ' *Teachers investigate their work* (2nd Ed). Routledge, London.
- Chowdry, H, Greaves E, Sibieta, L The pupil premium: assessing the options. The Institute for Fiscal Studies. March 2010. Printed by Pureprint Group, Uckfield. ISBN: 978-1-903274-73-6
- Collins, S (2010) Self- Evaluation and Study Support -demonstrating impact on attendance, behaviour and attainment. An East Midlands QiSS Partnership. QiSS <http://www.canterbury.ac.uk/education/quality-in-study-support/Publications.aspx> Accessed 09.09.11
- Coventry City Council (2014) Free School meals http://www.coventry.gov.uk/info/37/school-catering/168/free_school_meals (accessed 18/3/14)
- Cunningham R and Lewis K (2012) NFER. Teacher Voice. NFER Teacher Voice Omnibus 2012 Survey. The use of the Pupil Premium. The Sutton Trust.
- Cummings, C, Dyson, A, Muijs, D, Papps, I, Pearson, D, Raffo, C, Tiplady, L and Todd, L, with Crowther, D (2007) Evaluation of the full service extended schools initiative: Final Report. DfES Research report RR852
- Department for Education (2010) *Understanding school financial decisions*. Research Report DFE-RR183
- Department for Education (2013) Written statement to Parliament. Pupil premium funding. <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pupil-premium-funding> (Accessed 8/6/14)
- Department for Education (2014) Accountability and governance. Research priorities and questions (April 2014). https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/302929/Accountability_and_governance_research_priorities_and_questions.pdf (accessed (18/4/14)
- Department for Education (2010b) The Importance of Teaching White Paper Equalities Impact Assessment ref: DFE-00566-2010 <https://media.education.gov.uk/assets/files/pdf/i/importance%20of%20teaching%20white%20paper%20equia.pdf> (accessed 18/3/14)
- Department for Education (2010c) The importance of teaching: the schools white paper 2010 Ref: ISBN 9780101798020, Cm 7980PDF, <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-importance-of-teaching-the-schools-white-paper-2010> (Accessed 18/3/14)
- Department for Education (2011) Gov.Uk (19/9/11) (Press release) Funding for deprived pupils set to double. <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/funding-for-deprived-pupils-set-to-double> (accessed 2/5/14)
- Department for Education (2012) PUPIL PREMIUM GRANT 2012-2013: CONDITIONS OF GRANT (Updated October 2012).
- Department for Education (2013) Pupil Premium grant 2013 to 2014: conditions of grant. Reference: DFE-00276-2013

SES

Society for Educational Studies

Department for Education (2014) Policy. Raising the achievement of disadvantaged children. Gov.UK.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/policies/raising-the-achievement-of-disadvantaged-children> (accessed 7/6/14)

Department for Education (2014) Attainment gap at ages 11, 16 and 19.

<https://www.education.gov.uk/researchandstatistics/statistics/keystatistics/b00214299/attainment-gap-at-ages-11-16-and-19> (accessed 18/3/14)

Department for Education (2014b) Pupil premium: funding for schools and alternative provision: Accountability.

<http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/pupilsupport/premium/b00231348/pupil-premium-information-for-schools-and-ap-settings/accountability> (accessed 18/3/14)

Department for Education (2014c) Pupil premium: funding for schools and alternative provision: Inspections.

<http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/pupilsupport/premium/b00231348/pupil-premium-information-for-schools-and-ap-settings/inspections> (accessed 18/3/14)

Education Endowment Foundation Toolkit (2014)

<http://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/toolkit/> (accessed 18/3/14)

EISKent - Pupil Premium: What Can I Use This For?

<http://www.eiskent.co.uk/UserFiles/files/SIMS/User%20Forums/User%20Forums%20Pupil%20Premium.pdf> Education IT Services & Kent County Council (accessed 8/6/14)

Gov.Uk (2014) Apply for free school meals. What you need to know.

<https://www.gov.uk/apply-free-school-meals> (accessed 8/6/14)

Higgins, S (2011) What works in raising attainment and closing the gap: research evidence from the UK and abroad.

http://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/uploads/pdf/What_works_in_raising_attainment_and_closing_the_gap.pdf (Accessed 8/6/14)

MacBeath, J et al (2001) The Impact of Study Support. A report of a longitudinal study into the impact of participation in out-of-school-hours learning on the academic attainment, attitudes and school attendance of secondary school students. Research Report 273. DfES

MacBeath, J et al (2007) Schools on the Edge: Responding to Challenging Circumstances. Paul Chapman Publishing: London

NALDIC. Do schools get extra money to support EAL learners?

http://www.naldic.org.uk/eal-teaching-and-learning/faqs/doschoolsget_extra_moneyto_support_eal_learners. (Accessed 7/6/14)

Ofsted (2013) The Pupil Premium. How schools are spending the funding successfully to maximise achievement No. 130016 © Crown copyright 2013

Ofsted (2014) The framework for school inspection. Reference no: 120100.

<http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/framework-for-school-inspection> (accessed 18/3/14)

Robson C. (1987) *Experiment, design and statistics in psychology, an introduction*. Pelican, Middlesex.

SES – Society for Educational Studies <http://soc-for-ed-studies.org.uk/about/>
Accessed 10/7/13

SES

Society for Educational Studies

Sharp, C., Kendall, L., Bhabra, S., Schagen, I. and Duff, J. (2001). *Playing for Success: an Evaluation of the Second Year* (DfES Research Report 291). London: DfES.

Sharp, C., Blackmore, J., Kendall, L., Schagen, I., Mason, K. and O'Connor, K. (2002). *Playing for Success: an Evaluation of the Third Year* (DfES Research Report 337). London: DfES.

Sharp, C., Blackmore, J., Kendall, L., Greene, K., Keys, W., Macauley, A., Schagen, I. and Yeshanew, T. (2003). *Playing for Success: an Evaluation of the Fourth Year* (DfES Research Report 402). London: DfES.

Sharp, C., Schagen, I. and Scott, E. (2004). *Playing for Success: the Longer Term Impact. A Multilevel Analysis* (DfES Research Report 593). London: DfES.

Stewart W (2011) League tables to ignore race and poverty. TESconnect. (10 June 2011). <http://www.tes.co.uk/article.aspx?storycode=6086535>. (accessed 7/7/14)

Taylor, S. (2007) *The Impact of Out of School Hours Learning*. Wigan Council and UFA QiSS <http://www.canterbury.ac.uk/education/quality-in-study-support/Publications.aspx> Accessed 09.09.11

TLA (2009) *Extended services disadvantage subsidy. Narrowing the gap: raising attainment and improving well-being* <http://www.learning-exchange.org.uk/files/ExtendedServicesImpactDisadvantageSubsidyStories> (Access 18/3/14)

The Creative Way: The Learning Network for Thames Gateway (2009) Get a short. New versions: Promoting progression in photography September 2009.

The Education Endowment Fund. Toolkit. <http://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/toolkit/> (Accessed 8/6/14)

The School Information (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2012. <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2012/1124/made>. Accessed 24/4/2013

The Sutton Trust (2010) *Ensuring less privileged pupils benefit from the Government's school reforms*. August 2010

The Sutton Trust (2012) *Premium Policies: What schools and teachers believe will improve standards for poorer pupils and those in low-attaining schools*.

Webber, R & Butler, T *Classifying pupils by where they live: How well does this predict variations in their GCSE results?*

http://www.casa.ucl.ac.uk/working_papers/paper99.pdf. © Copyright CASA, UCL ISSN: 1467-1298

Appendix 1 - Interview Questions

The Impact of the Pupil Premium

April-

June 2013

I am Ian Durrant from the Faculty of Education, Canterbury Christ Church University.

We have been awarded a small research grant to explore the Impact of the Pupil Premium

The aim of this research is to explore how schools have been measuring and reporting the impact of the Pupil Premium. The intention is to provide information to assist the wider school community to develop more effective ways of measuring the impact and recording the data.

In undertaking this interview we are hoping you will be able to contribute with your perceptions of the impact of the Pupil Premium and supply some information about how this is measured and reported in your school.

Responses once collated will be thematically analysed and compared to those taken from other interviews. In addition it is hoped to draw on the responses of a larger on-line survey to provide a number of perspectives and examples. In the final report it would be useful to use specific quotes given by respondents, however they will be only identified in terms of role and type of school. All other information will remain confidential.

Participation is voluntary. If you do not feel able to answer these questions, it would be appreciated if you could identify the most appropriate person in your school that I could approach. Please note at any stage you have the right to withdraw from this research, this includes after the interview has finished.

Should you decide you no longer want your comments included as part of the research please contact me and your contribution will be removed from the dataset.

The interview will last no more than an hour. I have a number of questions to ask and may need to move the discussion along to ensure we cover all the areas.

Do you have any questions?

Thank you for your participation.

Ian Durrant

Senior Lecturer QiSS

Canterbury Christ Church University

Hall Place Enterprise Centre

Harbledown

Canterbury

Kent,

CT2 9AG

Tel: 01227 863643

Mobile: 07595 089946

Fax: 01227 863030 email: ian.durrant@canterbury.ac.uk

Section 1 - Claiming and auditing

1. What is your understanding of the purpose of the Pupil Premium?
2. What is your role in the school and in relation to the Pupil Premium?

Supplementary Questions (depending on person's role)

3. For what children do you claim the pupil premium and approximately how many are in each category? (how do you record this data?)
4. Who is responsible to deciding on how the PP funds are allocated and audited? (and how was this decided?)

Section 2 - Uses of Pupil Premium in your school.

5. In what ways do you currently use the PP funding? (and how was this decided?)

Supplementary Questions (depending on person's role)

6. To what extent is Pupil Premium funding used to meet the key priorities in your school? (if so what are they and how were they identified in relation to the pupil Premium funding?)
7. Is the Pupil Premium used in conjunction with any other form of funding?

Section 3 - Measuring the impact of the Pupil Premium

8. Who is responsible for measuring the impact of the Pupil Premium and can you describe the nature of their responsibility?
9. Please describe your method(s) for measuring the impact of the Pupil Premium. (Including what you feel has been impacted and how did you develop your method?)
10. How did you develop this method (i.e. did you use published tools or internal expertise?)
11. What is your success criteria in measuring the impact of the Pupil Premium in your school? (i.e. are you measuring against baselines, or comparisons or some other indicator?)
12. What do you believe are the strengths and limitations of the chosen method? (i.e. is it possible that other factors that may have affected the impacts which you are reporting?)
13. How do you separate out the impact of multiple funding streams?

Supplementary Questions (depending on person's role)

14. Can you provide any worked examples to illustrate the impacts you have reported?
15. Do you undertake any form of cost-benefit analysis? (if so please give details)
16. What have the key challenges been in measuring and reporting the impact of the pupil premium?

Section 4 - Reporting on the use of Pupil Premium

SES

Society for Educational Studies

17. To what extent do think your parents understand the aims and use of the Pupil Premium? (what of other stakeholders, e.g. governors)
18. Given the nature of this research, i.e. to explore the uses and impact of the Pupil Premium in schools, is there anything else you would like to add?
19. Supplementary Questions (depending on person's role)

How did you decide how to present the pupil premium on the website?

Thank you very much for your time. As mentioned before, your answers will be kept confidential and you have the right to withdraw you participation at any time. Do you have any questions?



Society for Educational Studies

Appendix 2 – Questionnaire

The Questionnaire was distributed by Survey Thing <http://qiss.surveything.net/> below is the elements of this questionnaire.

Email Text:

Dear Colleague,

Canterbury Christ Church University is undertaking research related to the impact of the Pupil Premium.

The intention is to collate information about the various ways its impact is being measured and reported.

The survey consists of 27 questions and should only take between 15-30 minutes to complete. Once completed the responses are submitted electronically and anonymously to the central database for collation. Although you are asked to supply your name and the name of your school; this is only to identify responses from the same school. Individuals or schools will not be identified in the final report. There are no right or wrong answers; we are simply interested in the processes, decisions and perceptions as they occur in your school.

To access the survey, please click on the link below, this will take you directly to the questionnaire. Clicking on the finish button at the end of the questionnaire will close the questionnaire and save your responses. Your email address will not be saved by the system.

<Link>

The closing date for responses will be XXXXXX.

If you feel there is a colleague in your school with more relevant knowledge in relation to the Pupil Premium, I would be grateful if you could forward this email to them.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours Sincerely

Ian Durrant

Senior Lecturer, Canterbury Christ Church University

Tel: 01227 863643

Mobile: 07595 089946

email: ian.durrant@canterbury.ac.uk



Society for Educational Studies

Questionnaire:

Pupil premium research

The aim of this research is to explore how schools have been measuring and reporting the impact of the Pupil Premium. The intention is to provide information to assist the wider school community to develop more effective ways of measuring the impact and recording the data. Although you are asked to identify your school, this is only to ensure that answers are not duplicated and the sample is representative.

Participation is voluntary. If you do not feel able to answer these questions, it would be appreciated if you could pass the questionnaire onto the most appropriate person in your school.

Yours Sincerely

Ian Durrant
Senior Lecturer, Canterbury Christ Church University
Tel: 01227 863643
Mobile: 07595 089946
email: ian.durrant@canterbury.ac.uk

Questions

A. Claiming and auditing

Which pupil groups are claimed for and what is recorded?

1. **For which eligibility category do you claim the pupil premium and approximately how many are in this category in your school?**

	Claimed for?	Approx. number 2012-2013
Free School Meals	<input type="radio"/>	
Looked after children	<input type="radio"/>	
Children from military families	<input type="radio"/>	
Children currently not on FSM, but who have registered in the last 6 years.	<input type="radio"/>	
<i>What proportion of the eligible pupils are also registered as having SEN?</i>		

2. **Do you use the Pupil Premium in conjunction with any other revenue streams (e.g. the £50 literacy funds for year 7s).**

Yes No

3. **Who is responsible for deciding how the Pupil Premium funds are allocated and audited?**

B. Uses of Pupil Premium in your school.

4. In what ways do you currently use the PP funding?

- For individual children
- For groups of eligible children
- For whole school projects
- For specialist projects
- Other please state

5. In which area of the school is Pupil Premium used for?

(please tick all which apply)

- Early years – helping children prepare for school
- Transition from primary to secondary school
- Improved behaviour/motivation/aspiration/ engagement
- Use/employment of specialist (e.g. FLW, TAs)
- Teacher training or development
- Extracurricular activities/extended services.
- Summer school
- Improving feedback between teachers and pupils / providing more feedback that is effective
- Metacognition
- Specific classroom practice.
- Specific curriculum areas e.g. phonics, numeracy etc.*

***Please provide details**

6. Does your school use the Pupil Premium to provide additional resources?

(please tick all which apply)

- Reducing class sizes
- Additional teaching assistants
- Additional teachers
- More one-to-one tuition
- Peer-to-peer tutoring schemes for pupils
- Early intervention schemes
- Extending the breadth of the curriculum
- Improving the classroom or school environment
- Offsetting budget cuts elsewhere
- Buying resources e.g. books
- IT equipment VLE
- Other (please state)

Additional comments

SES

Society for Educational Studies

7. What if any, specialist activities do you use Pupil Premium funding for?

8. To what extent is Pupil Premium funding used to meet the key priorities in your school?

Not at all

To some extent

A great deal

If it is used, what would you say are your school's three key priorities in the context of PP funding?

1.....

2.....

3.....

C. Measuring the impact of the PP

9. Is the responsibility for measuring the impact and reporting, the remit of one person or a group/team?

Individual	Group/team
------------	------------

Please brief details of their role(s) in the school

10. In measuring the impact or deciding how to measure the impact, did you use

	Currently used	Used in developing approach
Tool kits e.g. <i>Educational Endowment Foundation & Sutton Trust</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Commercially available software	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Services of an external consultant	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Internal expertise	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Published documents: e.g. <i>Premium Policies: What schools and teachers believe will improve standards for poorer pupils and those in low-attaining schools</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

11. What are the outcomes used by your school to measure the impact (e.g. attainment, achievement attendance or other indicators e.g. motivations, punctuality) and why were they chosen?

12. What are your key priorities/ success criteria in measuring the impact of the Pupil Premium in your school?

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

How and from where were they derived? (e.g. Ofsted report, SLT, governors, parents, floor targets etc.)

13. When measuring the impact do you:

Report any improvement	<input type="radio"/>
Improvements against set criteria?	<input type="radio"/>

If you report again set criteria, what are these and how were they established?

14. Do you collect/report data which demonstrates the 'comparative' impact i.e.

	Yes	No
Comparisons of performance of eligible against non-eligible pupils.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Improvements compared to previous cohorts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

SES

Society for Educational Studies

Improvement against predictions/targets	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
'other indicators' (e.g. behaviour, motivation)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you have answered yes, please provide details

15. If the methods used by your school to measure the impact of the Pupil Premium differ from those stated above please briefly describe or give an example.

16. Do you undertake any form of cost-benefit analysis?

Yes	No	Unsure
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

17. What do you see as the advantages of your chosen method of impact measure?

18. What do you see as the disadvantages of your chosen method of impact measure?

19. Do you plan to make any changes to this method of impact measure next year?

20. What if any supports do you need to develop your impact measures?

D. Reporting on the use of Pupil Premium

21. Presentation of Pupil Premium information on the website was based upon:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Another school's template | <input type="radio"/> |
| Member of staff discretion | <input type="radio"/> |
| Advice from external source | <input type="radio"/> |
| Develop in consultation with parents | <input type="radio"/> |
| Other please state | <input type="radio"/> |

Parents, Governors and stakeholders

22. To what extent do think your parents understand the aims and use of the Pupil Premium?

- | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Not at all | To some extent | A great deal |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

23. What have the key challenges been in measuring and reporting the impact of the pupil premium?

E. School details

24. What type of school do you work in?

(Please tick all which apply)

- | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Academy | <input type="radio"/> |
| Comprehensive | <input type="radio"/> |
| High School | <input type="radio"/> |
| Free School | <input type="radio"/> |
| Grammar | <input type="radio"/> |
| Independent | <input type="radio"/> |
| Special | <input type="radio"/> |
| Other (please state) | <input type="radio"/> |

What Phase is your school?

- | | |
|-----------|-----------------------|
| Primary | <input type="radio"/> |
| Secondary | <input type="radio"/> |

25. In which region is your school?

- | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|
| East of England | <input type="radio"/> |
| East Midlands | <input type="radio"/> |
| London | <input type="radio"/> |
| North East | <input type="radio"/> |
| North West | <input type="radio"/> |
| South East | <input type="radio"/> |
| South West | <input type="radio"/> |
| West Midlands | <input type="radio"/> |
| Yorkshire & Humberside | <input type="radio"/> |

26. **What is the name of your school?** (this information will not be used and is only collected to ensure a representative sample or identify duplicates).

27. What is your role within the school?

SES

Society for Educational Studies