

Strategy for 2020-21

At Noel-Baker Academy, we endeavour to fulfil the Pupil Premium Policy set out by the L.E.A.D Academy Trust by deploying the following Trust strategies to diminish the difference in attainment for pupils in receipt of the Pupil Premium funding.

- Clear, responsive leadership.
- Having a whole-school ethos of attainment for all.
- Addressing behaviours for learning and conduct behaviours that prevent pupils from learning.
- Monitoring and addressing low attendance.
- Facilitating high quality teaching for all through continued professional development of staff.
- Meeting individual learning needs including those pupils who are the most-able and seemingly need no support.
- Deploying staff effectively, both teaching and support staff.
- Using pupil progress data to inform the planning of interventions and provision.

Each Academy reviews the barriers and outcomes for the pupils in receipt of Pupil Premium to understand the strategies that they use to raise attainment. Each Academy explains their rationale for choosing the strategies and provides a cost breakdown. If you wish this statement to be explained, then please ask to speak with the Pupil Premium Leader via the main office. If you wish to find out more about the DfE policy for Pupil Premium then follow this link: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/pupil-premium-information-for-schools-and-alternative-provision-settings>

Based upon the evaluation of the outcomes from the previous academic year, research of projects for raising attainment and our own knowledge of what has worked well in our own Academy, the following strategy has been agreed:

1. Summary information for 2020-21					
Academy	Noel-Baker Academy				
Pupil Premium Leader	Simon Leach				
Academic Year	20/21	Total PP budget	£383,910	Date of most recent PP Review	September 2020
Total number of pupils	1018	Number of pupils eligible for PP	402 (39.5%)	Date for next internal review of this strategy	September 2021
2. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP including high ability)					
In-school barriers (<i>issues to be addressed in school, such as weak teaching, low attainment of whole cohort, etc.</i>)			External barriers (<i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates, high new EAL, mobility, social care and safeguarding</i>)		
Legacy of historically poor teaching and learning within school still affecting current KS4 students.			Literacy & Numeracy generally lower for PP students across new year 7 cohorts. Whilst we have no SAT's data this year, there is no reason to suggest this would be any different.		
Historically poor curriculum development has led to gaps in learning, skills and knowledge.			Cultural Capital Deficit. Childrens' experiences and understanding of the world are limited because of context and environmental factors. These experiential limitations have the potential to impact on academic progress in all curriculum areas since pupils are unable to draw upon models for progressive learning.		
Previously weak culture of targeted intervention, tracking groups, or support within school for disadvantaged pupils.			Significant proportion of SEND pupils in secondary phase are also PP.		
Historically the percentage of PP that receive a fixed or permanent exclusion is disproportionate.			PP attendance is below that of national average, including PA.		
Consistent underachievement across the school with attainment gaps existing across all year groups.			Social difficulties experienced by families (housing, finance, family literacy and parental anxieties).		

Historically the attainment gaps have widened throughout their time at NBA.	Negative performance of the school, has led to culture of negativity amongst parents and local community.
PP students engaged less during lockdown.	Limited experience of wider opportunities for personal development.
PP students are disproportionately represented when it comes to poor behaviour.	The extent of social, emotional and mental health needs of our children as a consequence of environmental factors including parenting, health, bereavement, poverty and neglect.
Lack of reliable data from previous academic year means it is more difficult to draw valid inferences.	A greater percentage of PP students lack access to an appropriate device at home (or internet).

1. Quality First Teaching						
What do we want to achieve?		How?	What is the rationale for this chosen strategy?	How will it be monitored?	Cost?	
<i>Initiative/Intervention</i>	<i>What do you want to achieve and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>	<i>How will the intervention or provision be delivered?</i>	<i>Refer to research from EEF or other research to justify the choice of strategy.</i>	<i>Provide simple breakdown of proportionate or full costs.</i>	
Develop and improve the quality of teaching learning and feedback for all pupils in all lessons.	To improve information given to the learner and for gaps in knowledge to be filled. TLAC strategies and Rosenshine principles to be evident in lessons. Feedback is tailored, specific and targeted to support PP eligible students in	QA to show all aspects of key pedagogy are routinely embedded and specifically fed back. Student response to feedback evident in books. Improved teaching and learning for all.	Weekly CPD for all teaching and support staff. All lessons. PSHE Bootcamp	EEF research suggests improved feedback may lead to pupil progress gains of up to 8 months. TLAC pioneered in charter schools in USA proved successful. Research conducted by Rosenshine. Sutton Trust 2011 report states that the effects of high quality teaching are	Ongoing QA of teaching and learning in line with schools QA process. QA evaluation / follow up quizzes. Student Voice.	CPD budget (Quality First teaching) = £6,615. EEF estimates that feedback costs around £80 per year per pupil = £32,000.

	<p>making accelerated progress.</p> <p>All staff to demonstrate an understanding of cognitive science.</p> <p>Meta-cognition is taught explicitly.</p> <p>Necessary amendments are made to teaching practice in light of COVID -19 protocols and risk assessments.</p>	<p>Progress of disadvantaged pupils improves and the gap between PP and non-PP closes.</p> <p>Students able to articulate key cognitive science and metacognition strategies.</p>		<p>especially significant for pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds.</p> <p>Metacognition and self-regulation approaches have consistently high levels of impact, with pupils making an average of seven months' additional progress. (EEF).</p>	<p>Staff briefings and deliberate practice.</p> <p>Staff DDI's.</p>	
<p>Develop and foster a climate of teacher development.</p>	<p>Teachers to engage with all professional development on offer and become better practitioners.</p> <p>Senior and middle leaders routinely and regularly conduct developmental drop in's in line with the new walk through.</p>	<p>DDI's show that teachers have acted on feedback.</p> <p>Teachers' performance management records show engagement with process.</p> <p>Teachers regularly access the CPD library to help improve specific aspects of their practice.</p>	<p>DDI's.</p> <p>Climate walks.</p> <p>Performance management conversations.</p> <p>CPD.</p>	<p>The EEF's 'closing the gap' guide states that what happens in the classroom makes the biggest difference.</p> <p>There is good evidence for the development of teacher professional development, but it highlights the fact the supply of high quality training is limited.</p>	<p>DDI data.</p> <p>Performance management review meetings.</p> <p>Climate walks.</p>	<p>£10,624.57 (42% of total cost for hours invested for DDI's).</p> <p>Cost of walk through books for all staff = £250.</p>

		Staff successfully pass their performance management targets related to pedagogical improvements.				
Evolve and evaluate our knowledge rich curriculum to ensure pupils learn about the best that has been thought and said.	<p>For all staff to be involved in evolving and delivering a knowledge rich curriculum leading to an improvement in the quality of learning and teaching leading to improved outcomes.</p> <p>All staff demonstrate improved subject knowledge</p> <p>For assessments to support the curriculum as the progression model and help evaluate the impact of our curriculum.</p>	<p>Faculty areas to evolve and adapt knowledge rich curricula.</p> <p>Assessment data to show more pupils making more progress.</p> <p>Achievement/ progress gap to have narrowed.</p> <p>Assessments synoptic in nature and are in line with school expectations.</p>	<p>Newly designed curriculum to be continuously reviewed and edited throughout implementation.</p> <p>QA of assessments.</p>	<p>Links with the Rosenshine principles and the “TLAC strategies” Doug Lemov.</p> <p>Pupils need to learn the knowledge before they can use it. The curriculum, traditional in approach, will allow pupils and teachers to identify any gaps in knowledge and fill accordingly.</p>	<p>Ongoing QA of teaching and learning.</p> <p>Data scrutiny meetings and analysis.</p> <p>Line management meetings.</p> <p>Faculty meeting minutes/ agendas.</p>	<p>Approximately 30 minutes per week per teacher during faculty meetings = £4,500</p>
Utilise the data and assessment tracking systems to ensure that progress of disadvantaged students is tracked effectively.	<p>To ensure all assessments are timely and relevant.</p> <p>To ensure all in-class assessments</p>	G4S used to accurately record and analyse key data at relevant points.	<p>Curriculum Directors.</p> <p>Line management meetings.</p>	Accurate data means we are able to better evaluate the success/impact of strategies we introduce.	<p>QA.</p> <p>Data scrutiny meetings.</p> <p>G4S.</p>	40% of G4S cost = £3,400.

	<p>are timely and relevant.</p> <p>To ensure data obtained is accurate and reliable.</p> <p>To ensure data tracking/analysis occurs at relevant points.</p>	<p>QA will show data and assessment is consistent across school/faculty.</p> <p>Data scrutiny will demonstrate accuracy of predictions.</p> <p>Assessment has been clearly used to inform teaching.</p>	CPD delivered by SLT.			
Identify student stating points to gauge impact of lockdown.	<p>All KS3 students to complete baseline assessments across English, Maths and Science.</p> <p>All pupils to complete reading age tests.</p>	<p>Gaps in learning clearly identified.</p> <p>Schools cohort gaps analysed and compared with national.</p> <p>Gaps to have closed by the end of the year.</p>	Through the completion of GL assessments and the analysis of results.	Identifying gaps enables teachers to know what is required to fill them.	The data gathered will be able to inform where and what more specific intervention is required.	40% of cost = £6000.
Homework.	Students to access homework across all subjects on a weekly basis.	Pupils to complete weekly homework linked to spaced retrieval practice.	Subjects to set homework in line with school expectations using G4S and Microsoft forms.	The EEF evidence shows that the impact of homework, on average, is five months' additional progress.	<p>G4S and Microsoft forms activity.</p> <p>Line management meetings</p> <p>Faculty records.</p>	40% of 1 hour per week per teacher = £37,000

2. Parental engagement						
What do we want to achieve?		How?	What is the rationale for this chosen strategy?	How will it be monitored?	Cost?	
<i>Initiative/Intervention</i>	<i>What do you want to achieve and how they will be measured.</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>	<i>How will the intervention or provision be delivered?</i>	<i>Refer to research from EEF or other research to justify the choice of strategy.</i>	<i>Provide simple breakdown of proportionate or full costs.</i>	
<p>Opportunities for high levels of parental engagement are provided and pursued where necessary.</p>	<p>For parents to better engage with their child's school experience.</p> <p>Parents of PP eligible students know how to support their children in their preparation for GCSE examinations.</p> <p>For parental contact with the school to increase.</p> <p>For parents to access greater student information.</p>	<p>G4S accessed by the vast majority of parents and students.</p> <p>Parent forums to be well attended.</p> <p>Parental attendance at parents evening to increase.</p>	<p>Continuation of parent forums.</p> <p>48 hour reply guarantee.</p> <p>Introduction of a parental engagement programme.</p> <p>Pursue attendance of disadvantaged students' parents at subject evenings – telephone calls/texts to take place one week before events.</p> <p>Study Skills session provided for parents of</p>	<p>Improving lines of communication and highlighting the changes we are making should improve the negative perception many parents have of the school.</p> <p>Where parental support is good, students are better placed to achieve well, and feel supported and motivated.</p> <p>Building relationships with pupils and home may lead to pupil progress gains of up to 3 months (EEF).</p>	<p>Parental feedback.</p> <p>Attendance registers.</p> <p>G4S access logs.</p> <p>Student Voice.</p> <p>Parent Forum minutes.</p>	<p>£2,000</p>

			Year 11/10 students. Will inform parents on how they can support their children in preparing for examinations, reducing stress levels and maintaining motivation. (COVID-19 permitting).			
3.Behaviour and Attendance						
What do we want to achieve?			How?	What is the rationale for this chosen strategy?	How will it be monitored?	Cost?
<i>Initiative/Intervention</i>	<i>What do you want to achieve and how they will be measured.</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>	<i>How will the intervention or provision be delivered?</i>	<i>Refer to research from EEF or other research to justify the choice of strategy.</i>		<i>Provide simple breakdown of proportionate or full costs.</i>
To improve the attendance of PP students. Reduction in persistent absences for PP eligible students.	Attendance of PP eligible students tracked and monitored rigorously to ensure early intervention. To close the gap between PP and Non PP attendance.	PP overall attendance has showed an improvement. The attendance gap has closed between PP and Non-PP students.	Employment of two Education Welfare Officers and one Senior Education Welfare Officer to implement early interventions using the 3	Students cannot access the curriculum if absent and therefore their learning is adversely affected. DfE attendance research indicates that there is clear evidence which links increased	G4S attendance module. G4S Intervention logs.	EWO salaries = £34,944.84. Line management meetings to discuss attendance.



<p>Targeted support for individual pupils.</p> <p>To reduce the amount of lates of PP students</p>	<p>PP students arrive to school on time</p>	<p>Persistent absence for PP students is decreased.</p> <p>Number of lates is reduced</p>	<p>Tiered Intervention Prevention strategy.</p> <p>Deployment of SLT to specifically focus on attendance.</p> <p>Attendance dashboards produced weekly.</p> <p>Prioritise home visits and parental meetings for PP eligible students where attendance is a concern.</p> <p>The profile of attendance and the importance of good attendance is promoted through PSHE</p>	<p>absence to lower attainment.</p> <p>To improve the capacity to carry out home visits support/challenge families where possible to build relationships with pupils and home may lead to pupil progress gains of up 3 months progress (EEF).</p>	<p>Regular attendance briefings.</p> <p>Calendared parent support meetings.</p> <p>Registration .</p> <p>Line management meetings.</p> <p>Weekly pastoral briefings.</p> <p>Data tracking.</p>	<p>£961.30 (42% of total cost for number of PP).</p> <p>SLT member responsible for attendance = (£29,000)</p>
--	---	---	---	---	--	---



			<p>and social media.</p> <p>Implement PSHE withdrawals for PP eligible students to discuss attendance, address worries, provide support and set targets.</p> <p>Students receive positive points and rewards for good weekly attendance.</p>			
<p>To improve the strategies used to support PP students to show a decrease in behaviour incidents.</p>	<p>To improve the behaviour of PP students to allow them more time in the classroom to learn.</p> <p>To introduce an updated rewards policy to motivate pupils.</p> <p>For students who require additional</p>	<p>A reduction in behaviour incidents for PP students.</p> <p>New rewards and awards system set up to reward effort and positive attitude to learning. Attending Intervention and after school revision sessions.</p>	<p>Designated Assistant Head responsible for PP.</p> <p>An increase in non-teaching pastoral staff capacity will enable more mentoring/</p>	<p>Significant number of behaviour incidents carried out by PP students which will decrease the amount of time spent in a lesson and therefore impact on their progress.</p> <p>Pupils need incentives to help encourage</p>	<p>G4S behaviour module.</p> <p>Pupil voice.</p>	<p>Progress leaders and behaviour mentors salary = £95,000</p> <p>ACE Centre costs = £48,000</p>

	support and small group sizes to have access to the ACE centre and a personalised provision.	Students who are part of the ACE Centre provision have access to tailored and personalised provision.	preventative action/parental contact/ restorative conversations to take place, thereby reducing the number of behaviour incidents. Reward policy.	expected/good behaviour. Rewards improve levels of conformity and pupil happiness.		(50% of total cost for number of PP). ACE centre staffing = £116,523. Assistant Headteacher = £29,000.
4. Targeted Intervention						
What do we want to achieve?		How?		What is the rationale for this chosen strategy?	How will it be monitored	Cost?
<i>Initiative/Intervention</i>	<i>What do you want to achieve and how they will be measured.</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>	<i>How will the intervention or provision be delivered?</i>	<i>Refer to research from EEF or other research to justify the choice of strategy.</i>		<i>Provide simple breakdown of proportionate or full costs.</i>
Supporting the curriculum through software programs.	Students in Key stage 4 to be accessing GCSE POD to support the learning. Students to use Hegarty maths for homework and revision.	Assessment data to show more pupils making more progress.	Communication made with home to promote the software and user names/logins provided. Regularly promoted and	EEF suggests the use of digital technology may lead to pupil progress gains of up to 4 months.	User logs. Software specific data. Comparative progress data.	GCSE Pod = £3000. Hegarty maths = £1000.

			encouraged with the students.			
Supporting the wellbeing of all students.	<p>Correct support and guidance is provided for all students to allow them to be successful.</p> <p>Additional time to support pupils in year 11 with GCSE preparations.</p> <p>All PP students have the adequate level of exam support.</p>	<p>Students feel safe and well supported.</p> <p>Students feel equipped to cope with the everyday demands.</p> <p>Students utilise the support on offer for all examinations.</p>	<p>Students will have access to our new school counsellor.</p> <p>Emotional literacy skills developed through nurture sessions.</p> <p>SPOA and school nurse referrals made for students where there are concerns.</p> <p>A designated exams concession Learning Mentor will ensure PP students are appropriately tested and therefore receive the correct level of examination support.</p>	EEF suggests that developing social and emotional learning may lead to pupil progress gains of up to 4 months.	<p>Intervention group registers.</p> <p>Referrals made when necessary.</p> <p>Log book with the schools councillor.</p> <p>Comparative progress data.</p> <p>Attendance and behaviour data.</p>	<p>School Counsellor = £33,280.</p> <p>Access arrangement costs = £6000.</p>

<p>Targeted additional intervention sessions.</p>	<p>Planned sessions for targeted pupils in different subject areas to support with coursework completion and examination preparation.</p> <p>Targeted tuition in Maths and English to students not making expected progress.</p>	<p>Progress of disadvantaged pupils improves and the gap between PP and non-PP closes.</p>	<p>Intervention sessions offered over a variety of days/ times depending on the subject/ type of intervention.</p>	<p>There is a strong evidence base showing the impact that high quality interventions can have on the outcomes of struggling students (EEF).</p> <p>EEF suggests that small group tuition may lead to pupil progress gains of up to 3 months.</p>	<p>Intervention group registers.</p> <p>Comparative progress data.</p>	<p>Extra-Curricular support = £5000M</p> <p>(See catch up premium strategy).</p>
<p>Improve the progress and achievement of Year 7 PP pupils in Mathematics and English through the Direct Instruction intervention programme.</p>	<p>Use of Placement assessments throughout the year to baseline, monitor and track students' progress.</p> <p>Pupils to show an improvement in their GL assessment results.</p> <p>Smaller class sizes in English for Year 7 students identified as requiring catch up for reading.</p>	<p>Targeted pupils show an improvement in their results for GL assessment.</p> <p>Students develop their confidence and their knowledge and understanding in Mathematics and English.</p>	<p>Students on the Direct Instruction pathway will receive 2 hours a week Direct Instruction alongside two hours a week of curriculum Maths and English lessons.</p> <p>Training provided for the staff members who will be delivering the Direct Instruction programme on administering the baseline assessments and the programme.</p>	<p>Direct Instruction programs are designed to accelerate students' learning and allow them to learn more material in a shorter amount of time.</p> <p>The research conclusively shows that Direct Instruction is more effective than other curricular programs.</p>	<p>Ongoing assessment throughout the programme with regular monitoring and tracking of performance.</p>	<p>Direct Instruction Resources = £4000.</p> <p>Staffing = £21,480.32.</p> <p>Support Staff support = £8450.52</p>

			Direct Instruction lessons will be ran in groups no bigger than 14 students.			
Provision for financial hardship is in place to overcome barriers to learning and to enable engagement through the removal of barriers.	<p>Financial Support for curriculum activities and academic resources (eg. subject trips/events, Food Technology ingredients, Art materials, uniform and subject equipment).</p> <p>Financial support for uniform and PE kit.</p> <p>Provision of electronic devices and internet dongles.</p> <p>Home resource packs for all students who need them including scientific calculators.</p>	<p>PP students are able to access the same opportunities as their peers.</p> <p>PP students have access to the correct equipment and uniform so they are ready for learning.</p>	To reduce disadvantage by ensuring access to necessary equipment and resources.		<p>Student Voice.</p> <p>Teaching staff.</p>	<p>Hardship fund = £ 15,000</p> <p>£5,000</p> <p>£1500</p>
Breakfast Club	An increased number of PP students attend Breakfast Club.	An increase in the number of PP students who attend Breakfast Club.	Every morning Intervention Leads will staff the canteen to support students from 8.15 am.	Not all pupils receive breakfast in the morning despite its documented importance. By offering a Breakfast Club, we will be able to ensure vulnerable	<p>Student Voice.</p> <p>Attendance registers.</p>	£225

		<p>PP overall attendance has showed an improvement.</p> <p>The attendance gap has closed between PP and Non-PP students.</p>		pupils have access to food and drink before school.		
Pupil premium barrier identification.	A pupil premium database created which identifies which students are in need of more specialised intervention and helps relevant staff members identify the specific barriers to further progress.	<p>Staff members know the barriers specific to each student.</p> <p>PP students to receive the intervention they require rather than a broad brushstroke.</p>	SLE to set up database with relevant people updating and monitoring.	There is no set or common profile of PP students. We run the risk of applying generic strategies to all students when not all are needed by all students.	Monitoring and tracking of database and cross checking with interventions received.	£3500

Date: 21/09/2020

Pupil Premium Leader: Simon Leach