# 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 | Marshfields |
| Number of pupils in school | 171 |
| Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils | 51% |
| Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers **(3-year plans are recommended)** | 2021/2022 – 2024/2025 |
| Date this statement was published | 30/06/2023 |
| Date on which it will be reviewed | 01/12/2023 |
| Statement authorised by | Ian Graham-Wells |
| Pupil premium lead | Ian Graham-Wells |
| Governor / Trustee lead | Isabel Clarke |

**Funding overview**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Detail** | **Amount** |
| Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year | £75540 |
| Recovery premium funding allocation this academic year | £74680 |
| 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 | £146832 |

# Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

## Statement of intent

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All members of staff and the governing body are committed to meeting the academic, pastoral, and social needs of students who qualify for Pupil Premium, to facilitate their best outcomes. We are committed to reducing the attainment gap between Pupil Premium and non-Pupil Premium students by investing pupil premium funding in a tailored manner to address individual, as well as shared, in-school, and external barriers.  **School objectives in spending PPG:**  Raising Attainment and achievement of students to at least expected progress through  i) Provision to raise literacy/numeracy levels  ii) Providing social & emotional support/interventions to improve attendance and  behaviour  iii) Enhanced/improved cultural capital – trips, activities, extra curriculum activities and support with uniform, materials etc.  iv) Personalised learning, e.g., use of external providers & IAG and CPD for staff to improve teaching and learning.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **What areas do we need to improve?** | Attainment of PPM students at KS3 and KS4  Improved English and Maths outcomes at KS4 | | **What *specific* impact do we intend these actions to have on standards, provision, attitudes, behaviour, efficiency, other?** | Enhance staff awareness of and accountability for PPM outcomes  Improve provision for PPM in lessons and tracking of performance  Improved student outcomes  Increased Parental engagement in supporting learning  Student engagement in extra-curricular | |

## Challenges

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Challenge number | Detail of challenge |
| 1 | All staff clearly identify support strategies for PPM students not complete |
| 2 | Clear and concise reporting tools not in place for all stakeholders to monitor the impact of PPG spending |
| 3 | Differentiation to ensure all students can access the curriculum not yet embedded |
| 4 | Clear and concise process in place to track progress of PP students not embedded |
| 5 | Clear and concise processes not in place to monitor effectiveness of PPG spending and impact |
| 6 | PPM students reading ages upon completion of school are below expectation |
| 7 | Currently not all students leave with both Maths and English at an appropriate level based on ability |
| 8 | All students receive the required level of support to access and engage with their education |

## 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 |
| Review the role of STA/TA staff | All STA/TA Interventions are targeted at PPM students to achieve maximum impact. All teaching staff are fully aware of the role of STA/TA |
| Additional intervention in Y11 to support Ma and Eng. | Improvement in Maths and English outcomes – increased attainment of students leaving school with both English and Maths qualifications based on prior attainment |
| Develop robust Literacy Intervention Strategy to boost levels across the school – PPM Students to read in lessons | Improvement in targeted students’ reading ages |
| Provision map further developed and used effectively to monitor the quality, impact, and value for money of funding for provision and intervention | End of year results and progress made to narrow the gap  All funding spent |
| Group’s academic progress tracked discretely at year group and whole-school level three times a year (once a term) | Interventions planned because of tracking by SLs and SLT  Book looks include group as focus  Parents to attend all reviews  SL meetings once a term to track progress of PPM students |
| Access to in- class differentiation is established, and now good practice needs to be shared – including Triangles of Inclusion | ‘What works well’ and Triangles of Inclusion for PPM etc. in lessons is established |
| Ensure transparency of use of pupil premium funding in relation to its impact on student achievement | Details on website  Report to SLT and governors  Information shared with PPM students, staff, and parents |
| All staff clearly identify support strategies for PPM students | Observations and Work scrutinies show use of strategies in teacher planning and lessons |
| Creation of additional teaching and support staff to further the recovery from Covid-19 | Increased attendance, reduced negative behaviour and enhanced outcomes academically |

## 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: £73,420

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
| Creation of a specific Intervention Tutor role to lead on 20-minute sessions on language comprehension from a lead practitioner for disadvantaged pupils that require further support. Each pupil to receive two sessions per week for one term. | Understanding the meaning of a text requires a combination of word recognition and language comprehension:  [Learning to Read: “The Simple View of Reading” | National Centre on Improving Literacy](https://improvingliteracy.org/brief/learning-read-simple-view-reading)  Lexia:   * Struggling readers achieved +2 months’ progress compared to non-users in as little as 16 hours of program use. * EEF awarded a high ‘padlock’ rating, enabling schools to draw strong conclusions on impact. * The study deemed Lexia as a ‘very low cost’ program. * Fidelity of implementation in schools was ‘high’ | 3,6,7 |
| CPD for teaching staff | Evidence from cognitive science suggests that teachers must carefully introduce new content to pupils to ensure they can reference this against existing knowledge:  [Cognitive Load Theory and its application in the classroom – The Early Career Hub (chartered.college)](https://earlycareer.chartered.college/cognitive-load-theory-and-its-application-in-the-classroom-3/) | 1,3,8 |
| Clear identification of SLT responsibility for Pupil Premium to enhance staff and student engagement and tracking of PPG spending impact | Evidence and experience suggest that where PPG spending is led on from a senior level that outcomes are far more positive | 2,4,5 |
| Recruitment and Retention of additional Primary teaching staff to address the needs of primary aged children following the Covid-19 pandemic | Evidence suggests that teaching staff provide greater outcomes and close gaps in attainment far more than support staff or bought in tutoring | 3, 6, 7, 8 |

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

Budgeted cost: £16,052

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
| Purchase of 3-year license of Lexia Software to enhance and improve Reading ages across the school | Lexia:   * Struggling readers achieved +2 months’ progress compared to non-users in as little as 16 hours of program use. * EEF awarded a high ‘padlock’ rating, enabling schools to draw strong conclusions on impact. * The study deemed Lexia as a ‘very low cost’ program. * Fidelity of implementation in schools was ‘high’ | 3,6,7 |
| Targeted Alternative Provision for students to enrich and enhance the curriculum to further engagement | For pupils with SEND, alternative provision can be a useful tool to support teaching. This provision will also support pupils’ social and emotional literacy and skills, and help to deliver the curriculum overall | 1,8 |

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

Budgeted cost: £58,860

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Activity |  | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
| Training Year 9–11 pupils to use public transport.  This will involve CPD and release time for two staff members. |  | Independent Travel Training is likely to enhance pupils’ social and employment opportunities:  [Department for Education (publishing.service.gov.uk)](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/575323/Home_to_school_travel_and_transport_guidance.pdf) | 1,3 |
| Creation of a Pastoral Lead role within teaching staff |  | We have observed that an identified link for small schools that don’t benefit from a defined Head of Year type structure makes a significant difference when it comes to pupil/parent engagement in learning and progress. | 8 |
| Programme working with parents and carers to develop effective home learning environments and increased self-expression. |  | The NSPCC recommends parents and carers work with their children to create routines that provide structure to their day, partake in activities together, and assist children in expressing their emotions: [Supporting children with special educational needs and disabilities | NSPCC](https://www.nspcc.org.uk/keeping-children-safe/support-for-parents/coronavirus-supporting-children-special-educational-needs-disabilities/) | 3,8 |
| Recruitment and retention of Pastoral Support Assistants to enhance the pastoral support in school |  | We have observed that an identified link for small schools that don’t benefit from a defined Head of Year type structure makes a significant difference when it comes to pupil/parent engagement in learning and progress. | 8 |

**Total budgeted cost: £84,995**

# 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.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **What we are doing well (from internal PPM Review):**   * The information that has been produced for PPM is very detailed with clear breakdowns of the position of the school – this has provided Governors, SLT and Middle leaders with clear breakdowns of PPM performance to inform department and whole school planning. * The school and staff understand that the key to PPM is high quality teaching - this is evident from lesson observations where specific strategies have been seen to promote PPM progress using lesson planning and triangles of inclusion. Work in progress   **Impact of the PPG**  • Overall school attendance so far for 2021-22 was 91.5%. Non-PP students’ attendance was 92.48% and PP students’ attendance was 91.18%.  • 100% of PP students who are due to leave the school in the summer of 2022 are set to go on to further education or employment.   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Measure** | **Pupil Premium** | | **Non-Pupil Premium** | | |  | **Actual 2021** | **Actual 2022** | **Actual 2021** | **Actual 2022** | | 5 x Level 1 Qualifications | 23% | 24% | 24% | 44% | | 5 x Level 1 Qualifications inc. Eng. & Maths | 15% | 5% | 12% | 22% | | 5 x Qualifications | 92% | 95% | 76% | 100% | | 3 x Qualifications | 100% | 95% | 100% | 100% | |

## Externally provided programmes

*Please include the names of any non-DfE programmes that you purchased in the previous academic year. This will help the Department for Education identify which ones are popular in England*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Programme | Provider |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Further information (optional)

|  |
| --- |
| **Additional activity**  Our pupil premium strategy will be supplemented by additional activity that we are not funding using pupil premium or recovery premium. That will include:   * Working in partnership with local colleges to provide opportunities such as taster courses, link programmes and mentoring to enable young people with SEN to familiarise themselves with the college environment and gain some experience of college life and study. * Arranging work-based learning that enables pupils to have first-hand experience of work, such as apprenticeships, traineeships, and supported internships. |