

Pupil premium strategy statement

This statement details our school's use of pupil premium (and recovery premium for the 2023 to 2024 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	1777
Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils	28.8% (511) 33.5% 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	21 st December 2023
Date on which it will be reviewed	September 2024
Statement authorised by	Nathan Walters
Pupil premium lead	Kamal Thacker
Governor / Trustee lead	Umesh Sharma

Funding overview

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year	£430,000.00 (Apr 23 → Mar 24)
Recovery premium funding allocation this academic year	£117,000.00
Pupil premium funding carried forward from previous years (enter £0 if not applicable)	£0
Total budget for this academic year If your school is an academy in a trust that pools this funding, state the amount available to your school this academic year	£547,000.00

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 / progress gap that had opened up between the disadvantaged and non -disadvantaged during 2020 and 2021 has been largely removed in 2022 although there remains a slight gap in the progress 8 score of the two cohorts. This was sustained in 2023.

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
2023	68	200	25%	5.0	5.1	-0.1	0.74	0.88	-0.14

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">2023</td> <td>English Language</td> <td>81%</td> <td>78%</td> <td>+3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>English Lit.</td> <td>84%</td> <td>83%</td> <td>+1%</td> </tr> <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. This was sustained in 2023. 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	2023	English Language	81%	78%	+3%	English Lit.	84%	83%	+1%	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																																																		
2023	English Language	81%	78%	+3%																																																		
	English Lit.	84%	83%	+1%																																																		
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 and 2023:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Disadvantaged</th> <th>Non-disadvantaged</th> <th>Difference</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2023</td> <td>74%</td> <td>77%</td> <td>-3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2022</td> <td>81%</td> <td>84%</td> <td>-3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Year	Disadvantaged	Non-disadvantaged	Difference	2023	74%	77%	-3%	2022	81%	84%	-3%																																						
Year	Disadvantaged	Non-disadvantaged	Difference																																																			
2023	74%	77%	-3%																																																			
2022	81%	84%	-3%																																																			

2021	73%	87%	-14%
2020	79%	87%	-8%
2019	76%	85%	-9%

Current internal Year 10 data shows the gap remains but is narrow similar to 2022 and 2023.

3

Significant attainment and progress gaps were noted between the disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils in many cohorts in 2023.

Cohort	ATTAINMENT			PROGRESS		
	Disadvantaged	Non-disadvantaged	Diff.	Disadvantaged	Non-disadvantaged	Diff.
All pupils	5 (68)	5.1 (200)	-0.1	0.74	0.88	-0.14
Male	4.6 (32)	5.1 (109)	-0.5	0.33	0.83	-0.5
Female	5.3 (36)	5 (91)	0.3	1.1	0.95	0.15
H attainers	6.9 (10)	7.4 (29)	-0.5	0.3	0.81	-0.51
M attainers	5.5 (30)	5.6 (95)	-0.1	0.68	0.99	-0.31
L attainers	3.6 (23)	3.6 (50)	0	0.99	0.73	0.26
SEN support	3.9 (7)	3.6 (8)	0.3	0.71	0.33	0.38
EHC Plan	0.1 (1)	3.5 (5)	-3.4	-1.48	0.8	-2.28
No SEN	5.2 (60)	5.2 (187)	0	0.78	0.91	-0.13

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:

	Autumn 2022	Autumn 2023	Autumn 2022	Autumn 2023
	Disadvantaged (est. 31% of cohort)	Disadvantaged (est. 25% of cohort)	Non-Disadvantaged (est. 69% of cohort)	Non-Disadvantaged (est. 75% of cohort)
Negative behaviour points	1772 (32%)	3606 (39%)	3823 (68%)	5962 (61%)
Positive behaviour points	17026 (31%)	20060 (34%)	38681 (69%)	38948 (66%)

Clearly a gap has started to build up between the disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged cohorts between 2022 and 2023.

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%

	2022 → 2023	92.0%	93.7%	-1.7%
	Autumn 2023	89.0%	92.0%	-3.0%
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 (post-COVID) 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 extensive programme of curriculum visits including residential stays and visits abroad.			

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 / exceed 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. 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. 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, enrichment and careers based activities (quantified). Reduction in the level of support being asked of the Social Inclusion Team with anxiety concerns. The attendance rate of both disadvantaged pupils and non-disadvantaged pupils to return

	<p>to pre-pandemic levels by 2024/25. With the rate of attendance for the disadvantaged equalling that of the non-disadvantaged. 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) £3,000</p>	<p>Provide evidence into pupils’ strengths and weaknesses and identify correct level and nature of interventions Standardised tests (EEF)</p>	<p>1 → 5</p>
<p>1a) Timetable additional class for English 7Y6 x 6 periods per fortnight £50 x 14 periods x 19 fortnights = £13,300</p> <p>1b) Timetable additional class for English 8Y6 x 6 periods per fortnight £50 x 14 periods x 19 fortnights = £13,300</p>	<p>Planned and sustained structural changes within the package of implementation strategies (EEF)</p> <p>Includes Recruitment costs</p> <p><u>Teaching of disciplinary literacy:</u></p> <p><u>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/guidance-reports/literacy-ks3-ks4</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>2a) Timetable additional class for maths 7Y6 x 10 periods per fortnight £50 x 10 periods x 19 fortnights = £9,500</p> <p>2b) Timetable additional class for maths 7Y6 x 10 periods per fortnight £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: https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/evidence-summaries/evidence-reviews/improving-mathematics-in-key-stages-two-and-three/</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 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 Oracy Co-ordinator £2800</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"> 1. Use of co-operative writing 2. Structured approaches that give students step by step guides to writing in various genres, focused squarely on writing outcomes 3. Programmes that teach students to assess their own and others’ drafts, to give students more feedback and insight into effective writing strategies. 	1, 3 and partly 4

<p>4) Funding for Spanish and French theatre performances delivered by external providers (Onatti Productions Ltd) in school £1,000</p>	<p>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/guidance-reports/literacy-ks3-ks4</p> <p>Foreign language learning and its impact on wider academic outcomes: A rapid evidence assessment EEF – July 2020: “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 £5000</p>	<p>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/guidance-reports/science-ks3-ks4</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pre-conceptions – build on the ideas that pupils bring to lessons 2. Modelling: use models to support understanding 3. Memory: support pupils to retain and retrieve knowledge 4. Practical work: use practical work purposefully and as part of a learning sequence 5. Language of science: develop scientific vocabulary and support pupils to read and write about science 6. Feedback: use structured feedback to move on pupils’ thinking <p>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/evidence-reviews/science</p> <p>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 than 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 EEF – January 2015</p>	<p>4</p>

<p>£50 x 12 x 19 = £11,400</p> <p>Twinkl EAL resources = £1800</p> <p>Subscription to Bedrock resources to promote literacy for EAL pupils in Year 7 at stage C £8000</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>Experience of work and contact with employers £26,000</p> <p>Funding for “Inspire” pre- GCSE programme Co-ordinator £2800</p> <p>Extended IAG support for pupils negotiated through Ealing Connexions £16,000</p> <p>Renewal of Unifrog £3300</p> <p>Renewal of Uplearn resources X 50% = £6600</p>	<p>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/evidence-reviews/careers-education</p> <p>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/evidence-reviews/employer-engagement-in-education</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&R for a lead teacher to map cross curricular approaches to the development of cultural capital, SMSC and world views across the curriculum. £3500</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>Appointing Acting Assistant Head Teachers to reform assessment and reporting systems at KS3 and support whole school literacy and reading £23,700</p> <p>Maths consultancy £1000</p> <p>Funding for NTP and recovery premium co-ordinator £2800</p>	<p>Using a Distributive leadership approach</p> <p>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/evidence-reviews/feedback-approaches</p> <p>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/evidence-reviews/attainment-measures-in-literacy-mathematics-and-science</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>£200 for replacement of Headphone sets for LRC / NTP intervention</p>	<p>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/evidence-reviews/metacognition-and-self-regulation</p> <p>Support pupils to plan, monitor and evaluate their learning. Explicitly teach pupils how to organise and effectively manage their learning independently</p> <p>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/evidence-reviews/digital-technology-2019</p> <p>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/evidence-reviews/remote-learning-for-pupils</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider how technology will improve teaching and learning before introducing it 2. Technology can be used to improve the quality of explanations and modelling 3. Technology offers ways to improve the impact of pupil practice 4. Technology can play a role in improving assessment and feedback 	<p>4</p>
<p>Whole school curriculum CPD £1700</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whole school INSET on curriculum sequencing and planning 2. Whole school INSET on acquiring disciplinary literacy 	<p>1→ 4</p>

	https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/guidance-reports/effective-professional-development https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/guidance-reports/literacy-ks3-ks4	
Home learning club for SEND, EAL and disadvantaged cohort £20 x 5 x 38 = £3,800	https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/guidance-reports/send 1. Create a positive and supportive environment for all pupils without exception 2. Build an ongoing, holistic understanding of your pupils and their needs – assess, plan, do review approach. 3. Ensure all pupils have access to high quality teaching 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: £150,000

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 good proportion of those will be high attainers. £117,000 (recovery premium and 16-19 catch up funding)	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: One to one tuition EEF (educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk) And in small groups: Small group tuition Toolkit Strand Education Endowment Foundation EEF	1 → 3

HLTA staffing costs for after school intervention support £10,200		
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. £11,400	One to one tuition EEF (educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk) And in small groups: Small group tuition Toolkit Strand Education Endowment Foundation EEF	1 → 4
Catch up interventions for small groups of Year 7 pupils for English and maths 12 periods X £50 X 19 fortnights = £11,400	Small group tuition Toolkit Strand Education Endowment Foundation EEF	1 → 4
Targeted Academic costs = £150,000		

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

Budgeted cost: £227,000

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Summer Curriculum Enrichment Week £35,000 and the Duke of Edinburgh Award £4,000 Support for cookery, food and nutrition £5,300 invoices for Arts Week £5,000 Provision of free breakfast club	https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/guidance-for-teachers/life-skills-enrichment “Enrichment approaches can directly improve pupils’ attainment...” EEF	6

<p>£9000</p> <p>Free music peripatetic lessons fully funded £65,000</p> <p>Summer School with "Let me play" £7,100</p> <p>Summer School staffing £1,200</p> <p>Additional Capacity for Learning mentor team £50,000</p> <p>Rewards for pupils funding £10,000</p> <p>Subsidy for educational visits £10,000</p> <p>Stationery, digital equipment for remote access, and revision guides for disadvantaged pupils £20,000</p>		
<p>Embedding principles of good practice set out in DfE's Improving School Attendance advice.</p>	<p>The DfE guidance has been informed by engagement with schools that have significantly reduced persistent absence levels.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Contingency £5,400</p>	<p>Ad hoc unplanned expenditure to support disadvantaged cohort</p>	<p>1 → 6</p>

Total budgeted cost: £ 547,000.00

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 2022 to 2023 academic year.

Ebacc entry in 2023 was very high at 79% 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%
2024	234 / 276	85%

The school had 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). However, in 2023 a slight gap has opened up with the non-disadvantaged achieving an attainment 8 score of 5.1 and the disadvantaged achieving an attainment 8 of 5.0. The progress 8 score for the disadvantaged at 0.74 (1.05 in 2022) compares to that of 0.88 (1.15 in 2022) for the non-disadvantaged meaning there was a gap of -0.14.

As mentioned above our overall attainment 8 for disadvantaged pupils remains significantly above the national average for all schools in 2023, 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 consistently 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 since 2022 bridging much of the gap that had developed. This trend has been largely sustained in 2023.

Attendance figures show an improvement for both cohorts since the COVID pandemic. However, in 2022-3 in all year groups, the non-disadvantaged still have a better rate of attendance. Year 11 rates of attendance were a concern in 2021-22 but have seen a pronounced improvement in 2022-3.

Year Group 2021 – 2022 & 2022 – 2023	Attendance – Disadvantaged		Attendance – Non-Disadvantaged	
	2021 - 2022	2022 – 2023	2021 - 2022	2022 – 2023
Year 7	94.76%	92.9%	96.03%	95.0%
Year 8	94.64%	94.0%	94.46%	94,7%
Year 9	91.95%	90.9%	94.98%	92.8%
Year 10	92.33%	89.6%	94.26%	92.8%
Year 11	78.12%	91.7%	80.93%	93.5%
Year 12	92.66%	92.2%	92.56%	93.5%

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