

Red House Academy Pupil Premium (PP) Strategy Statement (2015-16)

1. Summary information					
School	Red House Academy				
Academic Year	15/16	Total PP budget	£311,933	Date of most recent PP Review	NA
Total number of pupils	547	Number of pupils eligible for PP	336	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Sep 16

2. Current attainment 2015		
	Pupils eligible for PP (Red House)	Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)
% achieving 5A* - C including English and Maths	15%	64.7%
% achieving expected progress in English / Maths	40% / 27%	75.8% / 73.4%
Progress 8 score average	-1.0	0.12
Attainment 8 score average	40.0	52.0

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)	
In-school barriers <i>(issues to be addressed in school, such as poor literacy skills)</i>	
A.	High attaining disadvantaged students make progress that is well below national average.
B.	Rates of progress of disadvantaged students in maths and English are well below the national average
C.	The perennial Academy pattern of year groups below or significantly below national average on entry, with disadvantaged students at least one sub-level below their peers on average.
External barriers <i>(issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)</i>	
D	Some families are 2 nd or 3 rd generation unemployed; with many students having low aspirations and expectations for their life chances as a result.
E	Disadvantaged students' attendance was 93.1%, with persistent absence (ie attendance below 90%) at 15.3% and punctuality was 98%. This reduces time in school and limits the progress they can make.

4. Desired outcomes		Success criteria
A.	<p>The outcomes of disadvantaged students in English and mathematics (at Key Stages 3 and 4) improve significantly. (Tracked at data collections and measured at publication of final 2016 exam results)</p> <p>To prevent the gap on entry between disadvantaged pupils and their peers from widening.</p> <p>Ensure disadvantaged students who enter the academy <Level 4 in English and/or maths achieve that standard by the end of Year 7.</p>	<p>30% Basics* in Year 11 55% Expected Progress in English at GCSE 55% Expected Progress in Maths at GCSE</p> <p>70% Expected Progress in English in Years 7 & 8 70% Expected Progress in maths in Years 7 & 8</p> <p>>80% of students achieve Level 4 by the end of Y7</p>
B.	<p>The attendance of disadvantaged students is above the national average for all pupils. (Tracked throughout the year to final measure at end of year). Punctuality of disadvantaged students is above 98.5%.</p>	<p>Attendance: >93.5% PA* (ie below 90% attendance): <22% Punctuality: >98.5%</p>
C.	<p>All disadvantaged students leave Red House Academy with an intended destination for further study, apprenticeship or employment. (Measured via destinations survey).</p>	<p>NEET*: Zero</p>
D.	<p>The attainment and progress of high attaining (HAT) disadvantaged students will continue to improve; diminishing the difference to their peers and to the national average.</p>	<p>More than Expected Progress in English and Maths at GCSE: 45% Progress 8 score of >-0.4 in Year 11</p>
E.	<p>Parents of disadvantaged students participate fully in their child's education. Attendance at parent teacher consultation evenings (of parents of disadvantaged students) continues to improve.</p>	<p>100% of parents to be contacted personally 50% attendance of parents at PTC events</p>

NB: All terms marked with an asterisk* are explained in the glossary on page 16.

5. Planned expenditure					
Academic year	2015-16				
The three headings below enable schools to demonstrate how they are using the Pupil Premium to improve classroom pedagogy, provide targeted support and support whole school strategies.					
i. Quality of teaching for all					
Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will we ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will we review impact?
A: To improve outcomes for learners by improving the quality of teaching and learning to at least 65% good or better	CPD* on TEEP* and Dylan Williams Formative Assessment Project.	To provide peer led CPD* Peer coaching and learning Action research.	CPD* calendar and monitored by AVP*	AVP	Termly
A: To improve the quality of teaching through a series of professional conversations	Upper Pay Spine teachers as coaches. Teacher Toolkit professional book	To provide peer to peer coaching for staff whose teaching requires improvement To provide academic research for these teachers to use in their practice	Support plans in place – monitored on half-termly basis Fortnightly discussion in CPD* about the Teacher Toolkit book	AVP	Half-Termly
Total budgeted cost					£1 000

ii. Targeted support					
Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will we ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will we review impact?
A: To raise attainment and accelerate rates of progress for disadvantaged students in English and maths	Creation of disadvantaged intervention group for Y7 English. Intervention Unit established for Maths and English basic skills.	Small group and 1-2-1 tuition, specifically aimed at diagnosing skills deficits and addressing them.	Regular monitoring and testing to ensure progress.	Curriculum Leaders English and Maths	At every data collection
A: Improve the quality of teaching in core subjects by creating additional staffing in Ma and En, giving additional sets and providing tighter setting in KS4	Maths: creation of a disadvantaged set taught by Vice Principal (VP) to reverse previous underachievement.	Good quality first teaching. Positioning the teachers with the track record of success in the key groups.	New Vice Principal starting in October: data collections to track improvements English will enable different pathways, allowing for some early entry	Curriculum Leaders English and Maths	Jan 16
D: Improved progress for high attaining pupils C: Aspirational visits and speakers	Regular monitoring and mentoring of high attaining students (HATs). Liaising with parents. Working with curriculum leaders (CLs) to develop stretching curriculum. Bucket meeting focus. Aspirational speakers and visits.	Engaging parents and challenging curriculum leaders to achieve the highest grades for disadvantaged students. Raising aspiration and defining progression routes is known to help students and motivate them to higher success.	Time of a dedicated coordinator for HATs* with dedicated time for disadvantaged students. Specific 'bucket' meetings to forensically analyse the progress of disadvantaged HATs* Tracking systems. Interventions and support after school, during holidays and at weekends to tackle underachievement	MAB* VPs	Jan 16
Total budgeted cost					£228 607

iii. Other approaches					
Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will we ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will we review impact?
A: Improve Key Stage 4 outcomes	<p>Introduction of Challenge meetings in Progress 8 Buckets* (Bucket meetings*)</p> <p>Departmental Intervention Fund</p>	<p>Holistic intervention strategy; looking forensically at the performance of each underperforming student.</p> <p>Specific focus upon disadvantaged students within the accountability cycle.</p> <p>Departmental skills gap intervention: 1-2-1, small groups, holidays and weekends.</p>	Led by Vice Principal and quality assured by both achievement partner and governors.	VP*	January 2016
B: Raise attendance and punctuality of all disadvantaged students so that their rates match those of all pupils nationally	<p>Appoint disadvantaged champion.</p> <p>Weekly monitoring of pupils <94.5% and those for whom punctuality is becoming an issue.</p> <p>Monitor uptake of disadvantaged students at breakfast</p>	<p>Regular monitoring, direct engagement and instant intervention</p> <p>Holding parents to account for their children's attendance.</p> <p>Students' concentration and motivation improves.</p>	<p>Regular supervision of disadvantaged champion by Vice Principal.</p> <p>Parents called to account before Governors</p> <p>Catering staff monitor uptake which increases term on term.</p>	VP	Termly
Total budgeted cost					£82 461

6. Review of expenditure				
Previous Academic Year		2015-16		
i. Quality of teaching for all				
Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	Estimated impact: Did we meet the success criteria?	Lessons learned (and whether we will continue with this approach)	Cost
A: Improve student outcomes by raising the quality of teaching over time	TEEP* Formative Assessment project	Pupil progress and outcomes improved because of 65% good or better 'teaching over time' Teaching and Learning database validated by achievement partner: 68% good or better.	Teaching has improved across the academy, especially in English. OFSTED validated 65% of teaching over time to be at least good. Continue with project in 2016-17.	Academy budget
A & D: By improving feedback	CPD* Work scrutiny with supportive feedback Marking coaching	Work scrutiny showed that students made accelerated progress by receiving and responding to high quality focused feedback.	Continued focus in 2016-17.	£1 000
A & C: by focusing upon Curriculum	To offer a broad and balanced curriculum offer that allows students to progress to the next phase of their education. Key Stage 4 offer meets new accountability measures of P8*	The curriculum is responsive to and meets the needs of students well. For example, 'Bridge' students were provided with a basket of qualifications that included many that were not eligible for the national performance measures, because they met students' intended destination requirements and learning needs. Because of the curriculum focus, 100% of disadvantaged students, including those in the Bridge, had secure destinations with no NEETs*.	Increase the number of P8* subjects achieved by students in the Bridge Centre* (all PP). Increase the proportion of students who are entered for Ebacc, especially within Year 10. Year-on-Year: Increase the proportion of students studying a modern foreign language. Begin HAT* year 7 students on a pathway of 2 modern foreign languages.	

Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	Estimated impact: Did we meet the success criteria?	Lessons learned (and whether we will continue with this approach)	Cost
<p>A: Improve the quality of teaching and increase pupils' rates of progress by securing a stable, high quality staff team</p>	<p>To recruit new, high quality staff, fill and cover maternity leave (Two in Science and one in English).</p>	<p>Science and English maternity covered by experienced specialist teachers.</p> <p>Inadequate teaching tackled.</p> <p>Additional maths specialist given temporary contract to cover absence and for intervention 1-2-1 with disadvantaged students.</p> <p>Recruitment – now (Sep16) fully staffed including new maths department, including leadership scale position.</p> <p>Appointment of Second in English Department</p>	<p>Minimising staff turnover is a major priority for 2016-17</p>	

A: 'Diminishing differences' between outcomes across all student ability groups	Holiday and Saturday interventions.	High Attaining Students				30% of all disadvantaged students achieved the Basics-meeting the success criteria. At 53%, English narrowly missed the objective of 55%. Leaders have acted swiftly to challenge underachievement through bucket meetings* and implementing interventions. The impact has varied across different cohorts. Expected Progress In Year 7 for disadvantaged: En 63% and Ma 40%. Neither met the success criteria of 70%. Expected Progress over Year 8 for disadvantaged pupils: En 79% and Ma 77%. Both met the success criteria. Average grades of all groups have improved, except for those middle ability students. The proportion of disadvantaged students in the middle ability cohort has significantly increased from 53% to 65%. Average grades have improved by up to a full grade and high ability disadvantaged students have made the greatest gains, improving P8 score by 0.65 and improving progress in maths, English and the Basics*. The proportion of disadvantaged students gaining 5ACEM has increased from 16% to 28%: almost double the number of disadvantaged students left with 5ACEM in 2016, compared to 2015 (21 compared to 11). Following the successes with High ability students this year the focus will shift to Middle ability. Peer mentors from this group (majority PP) will be trained to work with low ability Y7. Sutton Trust and Hattie research suggests this is high impact. Teaching sets will be altered for Sep 16 to ensure quality first teaching impacts upon MAT* groups in Ma, En, Sci, History and computing. Schemes of work will be rewritten in Sep 16 in Ma and ICT to address progress issues. Intervention time will be increased to 3 hours per week.	£20 000	
	Intervention 'pot' bid for additional support		2015 PP (8 students)	2015 Non-PP (8)	2016 PP (13)			2016 Non-PP (15)
		Average Grade	C	B-	C+			B
		Basics	50%	88%	92.3%			93.3%
		Progress 8	-1.25	-0.5	-0.6			-0.17
		Exp Progress En	50%	50%	85%			80%
		Exp Progress Ma	50%	75%	62%			67%
		>Exp prog Eng	12.5%	25%	39%			40%
		>Exp prog Ma	12.5%	37.5%	31%			47%
	The impact of the PP funding has significantly diminished the difference between PP and non-PP: the success criteria have been met in every category (as indicated by green boxes).							
Middle Attaining Students								
		2015 PP (29)	2015 Non-PP (25)	2016 PP (41)	2016 Non-PP (22)			
	Average Grade	D-	D	E+	D			
	Basics	20	36	20%	36%			
	Progress 8	-0.95	-0.5	-1.1	-0.5			
	Exp Progress En	41%	64%	54%	64%			
	Exp Progress Ma	45%	56%	20%	36%			
The impact has been more uneven with middle attainers and this will be a priority for 2016-17. The red boxes indicate where the success criteria were not met; the yellow no change from 2015								
Low Attaining Students								
		2015 PP (28)	Non-PP (28)	2016 PP (16)	2016 Non-PP (7)			
	Average Grade	G	G	G+	F			
	Basics	0	0	0	0			
	Progress 8	-1.1	-0.9	-1.1	-0.5			
	Exp Progress En	36%	38%	25%	57%			
	Exp Progress Ma	4%	12%	0	0			
Not all the success criteria were met, but the average grade for low-attaining disadvantaged pupils has improved since 2015.								

Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	Estimated impact: Did we meet the success criteria?	Lessons learned (and whether we will continue with this approach)	Cost
<p>A: Improve outcomes for students by raising attainment across other departments</p>	<p>TEEP* VP* Coaching Bucket meetings Additional Staffing</p>	<p><u>Year 11 Strengths</u> Almost twice the number of PP students (21 out of 71) achieved 5+ A*-C grades including English and maths compared to 2015 (11 of 58).</p> <p>The proportion of PP students achieving a C+ in English increased from 23% to 41% and in Maths from 19% to 30%.</p> <p>Art: 100% of PP students made 3LP and 36% made 4LP*</p> <p>Photography: 70% of PP students achieved A*-C</p> <p>Hospitality: 100% of PP students made 3LP*; 60% made 4LP*; in addition, 4 PP students made 5LP*</p> <p>Textiles: 90%+ of PP students made 3LP and 30%+ made 5LP</p> <p>Manufacturing: 100% of PP students made 3LP; 80% made 4LP and 40% made 5LP.</p> <p>Hairdressing: 100% of PP students made 3LP.</p> <p>European Computer Driving Licence: 98% of PP students made 3LP and 78% made 4LP</p> <p>Performing Arts: 86% of PP students made 3LP and 43% 4LP.</p> <p>The two students with the highest P8* score, demonstrating outstanding progress from low initial start points were both students supported by the Pupil Premium Grant.</p> <p><u>In Key Stage 3</u>, PP students' prior attainment (KS2) average level was 1 sub-level below that of non-PP. The average end-of-year level for each year group also showed a difference of 1 sub-level, demonstrating equivalent progress for both PP and non-PP students. Therefore, this criterion in Section A was met.</p>	<p>Raising Attainment Plan meetings with all middle leaders have shown impact, especially in 'Bucket 3.'</p> <p>Next plan: Whole curriculum leaders' meetings as part of the cycle, student-centred focus upon negative P8 scores. This will: support Middle Leaders' development; reflect the broader curriculum; share the best practice of Curriculum Leaders and improve progress of students.</p> <p>Progress in the EBacc subjects needs accelerating further for all students; PP and non-PP.</p> <p>Move to collecting grades using 1 to 9 at each data collection across the school in 16/17. To tightly track P8* scores in each bucket and make early interventions where needed as part of a regular cycle of tracking and monitoring. Staff from subject areas and the pastoral team to meet regularly to discuss individual student progress.</p> <p>Extend the challenge currently provided by bucket meetings in KS4 to KS3 in 16/17.</p>	<p>£170 072</p>

ii. Targeted support				
Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	Estimated impact: Did we meet the success criteria?	Lessons learned (and whether we will continue with this approach)	Cost
A: Improved reading ages	Learning Support Assistants	Evidence file shows students making sustained progress: for example, 100% of the disadvantaged students who underwent the reading programme successfully completed the programme with an average of 1 year's improvement to their comprehension age.	Maintain this approach for students with specific reading deficits and introduce peer mentoring by Year 10 Leaders of Learning. Broaden the reading strategy to Accelerated Reader for all students.	
A: Improve Literacy & Numeracy across the academy	1-2-1 small group support	<p>In total, 94 girls and 99 boys received targeted support in the intervention suite. The proportions who made at least expected progress were:</p> <p>English: Year 7: Boys = 18% Girls = 62.5% Year 8: Boys = 45.5% Girls = 85.7% Year 9: Boys = 33% Girls = 50%</p> <p>Maths: Y7: B = 62.5% G = 55.5% Y8: B = 60% G = 57.1% Y9: B = 22% G = 46.1%</p> <p>The impact of this strategy was mixed.</p> <p>Staffing issues prevented this strategy being rolled out for the full year, which impacted negatively on Year 7 students particularly.</p> <p>Approximately 90% of the students in this intervention were disadvantaged.</p>	<p>Continue with the intervention unit; in addition, train peer mentors from KS4 to work with Y7 students developing further reading and mathematics.</p> <p>Appoint Assistant Principal responsible for Literacy and Numeracy across the Curriculum to ensure greater level of monitoring and accountability.</p>	£25 935

iii. Other approaches

Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	Estimated impact: Did we meet the success criteria?						Lessons learned and whether we will continue with this approach	Cost	
B: Continue to improve the attendance of disadvantaged students	Appoint PP champion to closely monitor and challenge PP non-attendance		No in Year	% Attendance		No of HAT* (M/F)	No of MAT* (M/F)	No of LAT* (M/F)	<p>Ed Lounge is a virtual school provision which was purchased in late spring to assist with attendance interventions for students in the Bridge Centre and to support those with social and emotional issues. It utilises distance learning tutors. Training for staff was intensive so the roll-out to students was not expected to impact until 2016/17.</p> <p>However early impact was evidenced in the trial group with one student achieving 100% attendance and 7 out of 8 attending all GCSE examinations, significantly up on previous equivalents.</p> <p>Develop home/school liaison with primary cluster to further address the difference between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students. We have recruited one of our attendance team to improve parental links and establish common practices between the academy and feeder primaries and to educate and inform parents of the rigour with which we tackle non-attendance</p> <p>Next year we will need to pay attention to PP/SEND* students. PP Champion will attend Bucket Meetings* to re-enforce the link between attendance and attainment.</p>	£28 471
		Year 7 Total	120	94.9		45 (15/20)	64 (30/24)	12 (6/6)		
		Y7 PP (M/F)	82 (38/44)	94.2 (95.7/92.8)		26 (9/17)	45 (24/20)	12 (6/6)		
		Year 7 Non-PP	38	96.6						
		Year 8 Total	109	93.9		41 (26/15)	54 (25/29)	17		
		Y8 PP (M/F)	77 (34/43)	93.1		22 (12/10)	34 (16/18)	13 (5/8)		
		Y8 Non-PP	32	95.9						
		Year 9 Total	96	94.3		25 (13/12)	58 (25/32)	14 (5/9)		
		Y9 PP (M/F)	56 (21/35)	93.5		11 (5/6)	34 (13/21)	10 (3/7)		
		Y9 Non-PP	40	95.5						
		Year 10 Total	102	92.5		36 (20/16)	57 (27/30)	10 (7/3)		
		Y10 PP (M/F)	67 (38/29)	90.5 (90.9/90)		21 (11/10)	36 (21/15)	9 (6/3)		
		Y10 Non-PP	35	96.2						
		Year 11 Total	115	95		27 (8/19)	65 (29/36)	23		
		Y11 PP (M/F)	71 (30/41)	93.5		10 (1/9)	47 (21/26)	14 (8/6)		
		Y11 Non-PP	44	97.4						
		<p>The attendance of PP students across the academy was 93%, which, although marginally below the academy's target, is above both the national average for this group and the previous year's figure of 92.5%, indicating the positive impact of the PP champion.</p> <p>Evidently, improvement is not endemic, eg Y10 will need monitoring. In addition, monitoring of the whole SEND* cohort indicates a concern (91.8%).</p>								

Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	Estimated impact: Did we meet the success criteria?	Lessons learned (and whether we will continue this approach)	Cost																																																	
B: Reduce PAs	See above	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>ALL PA (M/F)</th> <th>PP PA (M/F)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Y11</td> <td>14 (5/9)</td> <td>13 (5/8)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y10</td> <td>18 (10/8)</td> <td>17 (8/9)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y9</td> <td>14 (6/8)</td> <td>11 (5/6)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y8</td> <td>12 (6/6)</td> <td>11 (6/5)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y7</td> <td>11 (3/8)</td> <td>11 (3/8)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Across the academy, the percentage of disadvantaged students who were persistent absentees was 18%, well below the national average for this group and the academy's target. <u>Objective achieved.</u></p>		ALL PA (M/F)	PP PA (M/F)	Y11	14 (5/9)	13 (5/8)	Y10	18 (10/8)	17 (8/9)	Y9	14 (6/8)	11 (5/6)	Y8	12 (6/6)	11 (6/5)	Y7	11 (3/8)	11 (3/8)	Ed Lounge*/Ed Class (see above) Develop home/school liaison with primary cluster	See above																															
	ALL PA (M/F)	PP PA (M/F)																																																			
Y11	14 (5/9)	13 (5/8)																																																			
Y10	18 (10/8)	17 (8/9)																																																			
Y9	14 (6/8)	11 (5/6)																																																			
Y8	12 (6/6)	11 (6/5)																																																			
Y7	11 (3/8)	11 (3/8)																																																			
A and B: Reduce FTE	ELMs* Heads of Year Bridge* Staff Social and Emotional support	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Total</th> <th>Boys</th> <th>Girls</th> <th>HAT*</th> <th>MAT*</th> <th>LAT*</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Year 7</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> <td>0</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 8</td> <td>6</td> <td>6</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 9</td> <td>6</td> <td>4</td> <td>2</td> <td>0</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 10</td> <td>5</td> <td>1</td> <td>4</td> <td>0</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 11</td> <td>7</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>0</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Academy</td> <td>27</td> <td>17</td> <td>10</td> <td>3</td> <td>13</td> <td>11</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The number of PP students who received one or more FTE was 27 (8% of the cohort). This is in line with the KPI set in 2015. <u>Objective achieved.</u></p>		Total	Boys	Girls	HAT*	MAT*	LAT*	Year 7	3	3	0	2	1	0	Year 8	6	6	0	1	3	2	Year 9	6	4	2	0	3	3	Year 10	5	1	4	0	3	2	Year 11	7	3	4	0	3	4	Academy	27	17	10	3	13	11	Ed Lounge*/Ed Class to be used strategically to reduce the number of FTEs in the disadvantaged cohort, especially those in the Alt Ed Support Base.	£30 000
	Total	Boys	Girls	HAT*	MAT*	LAT*																																															
Year 7	3	3	0	2	1	0																																															
Year 8	6	6	0	1	3	2																																															
Year 9	6	4	2	0	3	3																																															
Year 10	5	1	4	0	3	2																																															
Year 11	7	3	4	0	3	4																																															
Academy	27	17	10	3	13	11																																															
A and B: Maintain zero PEX	Alternative education support base.	Red House Academy is a fully inclusive school with <u>no</u> permanently excluded students for the 6 th successive year. <u>Objective achieved.</u>	Ed Lounge*/Ed Class	See above																																																	
A and B: Improve Punctuality	PP Champion ELMs*	<u>Objective achieved.</u> Punctuality across the whole school is excellent. PP punctuality 2015-2016 = 99%. Very few students are regularly late.	Persistent and consistent monitoring and challenge with sanctions works well and will be continued.	See above																																																	

Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	Estimated impact: Did we meet the success criteria?	Lessons learned and whether we will continue with this)	Cost																																								
A and D: To diminish the difference between HATs PP and national others in Achieving Basics and P8	Appointment of MAB Co-ordinator. Bucket meetings specific foci on PP and MAB PP Progress Manager to support MABs Holiday and Sat schools Accelerated Learning Workshop Work with Sunderland College to promote scholarships Russell Group Uni visits	<table border="1" data-bbox="712 188 1632 536"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2015 PP (8)</th> <th>2015 Non-PP (8)</th> <th>2016 PP (13)</th> <th>2016 Non-PP (15)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Average Grade</td> <td>C</td> <td>B-</td> <td>C+</td> <td>B</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Basics</td> <td>50%</td> <td>88</td> <td>92.30%</td> <td>93.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Progress 8</td> <td>-1.25</td> <td>-0.5</td> <td>-0.6</td> <td>-0.17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Exp Progress En</td> <td>50%</td> <td>50%</td> <td>85%</td> <td>80%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Exp Progress Ma</td> <td>50%</td> <td>75%</td> <td>62%</td> <td>67%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>>Ex prog Eng</td> <td>6</td> <td>17</td> <td>39</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>>Exp prog Ma</td> <td>6</td> <td>17</td> <td>31</td> <td>47</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Objective Achieved</u> PP HATs in 2015: 50% achieved the Basics: 2016 figure rose to 92.3% Difference in Basics (between PP and NPP) diminished to only 1 percentage point from 38% in 2015. Progress 8 Difference reduced from 0.75 to 0.43 in 2016. Of the 5 students who achieved scholarships from Sunderland college, 2 were disadvantaged. 4 of the top 7 performing students at the end of Year 11 in 15/16 were disadvantaged.</p>		2015 PP (8)	2015 Non-PP (8)	2016 PP (13)	2016 Non-PP (15)	Average Grade	C	B-	C+	B	Basics	50%	88	92.30%	93.3	Progress 8	-1.25	-0.5	-0.6	-0.17	Exp Progress En	50%	50%	85%	80%	Exp Progress Ma	50%	75%	62%	67%	>Ex prog Eng	6	17	39	40	>Exp prog Ma	6	17	31	47	Continue programme for High ability students and intensify the focus on Middle Ability students	£5,450
	2015 PP (8)	2015 Non-PP (8)	2016 PP (13)	2016 Non-PP (15)																																								
Average Grade	C	B-	C+	B																																								
Basics	50%	88	92.30%	93.3																																								
Progress 8	-1.25	-0.5	-0.6	-0.17																																								
Exp Progress En	50%	50%	85%	80%																																								
Exp Progress Ma	50%	75%	62%	67%																																								
>Ex prog Eng	6	17	39	40																																								
>Exp prog Ma	6	17	31	47																																								
B and C: Participation at extra-curricular activities to broaden experiences and opportunities	Provide free music tuition for PP students Monitor Ex Cur participation	<p><u>Objective Achieved</u> 64% of PP students receive paid for peri-music tuition. 100% PP invited to partake and 87% of PP students participated in at least 1 regular enrichment. No PP students were excluded from trips due to reasons of cost. Rates of participation in extra-curricular activities and participation in school shows and external showcase are high because of our PP strategies.</p>	Continue next year and monitor peri-music students' general school attendance and student voice 'enjoyment.'	£29,140																																								

Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	Estimated impact: Did we meet the success criteria?	Lessons learned (and whether we will continue with this)	Cost																		
A and B: and E Parental engagement	Parental Liaison	<p>Parental attendance at consultation evenings:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year Group</th> <th>Target %</th> <th>Actual %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>52</td> <td>58.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>50</td> <td>45.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9</td> <td>45</td> <td>60.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>25</td> <td>41</td> </tr> <tr> <td>11</td> <td>46</td> <td>62</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Parental engagement has worked well. Targets were based on previous year's attendance +10%. 53.4% of disadvantaged students' parents/carers attended consultation evenings, <u>which met our objective.</u></p> <p>All PP parents received regular mail outs / information. In addition to increased numbers across most year groups, there is also a nascent parent group forming which has the potential to have a positive impact on the</p>	Year Group	Target %	Actual %	7	52	58.5	8	50	45.5	9	45	60.2	10	25	41	11	46	62	<p>Actions – to grow this group and expand brief to include all aspects of parent voice – eg consultation on curriculum, policies etc.</p> <p>To ensure that parent volunteers are DBS checked so they can fully participate in strategies.</p>	£2 000
Year Group	Target %	Actual %																				
7	52	58.5																				
8	50	45.5																				
9	45	60.2																				
10	25	41																				
11	46	62																				
A and B: Engagement in Learning	Tariffs	<p>The EfL tariff is a calibrated 1-4 scale which is indicative of students' effort to engage with learning. Scores of 'mainly 1s and 2s' are used in this data set, representing 'good' or outstanding' engagement.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Milestone</th> <th>Target</th> <th>Actual</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Dec 15</td> <td>80</td> <td>84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mar 16</td> <td>85</td> <td>92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jul 16</td> <td>90</td> <td>94</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>The engagement for learning of disadvantaged students has exceeded the targets in every year group.</u></p>	Milestone	Target	Actual	Dec 15	80	84	Mar 16	85	92	Jul 16	90	94	Revisit tariff with all staff next year to ensure consistent use							
Milestone	Target	Actual																				
Dec 15	80	84																				
Mar 16	85	92																				
Jul 16	90	94																				
C: CEIAG* To reduce number of NEETs	Senior Leader Responsibility CEIAG* Audit	<p>To achieve the CEIAG* silver award – Achieved</p> <p>NEETs* – all PP students have intended destination on leaving full-time education – <u>Objective achieved</u></p>	<p>Working towards Gold Award</p> <p>Lead NET Network</p> <p>Develop careers information advice and guidance across primary phase</p>																			

Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	Estimated impact: Did we meet the success criteria?	Lessons learned and whether we will continue with this)	Cost
A B and C: Bridge	Educate those students at risk of Permanent Exclusion in the Bridge Centre	The Bridge Centre is a dedicated facility staffed with an ex-head of a special school and HLTAs*. Providing counselling, a suitable qualifications and courses to allow them to achieve. This is enhanced by bespoke work experience and support in transition to post-16. Objective met: <u>Zero NEET* from the alternative education cohort</u>	To broaden the curriculum offer, achieving increased number of relevant L2 or L1 qualifications.	See above
A C: Transition Between KS2-3 KS3-4 and KS4-5	Transition mentors Leadership	84% attended Summer school, 100% said they enjoyed it 'a lot' and learned from it. 100% attended Enterprise event, Performing arts open evening was well attended. 100% PP attended work experience. Disadvantaged students attended ESH, Russell Group/Jesus College/Oxford University. <u>Objectives Met</u> 5 Students including 2 PP are in receipt of Sunderland College Excellence Scholarship.	The Enterprise event to extend into primary schools as part of a cross-phase careers programme. KS4 and 5 transition events are very well attended and will continue.	

Y7 Catch up funding:

Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	Estimated impact: Did we meet the success criteria?	Lessons learned (and whether we will continue with this)	Cost
A: Ensure students who enter Y7 <Level 4 in English and/or maths achieve Level 4 by the end of Y7	1-2-1 small group intervention with HLTAs based on identified skills gaps	<u>Objective met.</u> 10 out of 11 Year 7 disadvantaged students in English and 11 of the 12 in Maths now at L4+ because of successful targeted interventions via HLTA* support.	Continue as last year with focus on students not 'deemed secondary ready' ie with a scaled score <100.	£9, 500

Glossary of Terms

Attendance and Disciplinary Committee	Preliminary challenge from governors to parents of students exhibiting issues around behaviour or attendance.
AVP	Assistant Vice Principal
Basics	Achieving both English and mathematics GCSE at a grade C grade or above (until 2016).
Bridge Centre	Alternative provision on the academy site for students at risk of exclusion
Buckets	The way subjects are split into three 'buckets' as part of the progress 8 calculation (see below). Bucket 1: Maths and English; Bucket 2: the English Baccalaureate subjects; Bucket 3: other GCSEs and vocational qualifications.
Bucket meetings	Meetings between Senior Leaders and the Curriculum Leaders of the subjects in each bucket
CEIAG	Careers Education, Information, Advice and Guidance
CL	Curriculum Leader
CPD	Continuous Professional Development
EfL Tariff	Calibrated 1-4 scale which is indicative of students' effort to engage with learning
ELM	Every Learner Matters Mentor
HATs	High Attaining Students (from their assessment at the end of Year 6 in primary school)
HLTA	Higher Level Teaching Assistant
LATs	Low Attaining Students (from their assessment at the end of Year 6 in primary school)
LP	Levels of Progress
MAB	Most Able Coordinator
MATs	Middle Attaining Students (from their assessment at the end of Year 6 in primary school)
MSG	Monitoring and Support Group (a sub-committee of the Board of Governors)
NEET	Not in Employment Education or Training
NET	Northern Education Trust
PA	Persistent Absence: students with absence rate of 10% or more
Progress 8 / P8	New national measure of progress across 8 subjects at GCSE
SEND	Special Educational Needs and/or Disabilities
SLT	Senior Leadership Team
T and L	Teaching and Learning
TEEP	The Teacher Effectiveness Programme
VP	Vice Principal