



Pupil Premium Strategy Statement

2016-2017

Pupil Premium Strategy Statement

2016-2017

1. Summary information					
School	De Lacy Academy				
Academic Year	2016-2017	Total PP budget	£180,450	Date of most recent PP Review	N/A
Total number of pupils	570	Number of pupils eligible for PP	208 (36%)	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Jan 2017

2. Current attainment		
	Pupils eligible for PP (your school)	Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)
% achieving 5A* - C incl. EM	36.7%	64.7%
% achieving expected progress in English / Maths	66.7% / 60%	75.8% / 73.4%
Progress 8 score average	0.54	0.12
Attainment 8 score average	41.83	52
3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)		
In-school barriers <i>(issues to be addressed in school, such as poor literacy skills)</i>		
A.	Literacy skills entering Year 7 are lower for pupils eligible for PP than other groups, which prevents them from making good progress in Year 7.	
B.	Pupils who are eligible for PP are making less progress than other pupils in English & Maths at KS4. This reduces their future life choices.	
C.	Low aspirations, resilience and thirst for learning is having a detrimental effect on their academic progress and that of their peers.	
External barriers <i>(issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)</i>		
D.	Persistent Attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP are higher than other groups, this reduces their school hours and causes them to fall behind.	

4. Desired outcomes <i>(desired outcomes and how they will be measured)</i>		Success criteria
A.	High levels of progress in literacy for year 7 pupils eligible for PP.	Pupils eligible for PP in Year 7 make more progress by the end of the year than 'other' pupils so that at least 50% exceed progress targets and 100% meet expected targets. Other pupils still make at least the expected progress. Evidenced through using reading age data, Lit Programme data, YARC assessments (all 3 times per year) and English assessment data (5 times per year)
B.	Improved rates of progress at KS4 in English & Maths for pupils eligible for PP.	Pupils eligible for PP make as much progress as 'other' pupils in English and Maths at Key Stage 4, so that 75% or above achieve 3 levels of progress at KS4. Evidenced through GCSE results.
C.	Aspirations, resilience and thirst for learning are developed for individuals eligible for PP who are displaying concerning behaviours. Ensure more vulnerable students are supported emotionally and socially.	Pupils identified through PASS, behaviour data and the pastoral team as causing concern or vulnerable are able to engage more positively in learning and require less interventions in the form of mentoring or behaviour management. Evidenced through PASS, outcomes from engaging with the Risk and Resilience programme and behaviour data.
D.	Reduction in the number of PA students that are eligible for PP.	Reduce the number of persistent absentees (PA) among pupils eligible for PP to 12% or below. Evidenced through half termly attendance data.

5. Planned expenditure

Academic year

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 - High levels of progress in literacy for year 7&8 pupils eligible for PP.	Whole school: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CPD on improving literacy skills across the curriculum, 	Provide high quality teaching to all pupils to drive up results, low levels of literacy have been identified as being higher amongst disadvantaged pupils.	QA process	CP Vice Principal & AB AAP T&L	After the formative QA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaborative leadership between English and International Studies - developing a common model for extended writing and feedback. 	Humanities are now required to develop extended writing as part of their GCSE curriculum.	Weekly joint line management meetings overseen by the Vice Principal	CP Vice Principal	Jan 2017
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Robust reading assessments, data to be shared across academy. 	To enable all subject areas to differentiate appropriately so that all students can access reading material, data has	QA process – Differentiated reading material. Staff use as data to	CP Vice Principal	After the formative QA

		shown that a significant percentage of disadvantaged pupils have a reading age lower than their chronological age.	inform seating plans (Kagan model).		
A - High levels of progress in literacy for year 7 pupils eligible for PP.	<p>English Department:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPD on using Accelerated Reader effectively and developing questioning/reading strategies to target key disadvantaged students in all Yr7 & 8 classes to improve reading ages. • CPD on applying whole-school marking policy. • Reader/Listener used to support PP students with reading close to or above chronological age. 	<p>Variety of reading activities used to support students in active reading sessions, trialled by outstanding/good schools with higher reading age data.</p> <p>Lead staff in issuing quality-first written feedback that allows students to show progress over time, focussed on literacy.</p> <p>Allows students to sustain opportunities for making or exceeding expected progress across the curriculum. System is developed from model used within outstanding schools</p>	<p>HoF to monitor progress of reading age data, 3 calendared reading age assessments within the academic year, QA of library lessons to assess level of support given from class teachers.</p> <p>Work scrutiny</p> <p>Reading age database to track and monitor progress at termly intervals</p>	<p>Head of English</p> <p>Head of English</p> <p>Head of English</p>	<p>January/July 17</p> <p>Termly</p> <p>Termly</p>

B - Improved rates of progress at KS4 in English & Maths for pupils eligible for PP.	Increased staffing to reduce class sizes and increase differentiation, diagnostic feedback and personalised revision.	Reduced class sizes will enable groupings to be more targeted, ensure a more personalised curriculum, differentiated materials and improve the quality of feedback, EEF teaching and learning toolkit sites feedback as having high impact +8 months.	Regular monitoring of progress and attainment through data tracking. Teaching of specific skills and knowledge through a robust scheme of work		
Total budgeted cost					£25,000
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?
A - High levels of progress in literacy for year 7 pupils eligible for PP.	Personalised and small group provision following diagnostic testing (CATS, RA, YARC/OWL) – to include Lit Programme, Fresh Start Phonics and SpI'd	Using diagnostic testing ensures student's individual needs are identified and the appropriate intervention programme is followed. The programmes used are shown to be effective in other schools and previous positive data in De Lacy Academy. EEF Teaching and Learning toolkit sites	Organise timetable to ensure staff delivering provision have sufficient preparation and delivery time. Data tracking of these students to show impact of the programme.	Assistant Principal – Inclusion & SENCO	January and June 2017

		Phonics and reading comprehension as having 'moderate impact for very low cost' +4 and +5 months respectively.	CPD for HLTA delivering Fresh Start.		
B - Improved rates of progress at KS4 in English & Maths for pupils eligible for PP.	Deliver targeted intervention & revision to small groups/individuals delivered by subject specific HLTAs and subject teachers.	EEF Teaching and Learning Toolkit shows that one to one tuition has a moderate impact +5 months. It also enables thorough and regular feedback to be given which is a high impact strategy (EEF).	Regular monitoring of progress through data tracking, RAG meetings. Bi-weekly meetings with HLTA linked to RAG Teaching of specific skills and knowledge through a robust analysis of assessments to identify individual student weaknesses.	Head of English and Maths	Weekly RAG meetings
B - Improved rates of progress at KS4 in English & Maths for pupils eligible for PP.	Extend the school day and intensive holiday classes. Link PP students to experienced teacher for bespoke sessions focussing on key exam skills linked to students' performance in mock exams. Year 11 only	Enables students to consolidate learning and access further personalised support from experienced subject specialists. Ensures that during the holidays students continue to access learning which	Teaching of specific skills and knowledge through a robust analysis of assessments to identify individual student weaknesses. Register from additional sessions	Head of English and Maths	Begin February 2017, review at weekly RAG meetings

		otherwise may not be the case.	to check on attendance		
B - Improved rates of progress at KS4 in English & Maths for pupils eligible for PP.	Regular subject interviews to discuss barriers to progress and attainment.	Students to have an in-depth knowledge of how to utilise a variety of strategies and opportunities to continue to make progress across Yr11.	Calendared timetable of student interviews, minutes and actions recorded.	Head of English and Maths	Ongoing
B - Improved rates of progress at KS4 in English & Maths for pupils eligible for PP.	Provide specific mathematical equipment including Casio FX-83 calculator, Pearson Revision Guide	To become more adept at using specific calculator functions. Compulsory use of revision guides in lessons to aid pupils in revision skills	Lesson QA Analyse improvement in assessments	HoF	Half-termly (through feedback in faculty meetings) SPTA common assessments
Total budgeted cost					£70,000
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>C - Aspirations, resilience and thirst for learning are developed for individuals eligible for PP who are displaying concerning behaviours.</p>	<p>2 x Learning Mentors deployed to support two different identified cohorts of students Cohorts to comprise of those who are vulnerable and need to engage in the Risk and Resilience Framework and those displaying poor behaviours for learning.</p>	<p>The EEF Toolkit suggests that targeted interventions matched to specific students with particular needs or behavioural issues can be effective, especially for older pupils.</p>	<p>Ensure identification process is robust, use of PASS and Boxall</p> <p>Learning mentors to engage with parents before intervention begins.</p> <p>Monitor behaviour but also monitor whether improvements in behaviour translate into improved attainment.</p>	<p>Assistant Principal - Inclusion</p>	<p>January and June 2017</p>
<p>C - Ensure more vulnerable students are supported emotionally and socially.</p>	<p>Learning mentor deployed to deliver 'nurture' intervention for KS3 students in the Bridge. Head of Student Support services to work with multi agencies to ensure those most 'at risk' access the support required.</p>	<p>Maslow's hierarchy of needs, until the bottom tiers of need have been met it is extremely difficult for anyone to engage in learning. A nurture group has run in Years 7 & 8 for the previous 4 years and has been very successful in supporting students.</p>	<p>QA - part of whole school process</p> <p>Regular meetings with Bridge manager</p> <p>Campus walks</p> <p>Weekly Inclusion meetings</p>	<p>Assistant Principal - Inclusion</p>	<p>January and June 2017</p>
<p>D - Reduction in the number</p>	<p>Attendance mentor to monitor pupils and follow up quickly on</p>	<p>We can't improve attainment for children if</p>	<p>Thorough briefing of learning mentor</p>	<p>Assistant Principal</p>	<p>January and June 2017</p>

of PA students that are eligible for PP.	absenteeism. First day response provision. Learning mentor to work with an identified cohort of students to deliver personalised mentoring, targets and rewards.	they aren't attending school. NfER briefing for school leaders identifies addressing attendance as a key step.	about existing absence issues. Attendance and progress discussed fortnightly with Assistant Principal – Inclusion Attendance data	– Inclusion	
D - Reduction in the number of PA students that are eligible for PP.	Increased awareness of the effects of mental health on attendance and the deployment of strategies to reduce this impact	Increasing in house evidence that mental health is being cited by parents as the reason for student absence. Lack of power to prosecute the parents of PA students due to student engagement with Camhs.	Attendance at courses on the effects of mental health. Attendance data	Assistant Principal – Inclusion	
Total budgeted cost					£50,000

6. Review of expenditure				
Previous Academic Year				
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 progress of disadvantaged KS4 students in English and Maths	<p>Reduced class sizes allowing for more diagnostic feedback.</p> <p>Weekly IMPACT meetings – analysis of data leading to targeted intervention</p>	<p>Increased percentage of disadvantaged students making 3LP</p> <p>English – 66.7% (+5.7% from 2015) the in-house gap was reduced to 14.9% from 27% and the gap with non-disadvantaged national is now only 7.3% not 13%.</p> <p>Maths – 60% (+10% from 2015) the in-house gap was reduced to 15.5% from 35% and the gap with non-disadvantaged national is now 12% not 22%.</p> <p>Both subjects are above national for the same indicator.</p>	<p>Diagnostic feedback was invaluable in providing the appropriate guidance for students to make progress in their work. The quality of DIRT (Directed improvement and Reflection Time) needs further strengthening to ensure all students maximise the impact of the feedback provided.</p>	£21,000
Positive Progress 8 school for disadvantaged students	<p>Quality First teaching through the introduction of TEEPS.</p> <p>Effective feedback through peer assessment and the use of bespoke exercise books</p>	<p>Achieved – Progress 8 score = 0.36 which is above in-house non-disadvantaged 0.24.</p>	<p>The value of TEEPS has been well exploited by most members of staff. The impact of this model can be further developed through targeted CPD, especially in the clarification stage, linked to the Sutton Trust recommendation of developing metacognition.</p> <p>Feedback had a big impact which can be further developed upon linking the new Teacher Toolkit (2016-17) to peer assessment.</p>	£2,500
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

<p>Improve progress of disadvantaged KS4 students in English and Maths</p>	<p>Weekly IMPACT meetings – analysis of data leading to targeted intervention – 1:1/ small groups with HLTA/ intervention teacher</p>	<p>Increased percentage of disadvantaged students making 3LP English – 66.7% (+5.7% from 2015) the in-house gap was reduced to 14.9% from 27% and the gap with non-disadvantaged national is now only 7.3% not 13%. Maths – 60% (+10% from 2015) the in-house gap was reduced to 15.5% from 35% and the gap with non-disadvantaged national is now 12% not 22%. Both subjects are above national for the same indicator.</p>	<p>Bespoke interventions were delivered throughout the year enabling students to overcome different barriers to progress, often enabling increased progress within the mainstream lesson. Moving forwards the identification of students requiring support needs to be earlier than Year 11 to reduce the pressure on specific students.</p>	<p>£40,000</p>
<p>Improve progress of disadvantaged KS4 students in English and Maths and achieve a positive Progress 8 score</p>	<p>Extension of the school day Intensive weekend and holiday programmes</p>	<p>Increased percentage of disadvantaged students making 3LP English – 66.7% (+5.7% from 2015) the in-house gap was reduced to 14.9% from 27% and the gap with non-disadvantaged national is now only 7.3% not 13%. Maths – 60% (+10% from 2015) the in-house gap was reduced to 15.5% from 35% and the gap with non-disadvantaged national is now 12% not 22%. Both subjects are above national for the same indicator. Progress 8 score - 0.36 which is above in-house non-disadvantaged 0.24.</p>		<p>£28,000</p>

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
Social and emotional support for the most vulnerable	Nurture group (Key) teaching social and communication skills in a highly supportive environment in Years 7 & 8	Positive transition from primary to secondary. Positive behaviour taught within this curriculum time had an impact on behaviour around the academy.	Some student's need of this support varied, but as the subject was timetabled to a specific route there was little scope for tailoring this support. Moving forwards the route will have a normal timetabled curriculum and specific students will be withdrawn from humanities/ enrichment/ technology lessons for specific nurture intervention to be delivered in the Bridge.	£11,500
Reduce number of disadvantaged students who are Persistent Absentees	Attendance clinics Mentoring	With the threshold for PA moving from 85% to 90%, the figure for PA has increased within the academy and for disadvantaged students. There are significantly more students within the 85-90% category than below it.	A multi-pronged approach is required to tackle the different reasons for PA. Work needs to be done on identifying different reasons why students are PA (e.g. mental health) and then different intervention strategies can be employed.	£13,000

