

Pupil premium strategy statement: The Samworth Church Academy

Policy Information

Named personnel with designated responsibility

Academic Year	Director of Deep Support	Team Director of Deep Support
2016/17	Carl Storey (CSO)	Emma Mottram (EMO)

Policy Review Dates: (Frequency of Review: Annually)

Review Date	Changes Made	By whom:
October 2016	Policy Reviewed	Carl Storey

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Funding
3. Evidence of what works
4. Accountability
5. Pupil Premium Reporting
6. Performance Tables
7. Strategy Statement

Introduction

Pupil premium is an additional funding grant for publicly funded schools in England given to raise the attainment of disadvantaged pupils of all abilities and to diminish the differences between them and their peers.

Funding

In the 2016-17 financial year:

- The academy will receive £935 for each pupil in Year 7-Year 11 who have been eligible for free school meals (FSM) at any time in the last six years.
- The academy will receive £1,900 for each pupil identified in the Spring school census who:
 - Have been in care for more than one day

October 2016

- Have ceased to be looked after by a local authority in England and Wales because of:
 - Adoption
 - A special guardianship order
 - A child arrangements order
 - A residence order
- The academy will receive £300 for each pupil who has a parent/care in the armed services, who face particular challenges.

We have been allocated £283 000 for the 2016/17 academic year. These funds are in addition to the main school budget.

Evidence of What Works

The Education Endowment Foundation has produced a teaching and learning toolkit to help teachers and schools effectively use the pupil premium to support disadvantaged pupils. Its families of school toolkit helps teachers learn about effective practice from similar school. It has also produced an evaluation toolkit to help schools measure the impact of the approaches they are using.

Information can be found on schools that have been recognised for their successful use of the premium on the Pupil Premium Awards website.

Pupil Premium Reporting

We must publish a strategy for the school's use of the pupil premium.

For the current academic year, we must include:

- our school's pupil premium grant allocation amount
- a summary of the main barriers to educational achievement faced by eligible pupils at the school
- how we'll spend the pupil premium to address those barriers and the reasons for that approach
- how we'll measure the impact of the pupil premium
- the date of the next review of the school's pupil premium strategy

For the previous academic year, we must include:

- how we spent the pupil premium allocation
- the impact of the expenditure on eligible and other pupils

Pupil premium funding is allocated for each financial year, but the information we publish online should refer to the academic year, as this is how parents understand the school system.

As we won't know allocations for the end of the academic year (April to July), we should report on the funding up to the end of the financial year and update it when you have all the figures.

Strategy Statement

1. Summary information					
School	The Samworth Church Academy				
Academic Year	2016/17	Total PP budget	283,000	Date of most recent PP Review	Sept '16
Total number of pupils	1207	Number of pupils eligible for PP	295	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Sept' 17

2. Current attainment		
	<i>Pupils eligible for PP (your school)</i>	<i>Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)</i>
% achieving 5A* - C incl. EM (2015/16 only)	33.% (npp. 64.7%)	64.7%
% achieving expected progress in English / Maths (2015/16 only)	68% (npp. 76%) / 59% (npp. 77%)	75.8% / 73.4%
Progress 8 score average (from 2015/16)	-0.84 (-0.32)	0.12
Attainment 8 score average (from 2015/16)	37.2 (49.4)	52

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP including high ability)	
In-school barriers	
A.	Literacy skill improvement decreases significantly over time; pupil premium boys, in particular, do not improve in the same way as girls.
B.	High attaining pupils who are eligible for PP are making less progress than other high attaining pupils across all key stages. This prevents sustained high achievement through KS4. English Progress: LAL GAP 0.22; MAL 0.34; HAL; 0.47, Maths Progress: LAL GAP -0.07; MAL 0.34; HAL 0.49. Overall Progress: LAL GAP 0.03; MAL 0.55; HAL 0.58.
C.	In KS4, boys who are pupil premium are significantly underachieving in comparison to girls. 23% Ppr boys achieved 5A*-CIEM 44% Ppr girls achieved 5A*-C IEM
External barriers	
D.	Attendance rates for pupils eligible for FSM are lower (below the target for all children of 95%). This reduces their school hours and causes them to fall behind on average. Attendance NFSM – 95.6% FSM: 90.1% Persistent absenteeism (below 90% attendance)

	NFSM: 10.7% FSM: 33.8%	
4. Outcomes		
	<i>Outcome</i>	<i>How is this going to be measured?</i>
A.	Equitable literacy improvement for non pupil premium and pupil premium students in years 7, 8 and 9, with a particular focus on boys' reading.	STAR reader data, Lexia program and current attainment data indicate equal rates of improvement.
B.	Improved rates of progress across all key stages and subjects for high attaining pupils eligible for PP.	The gap between pupils eligible for PP identified as high attaining (from KS2 levels / raw scores) is equitable to LAL and MAL, and reduced from 2015/16 results across Key Stage 4 in Maths, English and overall P8 and attainment 8 scores.
C.	Equitable achievement for pupil premium boys and girls in KS4.	Decreased gap between male/female performance, as indicated by P8 measures.
D.	Increased attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP.	Reduce the number of persistent absentees (PA) among pupils eligible for FSM to 15% or below. Overall attendance among pupils eligible for PP improves from 82% to 95% in line with 'other' pupils.

5. Planned expenditure					
Academic year		2016/17			
The three headings below enable schools to demonstrate how they are using the Pupil Premium to improve classroom pedagogy, provide targeted support and support whole school strategies.					
i. Quality of teaching for all					
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
A. Equitable literacy improvement for non pupil premium and pupil premium students in years 7, 8 and 9.	Lexia program engagement for all students who are reading at an a year below expected standards for their age, or below. STAR reading tests to underpin this and to allow for monitoring of improvement. Lexia: £30,000 AR: £13,000	“In numerous studies published in peer-reviewed journals, Lexia has been found to accelerate the development of critical fundamental literacy skills.” Program is proven to be an effective strategy for improving the literacy standards of weaker students.	Robust construction of lesson framework for Lexia to be delivered. Separate classes created to accommodate Lexia students in quiet, dedicated learning environment. Termly analyses of STAR reading age data, in addition to analyses of English CA in relation to Lexia users.	EMO	Feb' 17
A. Equitable literacy improvement for non pupil premium and pupil premium students in years 7, 8 and 9.	'Secret Literacy' CPD within English to encourage a contextualised and embedded approach to teaching literacy skills at KS3 and beyond.	'The ability to read is not innate and requires systematic and explicit teaching... If we want to improve reading, we need to teach knowledge, specifically, knowledge about language. We need to understand 90% of the vocabulary in a text before we can process it.' David Didau, <i>The Secret Literacy</i>	HOD to oversee resources and scheme development within KS3.	Head of English (CST)	October, March and June 17

A. Equitable literacy improvement for non pupil premium and pupil premium students in years 7, 8 and 9.	<p>Focus on engaging boys within the English curriculum and in the text selection throughout the literacy curriculum.</p> <p>Whole school drive to raise profile of reading, targeted at boys.</p> <p>Purchase of set of 'Here I stand' texts. £450</p> <p>WBD: large event aimed at whetting the appetite of male readers.</p>	<p>"The issue is deep-seated. Test results consistently show this is a long-term and international trend. Boys' attitudes towards reading and writing, the amount of time they spend reading and their achievement in literacy are all poorer than those of girls" – The Boys' Reading Commission, National Literacy Trust.</p>	<p>National Literacy Trust Football Skills Academy.</p> <p>Evidence of texts being selected with boys in mind.</p> <p>Subsequent analyses of library usage and tracking of reading age/ attainment data.</p>	EMO/LJO (FOOTBALL BOYS ACADEMY)	April 17
Total budgeted cost					£43,450.
ii. Targeted support					
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation ?
B. Improved rates of progress across all key stages and subjects for high attaining pupils eligible for PP.	121 and small group provision within English and maths at KS4.	<p>Some of the students need targeted literacy and numeracy support to catch up.</p> <p>The EEF Toolkit suggests that targeted interventions matched to specific students with particular needs can be effective, especially for older pupils.</p>	Data tracking of these students to show impact of the programme.	<p>HOD Maths/English,</p> <p>EMO Pupil Premium Coordinator</p>	Jun 17

<p>B. Improved rates of progress across all key stages and subjects for high attaining pupils eligible for PP.</p>	<p>NTU Raising Aspirations program; Careers Ready targeted program; Sixth Form PP events to ensure PP students have equal access to university information and engagement.</p> <p>Teacher/student mentoring, providing students with personal guidance tailored to their career and university choices.</p> <p>Regular reviewing of individual progress and guidance given on how to improve.</p> <p>Nottingham Trent University Raising Aspirations programme to be introduced to all year groups</p>	<p>We want to provide extra support to engender high aspirations.</p> <p>Aimed at breaking down barriers to university and making it achievable and accessible for all.</p>	<p>Feedback from students.</p> <p>Tiered programme in place throughout year groups with student engagement. Increased uptake of university places, particularly from students eligible for Pupil Premium.</p>	<p>LJO CTA BGO</p> <p>O/S by EMO (PPC)</p>	<p>Mar 17</p>
Total budgeted cost					£89,000
iii. Other approaches					
Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
<p>D. Increased attendance rates</p>	<p>Education Welfare Officer appointed to lead attendance team, to challenge and support children and families with attendance issues including signposting and involving outside agencies where appropriate.</p>	<p>In Sept 2011 Michael Gove identified an educational underclass of children who have simply not spent enough time in school to achieve academic success. The link between attendance and academic achievement is clear.</p>	<p>Data tracking of these students to show impact of the monitoring and intervention.</p>	<p>CSO.SBA (EWO)</p>	<p>Jan 17</p>

<p>C. Equitable achievement for pupil premium boys and girls in KS4.</p>	<p>Weekly focussed RAG where both genders are discussed in detail, and where students who are underperforming are directed towards specific interventions, with PP status meaning students are delineated as a 1 (on a hierarchical scale of 1>4) to determine need of available interventions.</p> <p>Build a celebration culture whereby Boys' achievements are celebrated as much as girls.</p>	<p>Again, the EEF Toolkit suggests that targeted interventions matched to specific students with particular needs can be effective, especially for older pupils.</p> <p>Not all students are intrinsically motivated and extrinsic reward/recognition can support those without the longer term aims or ambitions that the education system is geared towards.</p>	<p>Persistent tracking and monitoring of key groups, with a focus on measuring impact of interventions and holding HODs to account thereafter.</p> <p>Feedback from students about engagement in such activities, and monitoring of performance over the whole year.</p>	<p>EMO (PPC)</p>	<p>Jun 17</p>
Total budgeted cost					<p>£19 000</p>

6. Review of expenditure				
Previous Academic Year		2015/16		
i. Quality of teaching for all				
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost
Improve attainment across the curriculum	CPD	<i>Mixed:</i> training has informed approach to collaborative learning in school. We measured the impact on attainment for all children, not just PP eligible. Approach shows promise as evident from staff developing questioning technique as seen on learning walks. However, Progress 8 data shows that PP students did not make expected progress.	Focus needs to be given specifically to PP students and as such an associate team within the leadership team will be created for 2016/17.	21, 500
ii. Targeted support				
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost
Improve PP attainment	One to one English and Maths tuition delivered to targeted groups of students.	High: observed increased progress amongst participating children compared to peers, as measured using scores on the Progress in English test. Success criteria: met.	Small group and targeted interventions proved the most effective intervention in both English and Maths. English 121 was also directed at PP year 10 students which showed an increase in attainment.	107, 000

iii. Other approaches				
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost
Pastoral Support	Bridge and PLC provisions established	Support was offered for behaviour for learning, focusing on getting students back on track and understanding why they are behaving in a way that is a cause for concern. Support was also offered to build self-esteem and confidence and for study support, working with students to create a culture of organisation in relation to school commitments as well as preparing them for their future. • The Progress Learning Centre was used to provide curriculum support during and after the school day for students who are at risk of falling behind with learning and achievement.	A cohort of students needing an Alternate Provision was not catered for and so the therapeutic element of the Bridge will be contained in the PLC for 2016/17.	49, 500

7. Additional detail

In this section you can annex or refer to **additional** information which you have used to inform the statement above.
Our full strategy document can be found online at: www.highschool.sch.uk