

Pupil premium strategy statement – End of year review

Intended outcomes

This explains the outcomes we are aiming for **by the end of our current strategy plan**, and how we will measure whether they have been achieved.

Intended outcome	Success criteria
<p>To ensure disadvantaged pupils progress and attainment is in line with their peers</p>	<p>Assessment data indicates progress and attainment gaps have closed from our baseline assessments and using Masters of Recall and summative assessment data.</p> <p><i>While there is still a gap between disadvantaged pupils and their peers, we are pleased that an average score of 77.2% for Masters of Recall is a strong start. Non-disadvantaged scored an average of 84.6%. In assessments the gap between disadvantaged pupils and their peers was 12.4% which was slightly narrowed from 12.6% at assessment point 1. Disadvantage average score was 52.9%.</i></p>
<p>To ensure feedback is given to in a timely manner support the learning of children</p>	<p>Evidence of effective feedback is evident in student's work and there is a noticeable alteration to improve their understanding.</p> <p><i>Through internal quality assurance and reviews we have found strong examples of effective feedback, and this reflects our policy. We can see students have made alterations to work based on teacher feedback, both live and over time.</i></p>
<p>To ensure pupils have a complete understanding of content and the processes of how to get there.</p>	<p>Through knowledge-led teaching students learn the content, can practice implementing their knowledge in class and call recall when required.</p> <p><i>Again, internal QA and reviews show this as does the positive figures we have had in Masters of Recall.</i></p>
<p>To improve children's reading ability and close reading age of disadvantaged children to their peers.</p>	<p>All student's reading age improves, that of disadvantaged improves more quickly and closes the gap from their baseline assessment.</p> <p><i>All students' reading ages have improved on average by 17 months.</i></p>

Reading Ages	Initial Testing September 2021	Retesting June 2022
	%	%
On or above CRA	72.09	74.01
Below CRA	27.91	25.99
>1yr CRA	18.60	6.78
>2yr CRA	11.05	11.86
Below 9.06	12.21	10.16
FSM On or above CRA	22.67	51.2
FSM Below 9.06	25.64	3.39

The % of disadvantaged children as part of the FSM cohort who were at or above their CRA more than doubled this year, from 22.67% to 51.2%.

There was also a very positive increase in the number of disadvantaged children who moved above the illiterate figure of 9.06 – moving from 25.64% of the cohort to just 3.39%

<p>To rapidly improve the literacy of a select group of children who are significantly behind their peers.</p>	<p>That all the group significantly improve their reading age – at least 12 months</p> <p><i>As indicated above you can see the impact of this. Our Lexia (E4 group) also made positive gains as can be seen in the report. PP Male Overall: average 154.7 RA in months (RA increase from 126.9)</i></p>
<p>To ensure disadvantaged boys do not fall behind due to disruptive behaviour</p>	<p>Disadvantaged boys make progress in line with girls and any boys are supported through an effective graduated response that indicates an improvement in behaviour, identified through the tracking of points.</p>

	<p><i>Graduated responses have been put in place for some disadvantaged boys and an effective mentoring session was put in place. There is still work to do here, some boys didn't improve their negative behaviour points and this needs investigating further.</i></p>
<p>To ensure children who are behind in their cognitive ability and reading/spelling ages are given a curriculum they can access with the required support to enable them to 'close the gap'</p>	<p>Students who access group 4 can learn effectively and assessment and test data shows improvements and the gap to others is closed.</p> <p><i>See the Lexia data below, there have been significant gains for some of this group and they are closing the gap to their peers. Further, more intense, and specific intervention is needed next year.</i></p>
<p>To broaden the horizons of disadvantaged children and raise their aspirations for the future.</p>	<p>Students are immersed in activities that increase their aspirations and knowledge of what is available to them. Students access external courses, INVOLVE clubs and surveys indicate increased aspirations.</p> <p><i>Disadvantaged pupils have been actively involved in extra-curricular sessions and have benefited from our amazing experiences. 131 different Involve clubs were offered over the academic year. All PP students participated in 2 different clubs per week</i></p>
<p>To improve the attendance of disadvantaged children ensuring the gap is closed between them and their peers.</p>	<p>There is a reduced attendance gap between disadvantaged students and their peers.</p> <p><i>Whole school – 93.7%</i></p> <p><i>PP – 92.3%</i></p> <p><i>Non-PP – 94.5%</i></p> <p><i>There is still a 2.2% gap to close, however these figures for disadvantaged children at our school and significantly above local, regional and national figures. Work still required to narrow further.</i></p>
<p><u>Catch-up funding</u></p> <p>To improve the reading and language understanding of a group of disadvantaged students who are further behind due to COVID-19 and lockdowns</p>	<p>Reading ages improve alongside, writing and understanding of language, indicated through results of the intervention and results of assessments compared to baseline.</p>

	<i>See reading age data above and assessment data throughout. Catch-up funding was used well and had impact where required.</i>
--	---

Challenges

This details the key challenges to achievement that we have identified among our disadvantaged pupils.

Challenge number	Detail of challenge
1	Disadvantaged pupils have lower reading ages than their peers. This has a significant impact on their learning and understanding. Our baseline data indicates that disadvantaged students have a reading score of 24.3 compared to 29.3 of their non-disadvantaged peers.
2	Disadvantaged pupils have poor literacy skills, particularly writing. Our combined English baseline indicated disadvantaged students have a score of 51.4 compared to non-disadvantaged students having a score of 61.8.
3	Disadvantaged pupils generally have a lower attendance rate than their peers. This is reflected in national and local data over previous years.
4	Disadvantaged boys have a greater SEMH need and display more disruptive behaviour in lessons. Our boys have lower scores in reading and writing than girls and a lack of understanding can lead to SEMH needs being displayed. We also have a higher number of male SEMH students on the SEND register.
5	Disadvantaged higher ability pupils need their aspirations raising and to be pushed to achieve in line with their HA peers.
6	Disadvantaged pupils need to access as many extra-curricular events/activities as possible to broaden their horizons.

Pupil premium strategy spending and review

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed	End of year review
<p>To use a bookletised curriculum to deliver high quality education. This includes high quality text, structured tasks and a reduced cognitive load. £10,000</p>	<p>Metacognition and self-regulating strategies (+7 EEF Toolkit).</p> <p>Evidence shows that if children can process why they are learning something it will support their understanding. Our staff use a bookletised curriculum to do this. We explicitly teach knowledge and use visualisers to highlight the learning process and model the processes through guided practice and then independent work.</p>	<p>1,2,5</p>	<p>Booklets have been introduced by all subject areas and adapted to meet the needs of all children. The structure of this work has led to at least 400,000 words being read by children this year. The literacy strategy and reading strategies employed are shown by research to significantly impact on reading levels.</p> <p>Masters of Recall data PP students achieved 77.2% in their MoR scores on average throughout the year. Term 6 was 84% - an increase of 12% from Term 1.</p> <p>Assessment in English Spring assessment – PP score was 56%. Summer assessment – PP score was 57.4% Overall, 79% of PP students are working on or above target.</p>
<p>Live marking and focused whole class feedback will ensure misconceptions are</p>	<p>Feedback (+6 EEF)</p> <p>Both live marking and focused marking both have a direct impact on learning. Staff give</p>	<p>1,2,5</p>	<p>Learning walks and spotlights show live marking is embedded across all subjects and used to identify misconceptions,</p>

<p>highlighted and dealt with swiftly and whole class feedback focuses pupils work to correct any misconceptions.</p> <p>£500</p>	<p>specific information of how to improve so pupils can focus on this.</p>		<p>scaffold for high success, challenge to think deeper and mark for literacy. Live marking and WCF is personalised, and students can articulate what areas they needed to improve and how they improved them. Teaching is responsive and feedback is used to move learning forward.</p> <p>Our Masters of Recall data shows term by term improvements in most areas which is an indication that feedback is effective and supports learning.</p>
---	--	--	---

Masters of Recall results

Term	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ave Score	76%	76%	82%	87%	86%	88%
SEND K	66%	65%	77%	84%	80%	83%
Disad	72%	69%	76%	81%	81%	84%

<p>Mastery curriculum delivery in maths. Our Trust owns White Rose Maths who use this model throughout 85% of all primary schools.</p> <p>We have employed a CL of maths directly from White Rose Maths to establish this.</p> <p>0.2 time of maths CL £10,280</p>	<p>Research shows the impact of delivering mastery in maths. (+5 EEF).</p>	<p>1,2,5</p>	<p>The method of delivery really supports knowledge building and understanding. Maths data shows 54.7% average score for all Y7 in assessment 1.</p> <p>PP 46.8%</p> <p>Non-PP 58.5%</p> <p>Assessment point 2 summer</p> <p>PP 37.3%</p> <p>Non-PP 50% - this was a drop, but the average score for all students also dropped. The assessment was planned externally and wasn't reflective of our curriculum – this will be reviewed for next academic year.</p>
--	--	--------------	---

<p>Whole school reading. Three times a week children read for 15 mins with their form tutor and once a week in an English class. £1,296</p>	<p>Research shows that rapid reading out loud by an adult significantly improves children's reading ages. (EEF +6)</p>	<p>1,2</p>	<p>As indicated above the research indicates how productive reading aloud is. Pupils have read two books as a group in form time. Students always have a copy of the text in front of them and follow with a reading ruler.</p> <p>During the curriculum review (28.02.22), external comments were made by the SIP: evidence is clear that students with low reading ages are making good progress. Although students haven't been retested yet, it is clear that students' reading ability is improving with the help of form time reading.</p> <p>NGRT data Reading age in months PP Sept 136.2 Summer 151.8</p> <p>87.8% of PP students have made expected/ higher/ much higher progress from NGRT test 1 in September.</p> <p>34.1% of PP students have made higher/much higher progress from NGRT test 1 in September 2021 to June 2022.</p> <p>PP Male Overall: average 154.7 RA in months (RA increase from 126.9)</p> <p>Non-PP Male Overall: average 174.4 RA in months (RA increase from 156.7)</p>
---	--	------------	---

			<p>PP Female Overall: average 149.8 RA in months (RA increase from 141.7)</p> <p>Non-PP Female Overall: average 175.2 RA in months (RA increase from 158.5)</p> <p>PP SEN support: average 145.7 RA in months (all students who are PP SEN are making expected or higher progress with reading age) (increase from 114).</p>
--	--	--	--

Targeted academic support (for example, tutoring, one-to-one support structured interventions)

Budgeted cost: £ 47,927

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed	End of year review
Lexia programme £4,177	<p>Lexia is a recognised intervention to support literacy ability of small groups of children whose needs are specifically identified.</p> <p>Reading comprehension strategies (EEF +6)</p>	1,2	<p>Lexia Data: (5 out of 7 pupils are PP)</p> <p>All students are making steady progress using the Lexia programme.</p> <p>Units gained across the group this year:</p> <p>Word study: 390 units</p> <p>Grammar: 257 units</p> <p>Comprehension: 1211 units</p> <p>From start of course to April:</p>

			<p>In word study, 71% of the group were working at R-Y3, now 57% of the group are working at Y4-Y6.</p> <p>In grammar, 86% of the group were working at R-Y3, now 43% are working at Y4-Y6.</p> <p>In comprehension, 86% of students were working at R-Y3, now 86% are working at Y4-Y6.</p> <p>New students have been added to the E4 grouping and therefore data has included their placement level in the current data.</p> <p>September update on Lexia: In word study, 69% of students are now working at Y4-Y6.</p> <p>In grammar, 75% of students are now working at Y4-Y6.</p> <p>In comprehension, 78% of students are working at Y4-Y6 and 11% are now working at Y7.</p> <p>As you can see from the data there has been consistent improvement by all pupils in all areas. This work will continue in Year 8.</p>
<p>Reduced class sizes and a 'group 4' as part of the timetable. Group 4 will result</p>	<p>Reduced class sizes (EEF +2)</p>	<p>1,2,5</p>	<p>In our Group 4 there are 5 out of seven children who are disadvantaged children.</p>

<p>in a further 35 lessons needing to be funded by the academy.</p> <p>Group 4 curriculum time £2,000 per period £40,000 total</p>	<p>Small group tuition (EEF +4)</p> <p>We know that children who are significantly behind need more structure and support to complete the basics. This approach allows them to be taught 1:8 and have direct support of a teacher in EVERY lesson. The curriculum is the same content but adapted to meet their specific need. Group 4 also have an extra English lesson making 6 hours of English per week.</p>		<p>They have been taught a full curriculum with scaffolds to support their learning.</p> <p>In their latest assessment 44% of grades were ON TARGET and 44% were working towards. This target is measured from their starting point and in comparison to how their peers are doing in the same H/M/L banding.</p> <p>11% of grades were above target.</p>
<p><u>Small group tuition</u> Our English staff will deliver twice weekly reading and language interventions to groups of 5 students.</p> <p><u>Costings</u> Tuition fees £25 per hour £50 per week x 25 weeks £1250</p> <p>Extra 1:1 tuition will be given to those identified to further boost their knowledge</p> <p>£25 per hour Approximately 10 students 10 hours each £2500</p>	<p>Small group tuition (EEF +4)</p> <p>1:1 tuition (EEF +5)</p>	<p>1,2,5</p>	<p>20 PP students attended school led tutoring breakfast term 3. 10 PP students attended school led tutoring breakfast term 4&5. 11 PP students attended school led tutoring breakfast term 6.</p> <p>Results of PP students attainment in assessments and Masters of Recall can be seen below:</p> <p>Assessment point 1: PP score 47.6%</p> <p>Assessment point 2: PP score 52.9%</p> <p>Masters of Recall: Term 1 – 72% Term 6 – 84%</p>

Wider strategies (for example, related to attendance, behaviour, wellbeing)

Budgeted cost: £ 11,770

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed	End of year review		
<p>Behaviour interventions – using positive report cards, Zones of regulation to ensure emotions are linked to behaviour and positive mentoring from an adult.</p> <p>Graduated response will link into the work done by the SENDCo and specific assessments will be undertaken based on this work.</p> <p>Cost of rewards and logistics of the programme £300 0.2 of Assistant SLO - £4,200 0.2 cost of Education Psychologist work £480</p>	<p>Behaviour interventions (EEF +4)</p> <p>Mentoring (EEF +2)</p> <p>A graduated response for SEMH approaches will be started and tracked for all boys.</p> <p>SLT link will oversee the intervention and we will use classcharts to track the impact of the work</p>	4	<p>24 GR in total 16 students are PP As part of the GR referrals to external agencies are completed.</p>		
			Agency	Dis	Non Dis
			HEY	10	14
			COMPASS	6	8
			0-19	6	5
			SOCIAL CARE	4	3
			CAMHS	3	5
			TYS	2	2
			EHA	1	2
			CP	1	0
			CIN	1	0
			BRUV	1	1
			SALT	1	0
			ASDAT	4	1
			SCITeam	1	0
			JUNCTION	0	2
			Social Prescribing	1	0

			EWO	7	3
			Educational Psychologist	4	2
<p>INVOLVE clubs Offering leadership awards for pupils Developing partnerships with universities Experiences/trips/excursions</p> <p>INVOLVE time and equipment £500 Archbishop of York Award £120 JSLA award – external coaches 0.1 - £1900 Trips and transport costs - £2000</p>	<p>Extended school times (EEF +3)</p> <p>If we can let our children experience different clubs it can perk their interest, particularly focusing on our STEM specialism we can encourage them to raise their aspirations.</p> <p>By having partnerships with universities and making visits to campuses will promote university life for our children.</p> <p>Developing leadership courses will improve our children’s confidence and oral ability.</p>	3, 6	<p>A group of PP boys worked with an external company and one of our pastoral team to look at effort in class and attendance to school. Three of the boys maintained their 100% attendance all year and one had 100% attendance from the start of the intervention until the summer. Another student moved their attendance from 86% (in PA) to 96%.</p> <p>Half of the group reduced the number of negative points that had accrued before the intervention to afterwards. They all enjoyed the session from their feedback and felt motivated to work harder in class.</p> <p>131 different Involve clubs were offered over the academic year. All PP students participated in 2 different clubs per week.</p> <p>10 students completed the JSLA award. 13 students are completing the Archbishop of York award, including 2 PP.</p>		

<p>Mentoring sessions and attendance strategies, that include positive and negative approaches. Use of EWS</p> <p>Attendance incentives £1000 EWS 0.2 of cost £2,270</p>	<p>Research indicates the positive correlation between high attendance and high attainment. Mentoring (EEF +2)</p> <p>Attendance strategy part of pastoral and academy ADP. Regular monitoring and reporting to various groups, including LGB</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>180 students YTD Whole school – 93.7% PP – 92.3% Non-PP – 94.5% PA Figure – 19% PP – 18 Students PA - 10% Non-PP – 17 Students PA – 9.44%</p> <p>ASLO over 3 terms worked with groups of students with an attendance focus. 10 students were PP Attendance Support Plan Group work – 10 PP students identified to complete targeted support work with ASLO. 1 student improved week on week 2 students made no improvements, so a referral was submitted to EWO 1 student took a term time holiday 6 overall improved and rewards were given to celebrate the success</p> <p>One referral to the EWO resulted in a successful meeting at S.A.P. This case is ongoing but has had significant improvements.</p>
--	---	----------	---

Total budgeted cost: £ 81,773