

Pupil premium strategy statement – Tudor Grange Samworth Academy

This statement details our school's use of pupil premium (and recovery premium) 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 outcomes for disadvantaged pupils last academic year.

School overview

Detail	Data
Number of pupils in school	984
Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils	44%
Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers (3 year plans are recommended)	2023/24 – 2025/26
Date this statement was published	28/11/23
Date on which it will be reviewed	1/9/24
Statement authorised by	S. Roach
Pupil premium lead	C. Robinson
Governor / Trustee lead	N. Tansley

Funding overview

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year	£499,320
Recovery premium funding allocation this academic year	£99,975
Pupil premium (and recovery premium*) funding carried forward from previous years (<i>enter £0 if not applicable</i>) <i>*Recovery premium received in academic year 2021 to 2022 can be carried forward to academic year 2022 to 2023. Recovery premium received in academic year 2022 to 2023 cannot be carried forward to 2023 to 2024.</i>	£0
Total budget for this academic year <i>If your school is an academy in a trust that pools this funding, state the amount available to your school this academic year</i>	£599, 295

Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

Statement of intent

Tudor Grange Samworth Academy uses the pupil premium funding to close the gap between students in receipt of the pupil premium and their peers.

To achieve this requires a long-term strategy which is underpinned by an understanding of the research of issues affecting disadvantaged students, using evidence such as The Education Endowment Foundation to inform good practice.

In line with the EEF Guide to Pupil Premium, we use a tiered approach to pupil premium spending to:

- Improve Teaching
- Facilitate targeted academic support
- Employ wider strategies to break down barriers to success.

Based on our contextual research and our internal assessments we have chosen to focus on:

- Improving the quality of teaching experienced by all pupils (including disadvantaged).
- Improving the reading ages of disadvantaged pupils.
- Improving the attendance of and reducing persistent absence for disadvantaged pupils..
- Reducing the risk of exclusion for disadvantaged pupils.
- Ensuring all pupils (including disadvantaged) are fully prepared for life beyond Samworth Academy, including opportunities for extra-curricular activities.

Challenges

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

Challenge number	Detail of challenge
1	Not all teaching is sufficiently well matched to the need of learners (especially those who are eligible for Pupil Premium funding and/or are on the SEND register).
2	Children eligible for the Pupil Premium funding do not read as competently as their peers.

3	Absence rates, including persistent absenteeism, for those eligible for Pupil Premium funding are above those of children not eligible for the funding. This has an impact on learning.
4	Exclusion rates for children eligible for Pupil Premium funding are above that of children not eligible for the funding. This has an impact on their school hours and causes them to fall behind in their learning
5	Engagement in Personal Development opportunities is lower for children eligible for Pupil Premium funding, compared to those not eligible.

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
1) Improve the quality of teaching experienced by children eligible for Pupil Premium funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lesson observations indicate quality of teaching in all lessons is at least “on track”. Work scrutiny identifies there is no clear difference in the work produced by those eligible for Pupil Premium funding and their peers. RPGs indicate that children eligible for Pupil Premium funding are making at least expected progress.
2) Children eligible for Pupil Premium funding become confident readers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The reading ages [standardised reading age] of children eligible for Pupil Premium funding improve to be in line with their peers.
3) Improve the attendance and reduce persistent absenteeism for those eligible for Pupil Premium funding.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attendance of children eligible for Pupil Premium funding is in line with their peers. Persistent absence rates of those eligible for Pupil Premium funding is in line with the national average.
4) Reduce rates of exclusion for children eligible for Pupil Premium funding.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rates of exclusion for those eligible for Pupil Premium funding is lower than those not eligible for the funding.
5) Improve the quality, variation and tracking of Personal Development opportunities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement in Personal Development Opportunities, including clubs, trips, visits and careers support, for those eligible for Pupil Premium funding is at least in line with those not eligible for the funding.

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: £141,791.89

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Further embed quality first teaching through focused CPD and external quality assurance with a focus on expert planning, questioning and relationships.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EEF toolkit indicates that “mastery learning” can generate +5 months. EEF toolkit indicates that “feedback” can generate +8 months. 	1, 3, 4
Reduced secondary teacher allocation [max. 42hr].	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional time allocated for professional learning and expert planning. 	1
Daily reading lessons matched to student needs [based on NGRT data].	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EEF toolkit indicates that “reading comprehension” strategies can generate +6 months. EEF toolkit indicates that “oral language interventions” can generate +5 months. EEF toolkit indicates that “phonics” can generate +5 months. EEF toolkit indicates that “extending school time” can generate +3 months. 	1, 2, 3, 4
Reading homework in Key Stage 3 to place great emphasis on reading for pleasure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence suggests that there is a positive relationship between reading frequency, reading enjoyment and attainment (Clark 2011; Clark and Douglas 2011). Reading enjoyment has been reported as more important for children’s educational 	2,3,4,5

	success than their family's socio-economic status (OECD, 2002).	
Use of GL Assessment suite to baseline student attainment and monitor key progress indicators.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tracking key attainment indicators for students using the GL Assessment suite to allow comparison to a nationally. 	1,2

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

Budgeted cost: £152,710.40

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
One-to-one tuition (including graduate catch-up)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EEF toolkit indicates that "one to one tuition" can generate +5 months. 	1,2,3,4
Small group tuition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EEF toolkit indicates that "small group tuition" can generate +4 months. 	1,2,3,4
Structured reading and academic interventions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EEF toolkit indicates that "small group tuition" can generate +4 months. EEF toolkit indicates that "one to one tuition" can generate +5 months. 	1,2,3,4
Hive provision for vulnerable pupils who are struggling to access the curriculum pathway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A report published by Queen's University Belfast into the impact and cost effectiveness of "nurture groups" found evidence that they have "a significant and large effect in improving social, emotional and behavioural outcomes among children". 	1,2,3,4

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

Budgeted cost: £304,792.11

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Varied programme of reading-related events and competitions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research has shown that events focussing on reading for pleasure can also promote or enhance social skills in young people (e.g. Allan et al, 2005 cited by Clark and Rumbold, 2006). 	2,3,4,5
Attendance strategy [supported by EWO and attendance administrator].	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The link between absence and attainment for disadvantaged students is clearly established (DFE Research 2016. Ref: DFE-00089-2016). Actions relate to recommendations including those from The Key for School Leaders (Ref: 9539) and is in line with the DFE Expert report 2012 (Ref: DFE00036-2012) 	2,3
Breakfast provision for vulnerable students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EEF "Magic Breakfast" research suggests +2 months progress. 	3,4
External mental health support for pupils including Mental Health Practitioners, Youth Workers and an Educational Psychologist.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EEF toolkit indicates that "social and emotional learning" can generate +4 months. 	3,4
College Learning Mentors (Thrive trained).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EEF toolkit indicates that "behaviour interventions [strand 3]" can generate +3 months. EEF toolkit indicates that "social and emotional learning" can generate +4 months. 	3,4
Thrive Practitioners.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EEF toolkit indicates that "behaviour interventions [strand 3]" can generate +3 months. EEF toolkit indicates that "social and emotional 	3,4

	learning” can generate +4 months.	
Alternative provision placements to support students and prevent permanent exclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for students who are at significant risk of permanent exclusion who are not able to effectively access the curriculum to secure appropriate destination. • Educational outcomes (A8) are significantly lower for students who are permanently excluded compared to students with similar starting points in Y7 regardless of their Y11 educational provision. FFT Datalab May 2019 	1,2,3,4
Access Funding available for uniform, ICT equipment, trips and enrichment activities such as music tuition and clubs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EEF toolkit indicates that “physical activity” can generate +1 month. • EEF toolkit indicates that “arts participation” can generate +3 months. 	3,4,5
Careers Advisor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting students to secure an appropriate destination. 	3,4,5
Rewards Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools should have in place a range of options and rewards to reinforce and praise good behaviour (Behaviour and discipline in schools: Advice for headteachers and school staff - January 2016), 	3,4,5
Personal Development Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EEF toolkit indicates that “social and emotional learning” can generate +4 months. 	3,4,5
Transition Support, particularly for non-TGSA pupils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentally Healthy Schools (Anna Freud National Centre for Children and Families): transition period[s] needs to be carefully managed. If a child struggles with a transition it can have a negative impact on their wellbeing and academic achievement. 	3,4,5

Total budgeted cost: £ 599,295

Part B: Review of the previous academic year

Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils

Statement 1 Outcome: GCSE Results

Provisional data for year 11 shows that in terms of Attainment 8, those eligible for pupil premium funding achieved broadly in line with their peers:

- *Pupil Premium: 34.7*
- *Non-Pupil Premium: 35.4*
- *Disadvantaged gap: -0.7%*

In addition, pupils who were eligible for pupil premium funding achieved more highly than their peers in the percentage of pupils who achieved Grade 4+ in English and Maths:

- *Pupil Premium: 42%*
- *Non-Pupil Premium: 35%*
- *Disadvantaged gap: +7%*

Statement 2 Outcome: Reading Ages

NGRT data shows the reading ability gap closing over time. The following shows the average gap between those eligible for pupil premium and their peers in terms of reading at the chronological age to access the curriculum of a year group (e.g. reading at age 11 for year 7 etc):

- *Key Stage 3 Pupil Premium: 47%*
- *Key Stage 3 Non-Pupil Premium: 62%*
- *Key Stage 3 Disadvantaged Gap: -15%*

- *Key Stage 4 Pupil Premium: 64%*
- *Key Stage 4 Non-Pupil Premium: 69%*
- *Key Stage 4 Disadvantaged Gap: -5%*

Statement 3 Outcome: Attendance

Absence rates for pupils who are eligible for pupil premium remains higher than the absence rates for those not eligible for pupil premium funding:

- *Pupil Premium – 83.8%*
- *Non-Pupil Premium – 88.2%*
- *Disadvantaged gap – 4.4%*

The national attendance gap according to [Pupil attendance in schools](#) is 5.2%. The gap at Samworth Academy is 4.4%, so while attendance as a whole is below the national average, the disadvantaged gap is smaller.

Statement 4 Outcome: Exclusion Rates

Exclusion rates for pupils eligible for pupil premium funding remain higher than those who are not eligible for funding. The following shows the percentage of exclusions across the academic year:

- *Pupil Premium – 77%*
- *Non-Pupil Premium – 23%*
- *Disadvantaged Gap - -54%*

The number of days lost to exclusion has seen an increase for those eligible for pupil premium (from 200.5 in 2021/2022 to 247 in 2022/2023)

Statement 5 Outcomes: Support in place for pupils who have ACES

Based on the pupil premium band each child accesses a suite of assessment tools which support the academy to implement a tailored support programme. The assessment suites used include:

- CAT 4 assessment – Reviewed by senior staff and SENCO
- NGRT assessment – Reviewed by senior staff and SENCO
- Thrive assessment (Band A and B) – Reviewed by SENCO
- Single Point of Access (SPA) referral (Band A) – Reviewed by SENCO, DSL, SLT, Educational Psychologist and Thrive practitioner
- Educational Psychologist report (accessed via SPA) – Reviewed by SENCO, SLT and staff
- GL Assessment academic progress tests (Year 7) – Reviewed by subject leaders

Analysis of intervention impacts shows that on average, interventions have an impact score of 3/5.

Externally provided programmes

Please include the names of any non-DfE programmes that you used your pupil premium (or recovery premium) to fund in the previous academic year.

Programme	Provider
The Thrive Approach	Thrive
Little Wandle	Little Wandle
GL Assessment	Renaissance
Dyslexia Gold	Engaging Eyes

Service pupil premium funding (optional)

<i>For schools that receive this funding, you may wish to provide the following information: How our service pupil premium allocation was spent last academic year</i>
The impact of that spending on service pupil premium eligible pupils

Further information (optional)

TGAT has used the research completed by the Education Policy Institute (See Appendix 4 for a summary), information from FFT and research commissioned by the DfE to devise a points system based on risk factors that cause toxic stress and can affect pupils' progress. This scoring system enables leaders to effectively allocate resource and ensure the **most** vulnerable children are able to access a wide and diverse curriculum