



Pupil Premium Review Form 3 School Visit



Samworth Church Academy's visit, 26th February 2018

| | |
|--|--|
| Headteacher: | Lisa McVeigh |
| PPR: | Thomas Hague |
| Summary of school's existing areas of focus and strategies: | <p>Area one: Focus: Equal rates of literacy improvement and attainment for non-pupil premium and pupil premium students (with a particular focus on years 7, 8 and 9). Success criteria: STAR reader data, Lexia program and current attainment data indicate equal rates of improvement.</p> <p>Area two: Focus: Improved rates of progress across all key stages and subjects for mid-attaining pupils eligible for PP. Success criteria: To be no less than 0.3 away from non-pupil-premium performance, working towards an in-house gap of 0.</p> <p>Area three: Focus: Decreased behavioural points for PP, leading to higher rates of engagement within lessons. Success criteria: PPr Behavioural Gap to be less than 6.8% and working towards 0% with reductions on proportions of both PPr and nPPr cohorts with 20+ C4.</p> <p>Area four: Focus: Increased attendance rates for pupils eligible for FSM Ever 6. Success criteria: Reduce the number of persistent absentees (PA) among pupils eligible for FSM Ever 6 to 15% or below. Overall attendance among pupils eligible for PP improves from 82% to 95% in line with 'other' pupils.</p> |
| Summary of how effectively school uses evidence to identify effective strategies: | <p>Area one: Literacy intervention is necessary for PP students to access the whole curriculum. The strategy here is well informed by several pieces of research and evidence, including the EEF.</p> <p>Area two:</p> |

The focus on improved teaching and learning, CPD, aspirational interventions etc. are all cross-referenced against research from varying sources.

Area three:
The school has identified the need to close the behaviour gap, to in turn accelerate progress of PP students. evidence shows this to be effective in practice, but the strategy lacks detail regarding the action for this.

Area four:
As detailed in the strategy, the link between improved attendance and achievement is clearly positive.

Names of key people to speak to and outline itinerary (to be provided by headteacher using detail on Form 2): Discussion points to be noted.

| Time | Action | Required? |
|---------------|---|----------------|
| 8.25 – 8.55 | Pupil Premium Strategy Statement | EMO |
| 8.55 – 9.25 | Careers, CIAG and Raising Aspirations | CTA & EMO |
| 9.25 – 9.55 | LW English | CST (HOD) |
| 9.55 – 10.25 | LW Maths | DMU/ASH (HOD) |
| Break | Walk around school & Refreshments. Observations of behaviour. | EMO |
| 11.00 – 11.30 | Attendance meeting | SBA & CSO |
| 11.30 – 12.00 | Student Panel | DBA |
| 12.00 | Lunch in the restaurant. Observations of behaviour. | EMO |
| 13.00 – 13.30 | Literacy Interventions Discussion. | EMO |
| 13.30 – 14.00 | Lexia learning walk. | EMO |
| 14.00 – 14.30 | Observations of the day | EMO, CSO & LMC |

| Area (including sources of evidence) | Suggested questions and areas to explore Strengths Areas for development | Strengths | Areas to develop |
|--|---|--|--|
| <p>Pupil characteristics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Interview with pupil premium co-ordinator (PPCo) ❖ Published data | <p>What is the overall number and proportion of pupil premium eligible pupils within the whole school population?</p> <p>What is the two/three year pattern in eligibility for pupil premium?</p> <p>How well does the school know the eligibility data and patterns?</p> | <p>292 of the 1165 students at the Academy are PP. This equates to 25% of the school population.</p> <p>The proportions of students who are disadvantaged are fairly consistent across the year groups, however year 9 have a greater proportion of students who are disadvantaged.</p> <p>The Pupil Premium Coordinator has a strong grasp of the pupil data, regarding eligibility and also outcomes. She is aware that with the school growing in popularity for student places, this may impact on the proportion of students eligible for the Pupil Premium and hence will need to respond accordingly.</p> | |
| <p>Achievement₁</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Interview with PPCo ❖ Published data ❖ Current progress data ❖ Lesson observation and work scrutiny | <p>How well does the school make use of evidence including the EEF toolkit?</p> | <p>The academy's Pupil Premium Strategy statement is underpinned by evidence. This comes in two forms: evidence from several different external published sources, and then also from an evaluative approach of what works well in the school's own local setting.</p> | <p>Greater consideration of the EEF toolkit could be applied to the academy's Pupil Premium Strategy, particularly with regards to strategies which are found to have the greatest impact e.g. feedback. Furthermore, the rationale behind the academy's Pupil Premium Strategy statement could make</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | <p>Do evidence-based systems for evaluation of impact exist?</p> <p>What is the progress of disadvantaged pupils relative to their starting points?</p> <p>How quickly are attainment gaps for disadvantaged pupils closing compared to the national average?</p> | <p>The academy's Pupil Premium Strategy Statement clearly shows the ways in which impact will be evaluated, with quantifiable measures placed on each specific outcome. The Pupil Premium Strategy statement is evaluated and RAG'ed throughout the academic year at designated times (linked to the academy's assessment calendar), as is the academy's Improvement Plan.</p> <p>2017 outcomes for PP students show P8 to have improved by half a grade overall, relative to 2016. Progress of disadvantaged students overall rose from the 84th percentile nationally in 2016, to the 44th percentile in 2017.</p> <p>In 2017, the overall A8 of disadvantaged students was somewhat skewed by two students who were outliers.</p> | <p>explicit use to the EEF toolkit, naming the expected gains from the strategies employed.</p> <p>Overall progress for PP students remains below national overall in 2017, with both English and Maths - 0.79 and -0.35 respectively.</p> <p>The overall A8 of disadvantaged students was 36 in 2017, below the national for all pupils and other pupils. Attainment in the Basics at both 4+ and 5+ for disadvantaged students in 2017 was below the national for all pupils and other pupils. This data also shows in-school attainment gaps.</p> |
|--|---|--|--|

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | <p>What story does the current data tell?</p> | <p>Current 2018 predictions are for 21% of disadvantage students to achieve a 5+ in the Basics for 2018, in line with that achieved in 2017. Tracking shared for KS3 disadvantaged students shows them to be responding well to the academy's Pupil Premium strategy, with KS3 attainment and progress gaps between disadvantaged students and other pupils within the academy relatively less apparent than they have been historically. This can also be seen in the assessment of literacy levels in KS3, as a result of the interventions put in place as part of the Pupil Premium Strategy.</p> | <p>Current 2018 predictions are for disadvantaged progress overall to fall to -0.54, relative to -0.27 in 2017. The overall A8 of disadvantaged students is predicted to remain at 36 for 2018.</p> |
| <p>Leadership & Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Interview with Headteacher (HT) and Chair of Governors (CoG) ❖ Interview with PPCo ❖ Scrutiny of pupil premium policy documents ❖ Scrutiny of SEF / development plan ❖ Most recent OFSTED report Published and current data | <p>How well does the school make use of evidence including the EEF toolkit?</p> <p>Do evidence-based systems for evaluation of impact exist? How effectively does the school identify priorities for pupil premium funding?</p> | <p>As previously mentioned, the academy makes effective use of an evidenced based approach to its Pupil Premium Strategy.</p> <p>As previously mentioned, the evaluation of the impact of the Pupil Premium Strategy is ongoing throughout the academic year, with the impact judged against quantifiable benchmarks. The pupil premium strategy is triangulates effectively with the whole school Improvement Plan.</p> | <p>The Pupil Premium Strategy could be more effectively shared with Governors, so as they can quality assure it and challenge the academy's leaders more rigorously with regards its impact. A named link Governor for the Pupil Premium could assure the audit trail for the spending of the funding is in place, and quality assure the impact of</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| | <p>How well matched are the school's strategies with the perceived barriers to learning for disadvantaged pupils?</p> <p>How ambitious are the targets for disadvantaged pupils?</p> | <p>The academy's approach to identifying barriers to learning for disadvantaged students within the academy is effective. Analyse of data from the previous academic year has informed the strategy, with the notion being that if the named barriers to learning are overcome the disadvantaged students will attain well. Current tracking of the impact of the strategy is promising, for example in the closing of the behaviour and attendance gaps between disadvantaged and other students in the academy.</p> <p>Targets set as part of the Pupil Premium Strategy are used as benchmarks to evaluate progress against. The targets set for the desired outcomes are all reasonable, looking to rapidly close gaps for disadvantaged students but at the same time realising that this may take more than one year to achieve. Senior Leaders in the academy are aware of the need to close both in school gaps, and the gaps to national standards for other students.</p> | <p>interventions on Governor visits to the academy.</p> <p>A greater emphasis on the aspect of the Pupil Premium Strategy which refers to the progress of middle attainers is needed for this barrier to be overcome. In particular, evidence from the visit as part of the review would suggest that the 'quality of teaching for all' needs to become more effective in some lessons, to accelerate the progress of these disadvantaged learners.</p> |
|--|--|---|---|

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | <p>How does the school divide its use of funding between activities which have a clear and direct impact on pupil progress and those which focused on providing wider opportunities or meeting social/emotional needs?</p> | <p>The academy's approach to the Pupil Premium is that overcoming the identified barriers to learning will result in improved outcomes for disadvantaged students. as such, the academy divide their use of pupil premium funding between academic interventions e.g. small group tuition, and pastoral interventions e.g. staffing for attendance interventions.</p> | <p>There are examples of ways in which the academy has allocated pupil premium funding to improving teaching and learning. However, observations of lessons would suggest that more could be made of this e.g. the oracy strategy which is not yet embedded in lessons across the curriculum. Going forward a greater proportion of funding could be spent on improving first wave teaching (through CPD), followed by rigorous quality assurance.</p> |
| <p>Teaching, Learning and Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Lesson observation/learning walks, to include work scrutiny and discussion with teachers ❖ Observation of out of class interventions and tracking of intervention ❖ Current progress data ❖ Work scrutiny and lesson observation records ❖ Moderation of assessment ❖ Assessment and homework policies ❖ CPD records/programme | <p>How well do class teachers plan for disadvantaged pupils within lessons and for targeted interventions?</p> <p>Are parents/carers and multi professionals involved in these discussions?</p> <p>How well does the school plan for and achieve quality first teaching for disadvantaged pupils?</p> | <p>Targeted interventions are planned for and administered centrally. This is effective in ensuring that there is efficient coverage of interventions. These include English/Maths interventions for KS4 students and literacy interventions.</p> <p>Reporting to parents at the academy is regular and informative. Students stated that they are motivated by the Celebrating Success Agenda, particular when this is shared with parents/carers also.</p> <p>Seating plans are expected for all lessons, so as teachers are aware of who the disadvantaged students are in each class. Summative data is reported half termly, and teachers</p> | <p>In practice, there is inconsistency in the quality of teaching of disadvantaged students. Whereas in some lessons and subjects disadvantaged students receive</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| | <p>Where out of lesson interventions take place, how does the school evaluate impact?</p> <p>How effective is assessment?</p> | <p>are required to reset their seating plans each half term to respond to any underachievement of disadvantaged students. The Pupil Premium Strategy details the intention for quality assurance of the quality of teaching of disadvantaged students. The academy's literacy strategy for disadvantaged students is sound, with Accelerated Reader used for termly testing of reading ages. Within Key Stage 3, one of the four English lessons per week is focused on literacy, with intervention for disadvantaged students who's reading age is at least one year behind their actual age.</p> <p>The Pupil Premium Strategy clearly set out the way in which out of lesson interventions will be evaluated before they commence. This is then tracked by Senior Leaders, and the strategy is then reshaped depending on emerging data.</p> <p>Assessment practices established at the academy, with half termly central data collections. The 'chances' approach to tracking allows for leaders to be aware of who the underachieving disadvantaged students are, so as</p> | <p>effective teaching and formative PINs marking, in others namely a lack of formative feedback limits the progress of disadvantaged students. Feedback in these less effective lessons is very general, with written feedback to students not necessarily based on what they need to do improve. Students do not consistently engage with this feedback either, and when asked are not able to articulate what they personally need to do to improve their attainment.</p> <p>As previously mentioned above, written feedback through marking is not yet consistently effective. In addition, when speaking to KS4 disadvantaged students, they seemed unaware of the particular topics they need to revise in advance</p> |
|--|---|--|---|

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | <p>Where support is focused on wider issues in pupils' and their families' lives and / or to widen opportunity, is there evidence that this support is improving engagement and contributing to closing performance gaps?</p> | <p>lessons, and conducted themselves well during unstructured times also.</p> <p>The disadvantaged students who formed the pupil panel, were able to explain about how they are motivated by the Celebrating Success Agenda, and also the High Aspirations program. Much of this High Aspirations and careers program is differentiated for disadvantaged students, so as they are well informed to be able to suitably aim high. The academy is effectively forming a program of careers events for disadvantaged students as they move through the key stages, for example the inclusion of the 'fast tomatoes' sessions.</p> <p>Leaders have formed a plan to work with parents of persistently absent disadvantaged students, be forming different working parties – the impact of this is still to be seen as this part of the overall strategy is still forming.</p> <p>The curriculum facilities investing in allow different groups of disadvantaged learners to progress. The vocational centre includes an animal nurture room for more vulnerable students, as well as a Hair and Beauty suite.</p> | |
|--|---|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| <p>Evaluation of impact, drafting action plan and next steps</p> <p>❖ Discussion with HT/ CoG/ PPCo</p> | <p>How well is pupil premium funding used to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure quality first teaching and above expected progress? ▪ Support effective interventions? ▪ Widen opportunity? ▪ What support can the reviewer offer for action planning and ongoing monitoring of the plan? | <p>The Pupil Premium Strategy at Samworth Church Academy is well planned, with out of class interventions in particular matched to student need and monitored regularly. The careers strategy is differentiated for disadvantaged students across the key stages, and the impact of this will be seen in the coming years as more students move through this careers programme. Results for disadvantaged students have improved rapidly in the last academic year, and the current tracking of the objectives in the Pupil Premium Strategy all show positive outcomes so far this year. As such, it is expected that outcomes for disadvantaged students will continue to improve going forward.</p> | <p>To further accelerate progress of disadvantaged students, it is necessary for teaching to be more specific to the need of disadvantaged students. Feedback to students, particularly in written form, needs to be formative so as disadvantaged students know what they need to do to progress. Otherwise, as standards for all students' rise, the in-school gap will potentially grow. The impact of the pupil premium funding spent on CPD will help to improve teaching and learning, as will more effective quality assurance as intended in the Pupil Premium Strategy.</p> |
|--|---|--|--|

¹ When reviewing special schools reviews may also wish to consider the area of 'enrichment', and the following question: How will pupil premium eligible pupils benefit from the funding and how is its impact monitored as far as enriching their opportunities is concerned? What is the impact of this on their attainment?

Signed: _____ **PPR**