



INTRODUCTION

The Pupil Premium Plan for 2021-22 is an updated version of that produced during last year's financial planning process, in light of performance data published by the Department for Education. The plan has been structured around what the school sees as the key reasons why pupils from disadvantaged homes achieve less well than other pupils.

One of the key contributors to diminishing the difference in achievement between Pupil Premium pupils and other pupils is ensuring quality teaching for all. This is implemented across the school and includes teachers' focus on particular groups, such as disadvantaged pupils. The Executive Headteacher has developed a model for school improvement across all four of his schools in the federation which enables PP pupils to flourish. This model includes high expectations of teaching and behaviour and the extensive provision of out-of-school-hours support. The key barriers to the achievement of PP pupils identified at the start of this strategy are generalisations which do not apply to every family.

1. Summary information

School	Salvatorian College (DfE Number 310/5400)				
Academic Year	2021-22	Total PP budget	£73,535	Date of most recent external PP Review	16 January 2018
Total number of pupils	473	Number of pupils eligible for PP	100	Date for next internal review of this strategy	January 2022

2. Barriers to future attainment

A.	Low levels of literacy from some PP pupils, with limited models of language at home and often limited value placed on reading.
B.	Excessive use of technology such as mobile phones, games and the internet
C.	Low aspirations from some parents and pupils
D.	The environment that the children experience at home is often not conducive for learning (e.g. lack of suitable study space)
E.	PP pupils achievement in Mathematics was a weakness in the most recent Ofsted Inspection and 2018 results
F.	Attendance and punctuality of PP pupils not as good as non-PP pupils
G.	PP are most likely to have home environment affected by Covid-19 and least likely to have engaged with distance learning.

3. Analysis of Targets for 2020-21		
	Target	Comment
A.	95% of teaching at least 'Good' by September 2021	The majority of teaching in the school is either Good or Outstanding. In the Whole School Review, conducted in July 2021, reviewers found 90% (19 out of 21) lessons to be 'Good' or 'Outstanding'.
B.	Work scrutinies show high rates of completion of work set, by PP pupils	Achieved. Book reviews carried out by HoDs, SLT and an external reviewer comment that books show high completion rates by PP students.
C.	The progress made by PP is similar to that made by other pupils in all year groups.	In year 11, PP achieved a progress score of +0.26, which is below that of the whole school at +0.80. However, nationally non-pupil premium pupils achieved a score of +0.13. In year 10, PP students achieved a higher progress score than the rest of the cohort.
D.	No greater than a 3% gap between the attendance rate of PP and other pupils.	Target not met - 5.6% gap. PP 89.4% as compared to whole school 95%. Comment - Difficult year with a national lockdown, and parental concerns regarding their son's health in terms of Covid particularly in the Autumn and Spring terms.
E.	A 20% reduction in the number of PP pupils excluded.	Target not met.
F.	By the end of the Autumn term, a 10% reduction in the Xs given to PP pupils	Target not met - behavioural X's given to PP pupils have increased. Comment - This is a crude figure when monitoring behaviour of pupil groups, not least due to the subjective nature of teachers awarding behavioural X's. Also, it is important to note that we have a larger whole school cohort, with pupils having experienced their second lockdown. Impact of these lockdowns, on both Pupil and staff wellbeing, has been a contributory reason for the increase in behavioural X's.

4. Pupil Premium Action Plan 2020-21

1. Key Focus: Quality teaching for all (addressing barriers A, B, & C)

Desired outcomes:

- **95% of teaching at least 'Good' by September 2022**
- **Work scrutinies show high rates of completion of work set, by PP pupils**
- **The progress made by PP is similar to that made by other pupils in all year groups.**

Chosen action / approach	Rationale	Monitoring, evaluation and impact	Staff lead	Budget
<p>Appropriate Curriculum</p> <p>Year 10 and 11 Guided Study Classes</p> <p>Catch-up Interventions for core and foundation subjects at KS3.</p> <p>Study skills sessions in registration</p> <p>Targeted careers support</p>	<p>EEF Toolkit "metacognition and self-regulation: + 7 months, low cost, high impact"</p> <p>EEF Toolkit "small group tuition: +4 months, moderate cost"</p> <p>Stakeholder feedback that pupils need more guidance in study skills.</p> <p>Careers support to raise PP pupils' self-esteem and sense of purpose.</p>	<p>SLT (PP Lead) to conduct termly reviews with relevant HODs in light of progress data.</p> <p>HoDs to analyse impact after each data drop (end of term test)</p>	<p>DEV</p> <p>HoDs</p> <p>DEV</p> <p>DCO</p>	<p>£30,000 for additional hours input from teaching and support staff</p> <p>£1,000 on revision materials including Tim Foot 'Revision Cracked'</p>
<p>Quality First Teaching and Learning which focuses on PP pupils - appropriate classing and staffing of PP pupils</p> <p>Quality First Teaching and Learning - Appropriate classing and staffing of PP students -Teacher identification of PP students -Accurate recording of student current and predicted grades. -Revised framework to offer consistency and support for completion of home learning. -Embed MARK-PLAN-TEACH approach - Appropriate differentiation for pupils to support progress -Regular issuing, monitoring and marking of quality homework.</p>	<p>EEF Toolkit – 'feedback: +8 months, high impact' 'homework: +5 months, moderate impact'</p>	<p>SLT (PP Lead) identifies classes making least progress and/or most poorly behaved and follows up with HODs.</p>	<p>DEV GJA</p>	<p>£3,000 towards CPD budget</p>

Continued teacher identification of PP pupils	Lack of rigour in assessment arrangements during 2016-17. Improvements made in 2017-18 but more desired.	Review performance management to ensure teachers know their PP pupils and focus on how well they are performing.	DEV LMO	
Accurate recording of student current and predicted grades	Some PP pupils lack organisational skills and motivation.	Review with HODs strategies for ensuring that PP pupils are being targeted through questioning and assessment for learning.	DEV	
Regular issuing, monitoring and marking of quality homework.	The setting and completion of homework not rigorous enough.	Termly report on the completion of homework of PP pupils compared with others. ShowMyHomework implementation and training.	DEV	£2,500
Appropriate differentiation for PP pupils to support progress	Teachers not sufficiently targeting PP pupils in lessons and work scrutinies		DEV	
Improve the literacy of all PP students.				
Raise profile of the importance of literacy across the curriculum to all teachers.	PP pupils less likely to experience and use Standard English out of school	Head of English to provide termly report for SLT/PP Lead on the progress being made by groups	AIN IGO	£3,000 TLR for Literacy Co-ordinator £3,000 EAL support materials
Improve the literacy and reading ages of PP students from their starting points.	Sutton document 'improving literacy improves overall Improves core literacy student outcomes' Reading ages closely connected to literacy skills, especially spelling and comprehension. Pupils are more able to access materials across the curriculum		SLT	£10,000 EAL Co-ordinator salary
Handwriting club to develop presentational skills	Develop more rigour from PP pupils. Tidy work easier to revise	School work scrutinies evaluate presentation and feed back comments to staff	AIN	

<p>Progress score for PP pupils in mathematics to be broadly in line with the rest of the school</p>	<p>Teaching and achievement raised as areas of weakness by Ofsted</p> <p>Progress 8 for PP mathematics was negative in 2017-18 exam results and below the rest of the cohort in 2018-2020.</p>	<p>Interventions in place for pupil premium students will be monitored half termly by head of mathematics.</p>	<p>DEV LMO</p>	<p>[As above: £30,000 for additional hours input from teaching and support staff]</p>
<p>Review the quality of teaching assistants and classroom support.</p>	<p>EEF toolkit: low impact for high cost, based on limited evidence.</p>	<p>Formal review to be presented to Exec Head</p>	<p>DEV IGO</p>	
<p>Total budgeted spend: £52,500</p>				

2. Key focus: The behaviour, motivation and attendance of PP pupils (addressing barriers B,C,D,F,G)

Desired Outcomes:

- **No more than a 3% gap in the attendance of PP and other pupils**
- **A 20% reduction in the number of PP pupils excluded.**
- **By the end of the Autumn term, a 10% reduction in the Xs given to PP pupils**
- **If and when all or part of the school is to close, attendance to remote lessons has no more than a 3% gap (in line with normal times)**

Chosen action / approach	Rationale	Monitoring, evaluation and impact	Staff lead	Budget
<p>Intervention work to reduce number of PP pupils excluded. Behaviour interventions seek to improve attainment and attendance by further reducing any incidents of disruptive behaviour. Behaviour is targeted across the whole school, as well as specialist targeting of specific students through behaviour support programmes and counselling. Improved behaviour continues to raise the positive ethos across the school.</p>	<p>EEF Toolkit 'behaviour interventions: +4 months, moderate impact' EEF toolkit 'social and emotional learning: +4 months, moderate impact'</p> <p>Poorer behaviour a key contributory factor to PP underachievement</p>	<p>Termly analysis of behaviour records and follows up with individuals who could be moving towards exclusion.</p> <p>Termly evaluations of Xs given to PP pupils compared with those given to non PP pupils</p>	<p>DEV ACO</p> <p>ACO</p>	<p>£4,000 contribution towards seconded SLT member who is National Lead on Behaviour</p> <p>£5,270 allowance for Behaviour Lead / LSU manager</p>
<p>Rewards Review and update the rewards system to ensure that rewards are matched to pupil needs in order to improve motivation and raise aspiration.</p>	<p>Research has shown that self-esteem and the use of praise have a significant impact on pupils from vulnerable backgrounds.</p>	<p>Termly report to SLT/PP Lead</p>	<p>DCO LMO AIN</p>	<p>£4,000 for implementation of rewards system</p>
<p>Ensure that money is not a barrier for participation in school activities. School trip and resources grants supporting pupils to develop an in-depth interest in a subject or activity. These activities can also improve self-confidence and support social and friendship groups. PP students take part in school trips as much as non-PP students.</p>	<p>EEF toolkit Arts and Sports participation +2 months. Feedback from parental and pupil surveys about how school contributions have greatly aided pupil participation and self-esteem</p>	<p>Termly analysis of PP take-up of school trips.</p> <p>Termly analysis of PP take-up of school music lessons.</p>	<p>DCO</p> <p>BFO</p>	<p>£3,000 fund for subsidising participation in curriculum-related trips by PP pupils</p> <p>£3,000 fund for subsidising music lessons for PP pupils</p>

<p>To exploit the PP pupils interest in ICT by broadening its use across a range of subjects.</p> <p>Use technology more in Mathematics (MathsWatch) for homework completion. Training for the wider use of Microsoft Teams to supplement distance learning. Engage PP pupils through ICT-based competitions.</p>	<p>EEF toolkit: Digital Technology: moderate impact for moderate cost based on extensive evidence.</p>	<p>Relevant HODs to set up and monitor the use of technology and provide a termly report to SLT/PP Lead.</p> <p>Survey pupils regarding technology at home and support where necessary.</p>	<p>DEV LMO</p> <p>DEV</p>	<p>£1,000 for ICT resources used particularly by PP pupils</p>
<p>To set up a mentoring scheme where targeted PP pupils are provided with young mentors from a range of institutions to discuss and improve their work.</p>	<p>Some PP pupils have limited conversations at home about the completion and quality of work.</p>	<p>Progress reports by the Inclusion Lead</p>	<p>SGR HOY DEV</p>	<p>£500</p>
				<p>Total budgeted spend: £20,770</p>
<p>OVERALL BUDGETED SPEND: £73,270</p>				

APPENDIX

EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF PUPIL PREMIUM PROVISION AND ACHIEVEMENT 2016-17

SCHOOL: SALVATORIAN RC COLLEGE

DATE: 16 JANUARY 2018

EXTERNAL CONSULTANT: DAVID GOSLING

Introduction

This evaluation was commissioned by the headteacher as part of an external review of Pupil Premium (PP) provision and outcomes. It was conducted by an experienced external consultant who had previously been a lead inspector for Ofsted and head of school improvement. The process of this evaluation broadly follows the national guidance for external evaluations of Pupil Premium and the report informs the PP Action Plan for 2017-18 (see above). The school's 2017 PP Strategy Statement, in particular the sections on the attainment and progress of PP pupils, will need to be updated in light of examination results and assessments in 2018.

The review was conducted over one day and was preceded by an analysis of documentation, including the 2016 Raise on Line document, the 2017 IDSR and ASP and the most recent Ofsted report. During the visit, more documentation was analysed and interviews were held with the teacher responsible for PP. Interviews were also held with a sample of PP pupils. The afternoon of the day, in line with national guidance, was spent writing the draft 2017-18 PP action plan with the PP coordinator.

1. Summary

Data for 2016-17 points to considerable underachievement by disadvantaged pupils and a declining picture. This conflicts with the judgements in the Ofsted report of January 2017 but is identified as a key area for investigation in the 2017 IDSR. There were weaknesses in the leadership of PP in 2016/7, with some statutory areas not included on the website, a lack of monitoring of the action plan and lack of clarity about the gaps in achievement and attendance between PP and non-PP pupils. These weaknesses are now being addressed. The pupil premium pupils interviewed were positive about the school and said they were working hard.

Key Recommendations

1. Provide brief termly PP reports for governors and school leaders which provide:
 - ongoing succinct evaluations of PP pupils' attainment and progress compared with other pupils in the school;
 - trends in the attendance and punctuality of PP pupils compared with other pupils in the school;
 - evaluations of trends in the behaviour data on PP pupils compared with that on other pupils in the school
 - an ongoing succinct evaluation of how well the PP Action Plan is being implemented and the impact of actions.
2. Update the PP section on the school web-site so that it complies with statutory requirements.
3. Finalise the 2017/18 action plan and write a fresh plan (2018/19) in September in light of examination results
4. Keep an ongoing record of the completion of homework and misbehaviour (the x system) by PP pupils compared with other pupils in the school and follow up weaknesses with parents.

2. Key statements from Ofsted Report January 2017

"Leaders strive to ensure that all disadvantaged pupils make substantial progress from their starting points. The school's published pupil premium strategy includes a range of initiatives to support these pupils. Leaders know from experience that some of these initiatives historically did not have the desired effect on some pupils' progress. Consequently, they have revised their actions this year and have commissioned an external review from another school. Leaders carefully track individuals within this

group, many of whom join the school at times other than the start of Year 7. Staff offer individual support to meet pupils' sometimes complex needs. As a result, disadvantaged pupils are currently making good progress in line with that of their peers. "

"A small number of disadvantaged pupils, particularly those who arrive in-year from other schools, do not make the same progress as other pupils nationally."

"Middle and high ability disadvantaged pupils in 2016 made better progress in English than pupils nationally. However, the very small number of lower ability disadvantaged pupils made far less progress than pupils nationally and their peers. Disadvantaged pupils from all starting points made less progress in mathematics than pupils nationally." (mainly due to new arrivals)

"Pupils are proud of their school, are keen to do well and work hard."

"Pupils respect and celebrate each other's differences"

3. Summary of school's performance data

External data points to considerable underachievement of Year 11 disadvantaged pupils for the past two years, with the Progress 8 scores for this group significantly below the national average for 2016 and 2017. In 2017 the Progress 8 score declined and was in the lowest 21% of schools nationally. There was also a wide gap in GCSE attainment between all pupils and disadvantaged pupils. The percentage of all pupils gaining a level 4+ in English and mathematics at GCSE in 2017 was about 20% higher than the percentage for disadvantaged pupils. The school's internal data for 2016-17 points to disadvantaged pupils having achieved only slightly below other pupils at the end of Year 8 but considerably below at the end of Year 7. Data on Years 9 and 10 had not been analysed.

Key Stage 3 end of year attainment 2016-7		
Year 7	<i>Pupils eligible for PP Salvatorian College</i>	<i>Pupils not eligible for PP nationally</i>
% achieving expected or above attainment in English	74%	91%
% achieving <u>above</u> attainment in English	22%	43%
% achieving expected or above attainment in Maths	85%	87%
% achieving <u>above</u> attainment in Maths	30%	51%
Year 8		
% achieving expected or above attainment in English	85%	84%
% achieving above attainment in English	25%	30%
% achieving expected or above attainment in Maths	75%	83%
% achieving <u>above</u> attainment in Maths	40%	33%

Progress 8 scores 2016 and 2017						
Year	Progress 8		English		Mathematics	
	All	Dis	All	Dis	All	Dis
2016	0.14	-0.33	0.38	0.16	0.01	-0.57
2017	-0.1	-0.5	0.1	-0.4	-0.2	-0.5

Progress 8 Percentile Rankings 2016 and 2017						
Year	Progress 8		English		Mathematics	
	All	Dis	All	Dis	All	Dis
2016	35	52	14	20	51	74
2017	54	60	40	56	67	65

Attainment 8 scores 2016 and 2017						
Year	Attainment 8		English		Mathematics	
	All	Dis	All	Dis	All	Dis
2016						
2017	48	40	11	9	9	7

GCSE Results 2017 4+ in English and mathematics						
Year	English Lit		English Lang		Mathematics	
	All	Dis	All	Dis	All	Dis
2017	65%	44%	75%	52%	71%	52%

4. Pupil Surveys

The pupils interviewed were positive about the school, with almost 80% saying they enjoyed attending. They were very honest and polite and were keen to express their views. They were enthusiastic about computer games and mobile phones – most of those interviewed clearly found them to be a key leisure activity with 10% spending more than 10 hours on them at a weekend, 43% of them spending 4 – 9 hours and 48% saying that they spend less than 4 hours on them at the weekend. The amount of time spent on school work varied from an average of an hour a night to those that did more than two hours; only 5% of students said that they did very little homework. The pupils' books were very well marked with several containing good responses from pupils to teachers' comments. Teachers were careful to praise work by pupils of all abilities. Pupils took a pride in their books: work was well-presented and nearly all was completed. Over half the PP students surveyed believed that they work very hard in every lesson. The attendance of the pupils interviewed was good but there was some lateness in the mornings. The group generally had high aspirations, with the majority (57%) wanting to go to college or university and the rest not being sure (24%) or saying that they didn't want to (19%). The majority of pupils wanted to join a profession (67%) with the rest saying that they weren't sure.

5. Leadership and behaviour

A senior member of staff has been newly appointed to lead on PP and the school has commissioned an external review to provide a baseline for taking this area forward.

The PP section on the school web site does not include some key statutory areas. The plan on the website and the funding are for 2016-17 and there is no plan yet for the 2017-18 academic year. Also there has been no evaluation of the impact of spending for 2016-17 either in terms of pupils' outcomes or interventions funded by the PP grant. The website does briefly identify the main barriers to learning for PP pupils and includes some rationale for how funds have been allocated. The structure of the PP plan for 2016-17 is sound. It contains a broad section on key strategies for diminishing the difference between the performance of PP pupils and other groups, key actions and costings. The impact sections in the plan are too generalised and do not provide a clear enough picture on the evaluation of improvements made by specific interventions. This makes it difficult for governors to monitor the impact of spending decisions and the strengths and weaknesses of specific strategies.

The assessment system for 2016-17 provided some information on the progress of major groups but lacked clarity and no overall analysis of data was passed on to the new leadership team. Although assessment data is available at the end of each term, it needs to be supplemented with a brief evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses in each year group and the whole school. Again, this would make it much easier for governors to monitor the impact of spending decisions on PP pupils' achievement and hold school leaders to account.

The system for monitoring the attendance, punctuality and behaviour of disadvantaged pupils is not rigorous. Summary data on PP pupils in these areas for the whole school and for individual year groups has not been collated. Provisional data indicates that the attendance of PP pupils at after school clubs/teaching sessions is high but systematic data comparing the attendance of PP pupils with non PP pupils has not been collected.

Governors have been monitoring the performance of PP pupils but not systematically enough. In particular, they have not been monitoring the implementation of strategies in the PP plan and their impact.