

# Pupil premium strategy statement

This statement details our school's use of pupil premium (and recovery premium for the 2022 to 2023 academic year) funding to help improve the attainment of our disadvantaged pupils.

It outlines our pupil premium strategy, how we intend to spend the funding in this academic year and the effect that last year's spending of pupil premium had within our school.

## School overview

| Detail  | Data                                   |
|---|--|
| School name   | Featherstone High School               |
| Number of pupils in school  | 1787                                   |
| Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils                         | 23.5% (420)<br>30.4% for years 7 to 11 |
| Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers | 2021/22 → 2024/25                      |
| Date this statement was published                                       | December 2022                          |
| Date on which it will be reviewed                                       | September 2023                         |
| Statement authorised by   | Gerry Wadwa<br>/ Nathan Walters        |
| Pupil premium lead  | Kamal Thacker                          |
| Governor / Trustee lead   | Fay Harras-Gummer                      |

## Funding overview

| Detail   | Amount                          |
|--|---------------------------------|
| Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year  | £413,700.00 (Apr 22→<br>Mar 23) |
| Recovery premium funding allocation this academic year   | £116,196.00                     |
| Pupil premium funding carried forward from previous years<br>(enter £0 if not applicable)  | £31,755                         |
| <b>Total budget for this academic year</b><br>If your school is an academy in a trust that pools this funding,<br>state the amount available to your school this academic year | £561,651.00                     |

## Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

### Statement of intent

At Featherstone High School it is our intention to ensure that all our pupils, whether or not they are from disadvantaged backgrounds ultimately attain the best possible outcomes for the 8 qualifications across the broad curriculum for which they are entered at age 16.

We have a proud history of making very good progress in supporting our disadvantaged cohort (including the high attainers) in closing the gap in achievement. In the last year of normal examinations prior to the COVID pandemic in 2019 the average attainment 8 for the 32% that were disadvantaged was 5.246 (with a progress 8 score of 0.99) compared to 5.304 for other pupils (with a progress 8 score of 0.95). The overall attainment 8 for disadvantaged pupils was in the highest 20% of all schools in 2019, 2018 and 2017. In 2020 the average attainment 8 for the disadvantaged cohort was 5.324 (compared to 5.536) and in 2021 the average attainment 8 for the disadvantaged cohort was 4.937 (compared to 5.539) illustrating a gap opening up as a result of the pandemic. Soft anecdotal evidence confirms vulnerable cohorts such as the disadvantaged being disproportionately impacted by the pandemic.

The school is very pleased to note the attainment gap that had opened up between the disadvantaged and non -disadvantaged during 2020 and 2021 has been completely removed in 2022 although there is a slight gap in the progress 8 score of the two cohorts.

| Exam year | cohort Disadvantaged | cohort non Disadvantaged | % Disadvantaged | A8 Disadvantaged | A8 non Disadvantaged | Difference in A8 | P8 Disadvantaged | P8 Non-Disadvantaged | Difference in P8 |
|-----------|----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 2017      | 100                  | 136                      | 42%             | 5.2              | 5.2                  | 0                | 0.77             | 0.9                  | -0.13            |
| 2018      | 98                   | 134                      | 42%             | 5                | 5.3                  | -0.3             | 0.48             | 0.96                 | -0.48            |
| 2019      | 78                   | 163                      | 32%             | 5.2              | 5.3                  | -0.1             | 0.99             | 0.95                 | 0.04             |
| 2020      | 85                   | 151                      | 36%             | 5.3              | 5.5                  | -0.2             | 0.47             | 0.86                 | -0.39            |
| 2021      | 52                   | 211                      | 20%             | 4.9              | 5.5                  | -0.6             | 0.12             | 0.74                 | -0.62            |
| 2022      | 81                   | 178                      | 31%             | 5.5              | 5.5                  | 0                | 1.05             | 1.15                 | -0.1             |

While the principal focus of our strategy remains to support the disadvantaged cohort we will support all vulnerable students including those supported by social services and Looked After Children. Clearly, high quality whole class teaching equally benefits those who are not disadvantaged.

Our long- term recovery strategy uses the diagnosis, therapy and testing approach so that targeted support can be provided, for example, through additional provision timetabled after the school day and by using the National Tutoring Programme for the pupils with the widest gaps in their learning. This support is made available to all pupils including non-disadvantaged pupils who have fallen behind as it is based on identified individual needs.

To refine and improve our approach, we will maintain a relentless whole school focus on everyone working together to meet the needs of the disadvantaged as they make up ¼ of the cohort – living up to our motto “together we achieve!”

## Challenges

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

| Challenge number | Detail of challenge  |                   |                   |            |      |               |                   |                   |            |      |                  |     |      |     |              |      |      |     |      |                  |      |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |
|------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------|------------|------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------|------|------------------|-----|------|-----|--------------|------|------|-----|------|------------------|------|-----|-----|--------------|-----|-----|-----|------|------------------|-----|-----|-----|--------------|-----|-----|-----|------|------------------|-----|-----|-----|--------------|-----|-----|-----|
| 1                | <p>Until 2022 the 9 → 4 English attainment of Year 11 disadvantaged pupils was consistently lower than for non-disadvantaged pupils:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th></th> <th>Disadvantaged</th> <th>Non-disadvantaged</th> <th>Difference</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">2022</td> <td>English Language</td> <td>85%</td> <td>81%</td> <td>+4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>English Lit.</td> <td>89%</td> <td>84%</td> <td>+5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">2021</td> <td>English Language</td> <td>78%</td> <td>81%</td> <td>-3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>English Lit.</td> <td>83%</td> <td>88%</td> <td>-5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">2020</td> <td>English Language</td> <td>81%</td> <td>88%</td> <td>-7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>English Lit.</td> <td>86%</td> <td>88%</td> <td>-2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">2019</td> <td>English Language</td> <td>73%</td> <td>81%</td> <td>-8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>English Lit.</td> <td>84%</td> <td>86%</td> <td>-2%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>For the first time, in 2022 the disadvantaged cohort out- performed the non-disadvantaged cohort. However, for this gap to continue to be filled the current programme of intervention must be sustained over the course of the 3- year plan.</p> |                   |                   |            | Year |               | Disadvantaged     | Non-disadvantaged | Difference | 2022 | English Language | 85% | 81%  | +4% | English Lit. | 89%  | 84%  | +5% | 2021 | English Language | 78%  | 81% | -3% | English Lit. | 83% | 88% | -5% | 2020 | English Language | 81% | 88% | -7% | English Lit. | 86% | 88% | -2% | 2019 | English Language | 73% | 81% | -8% | English Lit. | 84% | 86% | -2% |
| Year             |  | Disadvantaged     | Non-disadvantaged | Difference |      |               |                   |                   |            |      |                  |     |      |     |              |      |      |     |      |                  |      |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |
| 2022             | English Language   | 85%               | 81%               | +4%        |      |               |                   |                   |            |      |                  |     |      |     |              |      |      |     |      |                  |      |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |
|                  | English Lit.   | 89%               | 84%               | +5%        |      |               |                   |                   |            |      |                  |     |      |     |              |      |      |     |      |                  |      |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |
| 2021             | English Language   | 78%               | 81%               | -3%        |      |               |                   |                   |            |      |                  |     |      |     |              |      |      |     |      |                  |      |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |
|                  | English Lit.   | 83%               | 88%               | -5%        |      |               |                   |                   |            |      |                  |     |      |     |              |      |      |     |      |                  |      |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |
| 2020             | English Language   | 81%               | 88%               | -7%        |      |               |                   |                   |            |      |                  |     |      |     |              |      |      |     |      |                  |      |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |
|                  | English Lit.   | 86%               | 88%               | -2%        |      |               |                   |                   |            |      |                  |     |      |     |              |      |      |     |      |                  |      |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |
| 2019             | English Language   | 73%               | 81%               | -8%        |      |               |                   |                   |            |      |                  |     |      |     |              |      |      |     |      |                  |      |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |
|                  | English Lit.   | 84%               | 86%               | -2%        |      |               |                   |                   |            |      |                  |     |      |     |              |      |      |     |      |                  |      |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |
| 2                | <p>Compared to English, there was an even greater difference in the 9 → 4 maths attainment for Year 11 disadvantaged pupils compared to non-disadvantaged pupils. This gap was reduced but not overcome in 2022:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Disadvantaged</th> <th>Non-disadvantaged</th> <th>Difference</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2022</td> <td>81%</td> <td>84%</td> <td>-3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2021</td> <td>73%</td> <td>87%</td> <td>-14%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2020</td> <td>79%</td> <td>87%</td> <td>-8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2019</td> <td>76%</td> <td>85%</td> <td>-9%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Current internal Year 10 data shows 69% of the disadvantaged are hitting targets for maths whereas 71% of the non-disadvantaged are hitting their targets. Although the gap remains it is not as pronounced as last year.</p>  |                   |                   |            | Year | Disadvantaged | Non-disadvantaged | Difference        | 2022       | 81%  | 84%              | -3% | 2021 | 73% | 87%          | -14% | 2020 | 79% | 87%  | -8%              | 2019 | 76% | 85% | -9%          |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |
| Year             | Disadvantaged  | Non-disadvantaged | Difference        |            |      |               |                   |                   |            |      |                  |     |      |     |              |      |      |     |      |                  |      |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |
| 2022             | 81%  | 84%               | -3%               |            |      |               |                   |                   |            |      |                  |     |      |     |              |      |      |     |      |                  |      |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |
| 2021             | 73%  | 87%               | -14%              |            |      |               |                   |                   |            |      |                  |     |      |     |              |      |      |     |      |                  |      |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |
| 2020             | 79%  | 87%               | -8%               |            |      |               |                   |                   |            |      |                  |     |      |     |              |      |      |     |      |                  |      |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |
| 2019             | 76%  | 85%               | -9%               |            |      |               |                   |                   |            |      |                  |     |      |     |              |      |      |     |      |                  |      |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |      |                  |     |     |     |              |     |     |     |

3

Significant knowledge gaps were noted between the disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils in most subject areas in last year's Year 10 (current year 11) as illustrated by subject leaders' diagnostic assessments.

Pupils in Year 10 on or above target at the end of 2022 (internal data):

| Subject                | Year Group | Disadvantaged | Non-disadvantaged | Difference |
|------------------------|------------|---------------|-------------------|------------|
| Art                    | 10         | 63.6%         | 79.4%             | -15.8%     |
| Biology                | 10         | 46.2%         | 66.7%             | -20.5%     |
| Business               | 10         | 80%           | 90%               | -10%       |
| Chemistry              | 10         | 46.2%         | 73.3%             | -27.1%     |
| Computer Science       | 10         | 75%           | 68.4%             | +6.6%      |
| Drama                  | 10         | 57.1%         | 80%               | -22.9%     |
| English Lang           | 10         | 61%           | 78.2%             | -17.2%     |
| English Lit            | 10         | 49.2%         | 61.1%             | -11.9%     |
| French                 | 10         | 55.2%         | 64.2%             | -9%        |
| Geography              | 10         | 55.6%         | 71.4%             | -15.8%     |
| Health and Social Care | 10         | 80%           | 100%              | -20%       |
| History                | 10         | 70.7%         | 77.1%             | -6.4%      |
| Maths                  | 10         | 67.8%         | 76.9%             | -9.1%      |
| Music                  | 10         | 80%           | 91.7%             | -10.7%     |
| Panjabi                | 10         | 100%          | 100%              | 0          |
| PE                     | 10         | 50%           | 37.5%             | +12.5%     |
| Physics                | 10         | 69.2%         | 66.7%             | +2.5%      |
| RE                     | 10         | 53.5%         | 64.9%             | -11.4%     |
| Science double         | 10         | 76.1%         | 83.6%             | -7.5%      |
| Spanish                | 10         | 35.3%         | 67.9%             | -32.6%     |
| Travel and Tourism     | 10         | 100%          | 97.6%             | +2.4%      |

4

During the second lockdown 85% of the total cohort were able to access remote provision despite the distribution of 400 laptops for home use. It became anecdotally apparent that many disadvantaged pupils with medical conditions, EAL at stages A to B and SEN needs were unable to access either the remote provision or the on-site provision on offer (on average 56 pupils attended every day (45 of them with SEND and 9 with EAL) and their attendance ranged from 56% to 91% from January to March 2021). We believe disadvantaged pupils were disproportionately impacted by the effects of the pandemic and fell further behind. The pastoral and social inclusion teams continue to monitor any gaps in the behaviour points between the disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged cohorts:

| 05/09/22 to 16/12/22      | Disadvantaged<br>(est. 25% of cohort) | Non- Disadvantaged<br>(est. 75% of cohort) |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Missed home learning      | 379 (30%)                             | 864 (70%)                                  |
| negative behaviour points | 1772 (32%)                            | 3823 (68%)                                 |
| Positive behaviour points | 17026 (31%)                           | 38681 (69%)                                |

|   |  |               |                    |            |
|---|--|---------------|--------------------|------------|
| 5 | Data shows the attendance of disadvantaged pupils continues to be lower than that for non-disadvantaged pupils:  |               |                    |            |
|   |  | Disadvantaged | Non- Disadvantaged | Difference |
|   | 2019 → 2020  | 95.8%         | 96.9%              | -1.1%      |
|   | 2020 → 2021  | 89.0%         | 92.6%              | -3.6%      |
|   | 2021 → 2022  | 92.7%         | 94.2%              | -1.5%      |
|   | Autumn 2022  | 92.3%         | 94.4%              | -2.1%      |
| 6 | The Pastoral and Social Inclusion teams have reported a noticeable rise in stress and anxiety in pupils some caused by concern over catch up. School Council (December 2021 – summer 2022) had also raised the lack of the usual calendared enrichment opportunities including careers and educational visits as a cause of concern for pupils. They urgently requested the relaunch of our culture days as days of celebration to mark our diversity. |               |                    |            |

## 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 to be achieved by 2024/5   |
|---|---|
| Improve level of attainment / progress of disadvantaged pupils to match the attainment / progress of non-disadvantaged pupils across a broad and balanced curriculum.                 | By the end of the three -year plan in 2024/25 the gap in attainment and progress between the disadvantaged pupils and non-disadvantaged pupils will continue to be bridged restoring the pre-Covid -2019 trend. We expect 85% / 90% of disadvantaged pupils to meet FFT20 expectations across the curriculum.   |
| Improve the reading, writing, oracy and numeracy skills of the disadvantaged, so that they are equal to the non-disadvantaged pupils including those with SEN, EAL and medical needs. | Assessment of the reading, writing, oracy and numeracy skills of the disadvantaged cohort will show an improvement that bridges the gap with the non-disadvantaged cohort by 2024/25.<br>That disadvantaged pupils are able, with support to attempt and complete their home learning at the same rate of completion as non-disadvantaged pupils as evidenced by records on SIMS.<br>Evidence from learning walks and book scrutiny should illustrate improvement in the acquisition of these communication skills by disadvantaged pupils. |
| To improve the well- being of all of our pupils including the disadvantaged. To include access to a wide range of extra-curricular activities to develop pupils' cultural capital.    | As evidenced by pupil / parent voice surveys (including the Ealing Health and Behaviour Survey) and the increased participation of disadvantaged pupils in extra-curricular,  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>enrichment and careers based activities (quantified).</p> <p>Reduction in the level of support being asked of the Social Inclusion Team with anxiety concerns.</p> <p>The attendance rate of both disadvantaged pupils and non-disadvantaged pupils to return to pre-pandemic levels by 2024/25. With the rate of attendance for the disadvantaged equalling that of the non-disadvantaged.</p> <p>The destinations of disadvantaged pupils show equivalence to those of non-disadvantaged pupils.</p> |
|--|---|

## Activity in this academic year

This details how we intend to spend our pupil premium (and recovery premium funding) **this academic year** to address the challenges listed above.

### Teaching (for example, CPD, recruitment and retention)

Budgeted cost: £170,000

| Activity  | Evidence that supports this approach   | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|---|--|-------------------------------|
| <p>Conduct knowledge gap analyses – standardised diagnostic tests to be periodically completed including NGRT/ST tests (literacy)<br/>£13,000</p> | <p>Provide evidence into pupils’ strengths and weaknesses and identify correct level and nature of interventions<br/>Standardised tests (EEF)</p>  | <p>1 → 5</p>                  |
| <p>1)Timetable additional class for English 7Y6 x 6 periods per fortnight<br/>£50 x 10 periods x 19 fortnights = £9,500</p>                       | <p>Planned and sustained structural changes within the package of implementation strategies (EEF)</p> <p>Includes Recruitment costs</p> <p><u><a href="#">Teaching of disciplinary literacy:</a></u></p> <p><u><a href="https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/guidance-reports/literacy-ks3-ks4">https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/guidance-reports/literacy-ks3-ks4</a></u></p> <p>“Disciplinary literacy is an approach to improving literacy across the curriculum that emphasises the importance of subject specific support.”</p> <p>“Teachers should prioritise teaching Tier 2 and 3 vocabulary, which students are unlikely to encounter in everyday speech.”</p> <p>“Developing students’ ability to read complex and academic texts – Strategies can be introduced through modelling and group work, before support is gradually removed to promote independence.”</p> | <p>1</p>                      |

|  |  |                   |
|--|--|-------------------|
|  | <p>“Reading helps students gain knowledge, which leads to better writing, whilst writing can deepen students’ understanding of ideas.”</p> <p>“High quality talk is typically well-structured and guided by teachers.”</p> <p>“Provide high quality literacy interventions for struggling students – Schools should expect and proactively plan to support pupils with the weakest levels of literacy, particularly in Year 7.”</p> <p>Developing teaching through mastery approaches</p>  |                   |
| <p>2) Timetable additional class for maths 7Y6 x 10 periods per fortnight<br/>£50 x 10 periods x 19 fortnights = £9,500</p>                                  | <p>Includes Recruitment costs</p> <p>Improving Mathematics in Key Stages Two and Three: Evidence Review March 2018:</p> <p><a href="https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/evidence-summaries/evidence-reviews/improving-mathematics-in-key-stages-two-and-three/">https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/evidence-summaries/evidence-reviews/improving-mathematics-in-key-stages-two-and-three/</a></p> <p>What is the evidence regarding the effect of using collaborative learning approaches in the teaching and learning of maths? Strength of evidence: HIGH</p> <p>To what extent does teaching thinking skills, metacognition and/or self -regulation improve mathematics learning? Strength of evidence (Thinking skills, metacognition and self-regulation): MEDIUM<br/>Strength of evidence (Working memory training): HIGH</p> <p>What is the evidence regarding mastery learning in mathematics? Strength of evidence: MEDIUM</p> | 2                 |
| <p>3) Funding for Literacy Co-ordinator to support literacy development across the curriculum<br/>£3,500</p> <p>Funding for Oracy Co-ordinator<br/>£1700</p> | <p>Includes Recruitment costs</p> <p>Writing Approaches in Years 3 to 13: Evidence Review EEF – July 2019</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use of co-operative writing</li> <li>2. Structured approaches that give students step by step guides to writing in various genres, focused squarely on writing outcomes</li> <li>3. Programmes that teach students to assess their own and others’ drafts, to give students more feedback and insight into effective writing strategies.</li> </ol>  | 1, 3 and partly 4 |

|   |  |          |
|---|--|----------|
| <p>4) Funding for Spanish and French theatre performances delivered by external providers (Onatti Productions Ltd) in school<br/>£1,000</p> | <p><a href="https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/guidance-reports/literacy-ks3-ks4">https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/guidance-reports/literacy-ks3-ks4</a></p> <p>Foreign language learning and its impact on wider academic outcomes: A rapid evidence assessment<br/>EEF – July 2020:<br/>“In general approaches that are largely meaning oriented, provided rich, authentic and stimulating FL input for students, which increases the involvement load tends to be more successful.”</p>   | <p>3</p> |
| <p>5) Funding for science week workshops<br/>£5000</p>  | <p><a href="https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/guidance-reports/science-ks3-ks4">https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/guidance-reports/science-ks3-ks4</a></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pre-conceptions – build on the ideas that pupils bring to lessons</li> <li>2. Modelling: use models to support understanding</li> <li>3. Memory: support pupils to retain and retrieve knowledge</li> <li>4. Practical work: use practical work purposefully and as part of a learning sequence</li> <li>5. Language of science: develop scientific vocabulary and support pupils to read and write about science</li> <li>6. Feedback: use structured feedback to move on pupils’ thinking</li> </ol> <p><a href="https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/evidence-reviews/science">https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/evidence-reviews/science</a><br/>September 2017</p> <p>“Unfortunately, existing research on pupils’ attainment in science has consistently shown an uneven spread of scientific knowledge. There is a consistent link between pupils’ socio-economic status and their attainment and participation in science learning at school. Pupils who come from higher SES families are more likely to do well in science subjects that less advantaged pupils and to continue to study science after the age of 16 years, when it is no longer compulsory to do so.”</p> <p>“Bringing students into a science “place” e.g. university or a science museum</p> <p>“Bringing scientists or extra -curricular science activities into schools.”</p> | <p>3</p> |
| <p>EAL induction support for pupils at stages A to B</p>  | <p>EAL_and_educational_achievement__Prof_S_Strand.pdf<br/>EEF – January 2015</p>   | <p>4</p> |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <p>£50 x 12 x 19 =<br/>£11,400</p> <p>Twinkl EAL<br/>resources = £1400</p> <p>EAL Academy<br/>Quality Award =<br/>£550</p> <p>Subscription to<br/>Bedrock resources<br/>to promote literacy<br/>for EAL pupils in<br/>Year 7 at stage C<br/>£2500</p>  | <p>“It is proficiency in the English language that is a major factor influencing the degree of support an individual student will require.....it is notable that recent arrival....and Black African ethnic groups are associated with much higher risks of low attainment for EAL students.”</p>   |   |
| <p>To renew quality<br/>assurance mark<br/>with the<br/>Educational<br/>Development Trust<br/>£1500</p> <p>Experience of<br/>work and contact<br/>with employers<br/>£26,000</p> <p>Funding for<br/>“Inspire” pre-<br/>GCSE programme<br/>Co-ordinator<br/>£3500</p> <p>Extended IAG<br/>support for pupils<br/>negotiated through<br/>Ealing Connexions<br/>£15,600</p> | <p><a href="https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/evidence-reviews/careers-education">https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/evidence-reviews/careers-education</a></p> <p><a href="https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/evidence-reviews/employer-engagement-in-education">https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/evidence-reviews/employer-engagement-in-education</a></p> <p>Employer engagement in education to enhance young people’s understanding of jobs and careers</p> <p>Employer engagement in education to provide young people with knowledge and skills demanded by the contemporary labour market</p> <p>Employer engagement in education to provide young people with knowledge and skills demanded for successful school to work transitions</p> <p>Employer engagement in education to enrich education and underpin pupil attainment</p> | 6 |
| <p>R&amp;R for a lead<br/>teacher to map<br/>cross curricular<br/>approaches to the<br/>development of<br/>cultural capital,<br/>SMSC and world<br/>views across the<br/>curriculum.</p>   | <p>Using a Distributive Leadership approach</p> <p>To lead training of ECTs and other professionals on the development of high quality cultural capital and “world views” within their lessons.</p>   | 6 |

|   |   |              |
|---|---|--------------|
| <p>£3500</p> <p>Appointing Acting Assistant Head Teachers to reform assessment and reporting systems at KS3 and support whole school literacy and teacher development<br/>£17,000</p> <p>Funding for numeracy co-ordinator<br/>£3500</p> <p>Maths consultancy<br/>£300</p> <p>Funding for NTP and recovery premium co-ordinator<br/>£6200</p> | <p>Using a Distributive leadership approach</p> <p><a href="https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/evidence-reviews/feedback-approaches">https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/evidence-reviews/feedback-approaches</a></p> <p><a href="https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/evidence-reviews/attainment-measures-in-literacy-mathematics-and-science">https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/evidence-reviews/attainment-measures-in-literacy-mathematics-and-science</a></p>   | <p>1,2,3</p> |
| <p>Metacognition and self-regulation – the development of remote learning strategies and the blended approach to learning. – Digital Learning Group set up</p> <p>Directed time for re-launch of small group tutorials</p> <p>£20,350 for Firefly – remote learning portal</p> <p>£6,400 for digital notebooks for students</p>               | <p><a href="https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/evidence-reviews/metacognition-and-self-regulation">https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/evidence-reviews/metacognition-and-self-regulation</a></p> <p>Support pupils to plan, monitor and evaluate their learning.<br/>Explicitly teach pupils how to organise and effectively manage their learning independently</p> <p><a href="https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/evidence-reviews/digital-technology-2019">https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/evidence-reviews/digital-technology-2019</a></p> <p><a href="https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/evidence-reviews/remote-learning-for-pupils">https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/evidence-reviews/remote-learning-for-pupils</a></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consider how technology will improve teaching and learning before introducing it</li> <li>2. Technology can be used to improve the quality of explanations and modelling</li> <li>3. Technology offers ways to improve the impact of pupil practice</li> </ol> | <p>4</p>     |

|   |  |       |
|---|--|-------|
| £200 for replacement of Headphone sets for LRC / NTP intervention                     | 4. <a href="#">Technology can play a role in improving assessment and feedback</a>   |       |
| Whole school curriculum CPD day<br>£3,300   | INSET themes include training day on 21 <sup>st</sup> November:<br>1. Whole school INSET on curriculum sequencing and planning<br>2. Whole school INSET on acquiring disciplinary literacy<br><br><a href="https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/guidance-reports/effective-professional-development">https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/guidance-reports/effective-professional-development</a><br><br><a href="https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/guidance-reports/literacy-ks3-ks4">https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/guidance-reports/literacy-ks3-ks4</a> | 1 → 4 |
| Home learning club for SEND, EAL and disadvantaged cohort<br>£20 x 5 x 38 =<br>£3,800 | <a href="https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/guidance-reports/send">https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/guidance-reports/send</a><br><br>1. Create a positive and supportive environment for all pupils without exception<br>2. Build an ongoing, holistic understanding of your pupils and their needs – assess, plan, do review approach.<br>3. Ensure all pupils have access to high quality teaching<br>4. Compliment high quality teaching with carefully selected small group and one to one interventions   | 4     |
| Teaching costs = £170,000   |  |       |

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

Budgeted cost: £140,000

| Activity   | Evidence that supports this approach  | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|--|---|-------------------------------|
| Engaging with the National Tutoring Programme to provide one to one and small group tutoring. A significant proportion of those pupils in receipt of NTP support will be disadvantaged and a | Tuition targeted at specific needs and knowledge gaps can be an effective method to support low attaining pupils or those falling behind, both one-to-one:<br><a href="https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/guidance-reports/one-to-one-tuition">One to one tuition   EEF (educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk)</a><br>And in small groups: | 1 → 3                         |

|  |  |       |
|--|--|-------|
| <p>good proportion of those will be high attainers.<br/>£66,500 (recovery premium)</p> <p>£26,800 (16-19 catch up)</p>   | <p><a href="#">Small group tuition   Toolkit Strand   Education Endowment Foundation   EEF</a></p>   |       |
| <p>HLTA staffing costs for after school intervention support<br/>£10,250</p> <p>Appointment of school - based student peer mentoring co-ordinator<br/>£1750</p>  |  |       |
| <p>Targeted exam booster support for individual and small groups of students provided through additional “alternative curriculum” after school sessions including support for LAC and other identified pupils.<br/>£23,300</p> | <p><a href="#">One to one tuition   EEF (educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk)</a><br/>And in small groups:<br/><a href="#">Small group tuition   Toolkit Strand   Education Endowment Foundation   EEF</a></p> | 1 → 4 |
| <p>Catch up interventions for small groups of Year 7 pupils for English and maths<br/>12 periods X £50 X 19 fortnights = £11,400</p>   | <p><a href="#">Small group tuition   Toolkit Strand   Education Endowment Foundation   EEF</a></p>   | 1 → 4 |
| <p>Targeted Academic costs = £140,000</p>  |  |       |

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

Budgeted cost: £250,000

| Activity  | Evidence that supports this approach   | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|---|--|-------------------------------|
| <p>Re-Launching Summer Curriculum Enrichment Week<br/>£50,000</p> | <p><a href="https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/guidance-for-teachers/life-skills-enrichment">https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/guidance-for-teachers/life-skills-enrichment</a></p> <p>“Enrichment approaches can directly improve pupils’ attainment...” EEF</p> | 6                             |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>and the Duke of Edinburgh Award<br/>£7,000</p> <p>Support for cookery, food and nutrition<br/>£5,300</p> <p>Dance company invoices for Culture Days<br/>£2,000</p> <p>Provision of free breakfast club<br/>£4,400</p> <p>Free music peripatetic lessons fully funded<br/>£65,000</p> <p>Summer School with "Let me play"<br/>£8,300</p> <p>Summer School staffing<br/>£5,000</p> <p>Newly refurbished standalone mentoring and coaching suite "the Orchard"<br/>£60,000</p> <p>Rewards for pupils funding<br/>£10,000</p> <p>Subsidy for educational visits<br/>£10,000</p> |  |  |
|--|--|--|

|  |  |       |
|--|--|-------|
| Stationery, digital equipment for remote access, and revision guides for disadvantaged pupils<br>£20,000   |  |       |
| Embedding principles of good practice set out in DfE's <a href="#">Improving School Attendance</a> advice. | The DfE guidance has been informed by engagement with schools that have significantly reduced persistent absence levels. | 4     |
| Contingency<br>£3,000  | Ad hoc unplanned expenditure to support disadvantaged cohort   | 1 → 6 |

**Total budgeted cost: £ 560,000.00**

## Part B: Review of outcomes in the previous academic year

### Pupil premium strategy outcomes

This details the impact that our pupil premium activity had on pupils in the 2021 to 2022 academic year.

Ebacc entry in 2022 was very high at 74% The school remains committed to teaching a broad and balanced curriculum and the Ebacc provides just this type of curriculum:

| Academic cohort / Year 11 | Numbers following an Ebacc. Curriculum | Percentage |
|---------------------------|--|------------|
| 2019                      | 177 / 241                              | 73%        |
| 2020                      | 195 / 237                              | 82%        |
| 2021                      | 214 / 263                              | 81%        |
| 2022                      | 193 / 262                              | 74%        |
| 2023                      | 211 / 268                              | 79%        |

The school has made very good progress in bridging the gap between the disadvantaged and the non-disadvantaged pupils in 2022 with an attainment 8 score of 5.5 for both cohorts (significantly above the national average). The progress 8 score for the disadvantaged at 1.05 (0.95 in 2019 when exams were last taken) compares to that of 1.15 (0.96 in 2019) for the non-disadvantaged meaning there was a gap of -0.1%.

As mentioned above our overall attainment 8 for disadvantaged pupils remains in highest 20% of all schools in 2022, 2019, 2018 and 2017.

We believe that the pandemic had disproportionately affected the disadvantaged cohort (2020 and 2021) as evidenced by the lengthening attainment gap. Although the quality of the curriculum delivered during closure was high and 85% of our students engaged consistency with on-line learning (during the second lock down) delivered through the live streaming of lessons using google classroom – a significant minority were unable to engage and had fallen back. The recovery curriculums put in place following 2021 and the catchup interventions put in place using the pupil premium and recovery premium funding have clearly had an impact for the better in 2022 bridging much of the gap that had developed.

Attendance figures show an improvement for both cohorts since the COVID pandemic. However, other than year 8, the non-disadvantaged still have a better rate of attendance. Year 11 rates of attendance were still a cause for concern at the end of the last academic year.

| Year Group<br>2021 – 2022 | Attendance – Disadvantaged | Attendance – Non-Disadvantaged |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Year 7                    | 94.76%                     | 96.03%                         |
| Year 8                    | 94.64%                     | 94.46%                         |
| Year 9                    | 91.95%                     | 94.98%                         |
| Year 10                   | 92.33%                     | 94.26%                         |
| Year 11                   | 78.12%                     | 80.93%                         |
| Year 12                   | 92.66%                     | 92.56%                         |

Overall rates of attendance have begun a recovery since the beginning of the autumn term.

We also believe, that the effect of restoring the enrichment opportunities and the removal of all restrictions to educational visits etc. will have a positive effect on pupil well-being and feelings of contentment; and this plan will continue to address those feelings over the next two years.