

## Pupil Premium Evaluation 2019 - 2020

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.
- 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 to use to raise attainment. Each Academy explains their rationale for choosing the strategies and provides a cost breakdown. If you require this statement to be explained, then please ask to speak with the Pupil Premium Leader via the main office.

1. Summary information for 2019-20					
<b>Academy</b>	Noel-Baker Academy				
<b>Pupil Premium Leader</b>	Sarah Leach				
<b>Academic Year</b>	19/20	<b>Total PP budget</b>	£ 414,732.50	<b>Date of most recent PP Review</b>	September 2019
<b>Total number of pupils</b>	984	<b>Number of pupils eligible for PP</b>	410 (42%)	<b>Date for next internal review of this strategy</b>	September 2020



## Pupil Premium Report Academic Year 2019-20

### Summary of National Examinations

PP GAP ANALYSIS										
DATA POINT	PROGRESS 8	ATTAINMENT 8	% 4 & ABOVE IN MATHS	% 5 & ABOVE IN MATHS	% 7 & ABOVE IN MATHS	% 4 & ABOVE IN ENGLISH	% 5 & ABOVE IN ENGLISH	% 7 & ABOVE IN ENGLISH	% 4 / ABOVE ENG AND	% 5 / ABOVE ENG AND
PREVIOUS RESULTS										
2019 RESULTS	-0.6	-1.4	-27.9	-22.6	-9.6	-29.2	-29.6	-13.0	-23.8	-19.6
TARGET GRADES										
2020 TARGET	0	-0.6	-12.9	-18.9	-4.4	-10.7	-11.7	-6.9	-14.1	-16
CENTRE ASSESSED GRADES										
May-20	-0.1	-0.7	-14.7	-11	-4.9	-15.3	-13.6	0.6	-15.8	-20.3
ACTUAL GRADES										
Aug-20	-0.1	-0.7	-14.1	-10.4	-4.9	-17	-13.6	-0.6	-15.8	-20.3

CATEGORIES	ACTUAL										
SUBGROUP	NUMBER OF STUDENTS (P8/AB)	PROGRESS 8	ATTAINMENT 8	% 4 & ABOVE IN MATHS	% 5 & ABOVE IN MATHS	% 7 & ABOVE IN MATHS	% 4 & ABOVE IN ENGLISH	% 5 & ABOVE IN ENGLISH	% 7 & ABOVE IN ENGLISH	% 4 / ABOVE ENG AND MATHS	% 5 / ABOVE ENG AND MATHS
		All students	221 (225)	-0.5	4.1	59.8	39.3	7.1	75.9	53.1	15.2
PP	82	-0.6	3.6	50.6	32.5	3.9	64.9	44.2	15.0	46.8	9.6
Non-PP	139	-0.5	4.3	64.7	42.9	8.8	81.9	57.8	15.6	62.6	29.9
IN SCHOOL GAP (PP - nonPP)		-0.1	-0.7	-14.1	-10.4	-4.9	-17.0	-13.6	-0.6	-15.8	-20.3

PP gap was -0.1, the FFT target gap was 0. This data shows a significant improvement based on the previous year's gap. The attainment gap was in line with target expectations.

Year 10 data - due to lockdown, we were unable to collect accurate, reliable and valid data via year 10 mocks. These will now take place in November.



### KS3 - GL scaled scores for core subjects (national comparison data)

SUB-GROUP	YEAR 7		
	MATHS	ENGLISH	SCIENCE
<b>NATIONAL</b>	100	100	100
<b>OVERALL</b>	95.5	97.1	95
<b>GAP</b>	-4.5	-2.9	-5
<b>FSM</b>	92.8	94.3	93.1
<b>NON FSM</b>	96.8	98.4	95.8
<b>GAP</b>	-4	-4.1	-2.7

Due to lockdown, we were only able to complete GL assessments for year 7. (Further assessments for year 7, 8 and 9 were planned for the end of the academic year as recommended). Year 7 data shows that FSM pupils were further behind their non FSM peers who are in turn behind the national average at the start of the year. In the absence of end of year assessments, we are unable to gauge any change in gap size. All KS3 year groups to undergo baseline testing in September 2020 as a result.

KS3 data taken in early 2020 shows PP students are performing well when compared to their peers across all subjects (residuals) and English and Maths.

<b>RESIDUALS</b>			
	YEAR 7	YEAR 8	YEAR 9
	Autumn	Autumn	Autumn
Overall	-0.29	-0.48	-0.49
SEND	-0.24	-0.61	-0.34
PP	-0.17	-0.28	-0.28
Male	-0.38	-0.51	-0.51
HPA	-2.07	-2.33	-1.82
<b>% OF PUPILS ON OR ABOVE TARGET IN MATHS</b>			
Overall	69%	68%	52%
SEND	47%	76%	64%
PP	72%	71%	53%
Male	66%	72%	59%
HPA	47%	35%	32%
<b>% OF PUPILS ON OR ABOVE TARGET IN ENGLISH</b>			
Overall	43%	50%	51%
SEND	53%	52%	64%
PP	44%	56%	77%
Male	37%	48%	52%
HPA	12%	9%	16%

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.	<p>To improve information given to the learner and for gaps in knowledge to be filled.</p> <p>TLAC strategies and Rosenshine principles to be evident in lessons.</p> <p>Feedback is tailored, specific and targeted to support PP eligible students in making accelerated progress.</p> <p>All staff to demonstrate an understanding of cognitive science.</p> <p>Meta-cognition is taught explicitly.</p>	<p>QA to show feedback within lessons is in line with expectations.</p> <p>Student response to feedback is evident in books and demonstrates clear progress.</p> <p>Improved teaching and learning for all.</p> <p>Progress of disadvantaged pupils improves and the gap between PP and non-PP closes.</p>	<p>Weekly CPD for all teaching and support staff.</p> <p>All lessons.</p> <p>PSHE</p> <p>Bootcamp</p>	<p>EEF research suggests improved feedback may lead to pupil progress gains of up to 8 months.</p> <p>TLAC pioneered in charter schools in USA proved successful.</p> <p>Research conducted by Rosenshine</p> <p>Sutton Trust 2011 report states that the effects of high quality teaching are especially significant for pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds.</p>	<p>Ongoing QA of teaching and learning in line with school's QA process.</p> <p>Student Voice</p>	<p>CPD budget (quality first teaching) = £6,615</p> <p>(42% of total cost for number of PP) 67 teaching members of staff receive a 20 minute learning walk every fortnight.</p> <p>£10,624.57 (42% of total cost for number of PP)</p>

				Metacognition and self-regulation approaches have consistently high levels of impact, with pupils making an average of seven months' additional progress. (EEF).		
Review and evaluation.	Regular and rigorous quality assurance show that the quality of teaching and learning has improved and taken the next step. TLAC strategies and associated language have become widespread within the majority of lessons, thereby improving the consistency of our educational offer. Regular CPD sessions were held that focused on feedback and assessment for learning. These are now part of our daily routine but are not yet embedded consistently. Cognitive Science forms part of our 'Why', which is then clearly communicated to staff and students whenever appropriate. Both staff and students have a greater understanding of the cognitive science strands, though further work needs to be carried out with students to ensure metacognition is used, enabling greater progress. The Centre assessed grade performance data demonstrates significant progress, which is a direct consequence of improved teaching and learning.					
Adopt a knowledge rich curriculum to ensure pupils learn about the best that has been thought and said.	For all staff to be involved in planning and delivering a knowledge rich curriculum, leading to an improvement in the quality of learning and teaching leading to improved outcomes.  All staff demonstrate deep subject knowledge.	Faculty areas to be delivering an adopted and adapted new knowledge rich curriculum.  QA to show quality of teaching and learning has improved and that greater consistency across the lessons has led to an increase in standards and expectation from all pupils.	Newly designed curriculum to be continuously reviewed and edited throughout implementation.	Links with the Rosenshine principles and the "TLAC strategies" Doug Lemov.  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.	Ongoing QA of teaching and learning.  Data scrutiny meetings and analysis.  Line management meetings.	

		<p>Assessment data to show more pupils making more progress.</p> <p>Achievement / progress gap to have narrowed.</p>				
Review and evaluation	<p>All staff have received appropriate training and contributed towards the development of their subject specific curricula. Schemes of learning and supporting resources have been and continue to be developed, incorporating our approach to teaching and learning, specifically embracing relevant areas of cognitive science. All students are now being taught an improved curriculum offer which has entitlement as its driving force. Reliable assessment data is not available for non examination year groups, due to lockdown, but initial data shows that disadvantaged students were more likely to be working towards expected progress than their non disadvantaged peers. Year 11 data shows the performance gap narrowed from the previous year, though no gap was expected to be achieved when using FFT50 target data.</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 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>G4S used to accurately record and analyse key data 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>	<p>Curriculum Directors</p> <p>Line management meetings.</p> <p>CPD delivered by SLT.</p>	<p>Accurate data means we are able to better evaluate the success/impact of strategies we introduce.</p>	<p>QA</p> <p>Data scrutiny meetings</p> <p>G4S</p>	

	Use of GL testing to compare NBA students' progress against national.					
Review and evaluation	Data and assessment tracking systems were set up at the start of the year which were used to accurately gauge performance of all pupils and groups of pupils. GL assessments were carried out for year 7 at the start of the year but due to lockdown, we were unable to complete the end of year assessments used to evidence in-year improvement. Assessment specific CPD was delivered to all staff with a move to synoptic assessments that support the curriculum as the progression model. This will continue to be a priority for the next academic year. CAG's submitted were in line with data captured within the previous year, all supported by valid and reliable mock examinations.					
<b>2. Parental engagement</b>						
<b>What do we want to achieve?</b>			<b>How?</b>	<b>What is the rationale for this chosen strategy?</b>	<b>How will it be monitored?</b>	<b>Cost?</b>
<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>
Opportunities for high levels of parental engagement are provided and pursued where necessary.	For parents to better engage with their child's school experience.  Parents of PP eligible students know how to support their children in their preparation for GCSE examinations.  For parental contact with the school to increase.	G4S accessed by the vast majority of parents and students.  Parent forums to be well attended.  Parental attendance at parents evening to increase.	Continuation of parent forums.  48 hour reply guarantee. Introduction of a parental engagement programme.  Pursue attendance of disadvantaged students' parents at subject evenings – telephone calls/texts	Improving lines of communication and highlighting the changes we are making should improve the negative perception many parents have of the school.  Where parental support is good, students are better placed to achieve well	Parental feedback.  Attendance registers.  G4S access logs.  Student Voice.	



	For parents to access greater student information.		to take place one week before events.  Study Skills session provided for parents of Year 11/10 students. Will inform parents on how they can support their children in preparing for examinations, reducing stress levels and maintaining motivation.	and feel supported and motivated.  Building relationships with pupils and home may lead to pupil progress gains of up to 3 months (EEF).		
Review and evaluation	Parents evening for three year groups occurred before lockdown with percentage attendance similar to last year overall (less than 70%), but PP attendance was down. This will continue to be a target for next year. Parent forums were attended every month with a range of issues discussed across the year. The vast number of students, including PP students have access to (and have accessed) their school accounts.					
<b>3.Behaviour and Attendance</b>						
<b>What do we want to achieve?</b>			<b>How?</b>	<b>What is the rationale for this chosen strategy?</b>	<b>How will it be monitored?</b>	<b>Cost?</b>
<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	Attendance of PP eligible students tracked and monitored rigorously to ensure early intervention.	PP overall attendance has showed an improvement.  The attendance gap has closed between	Employment of 2 Education Welfare Officers to implement early interventions.	Students cannot access the curriculum if absent and therefore their learning is adversely affected.	G4S attendance module.	EWO salaries = £34,944.84.



<p>for PP eligible students.</p> <p>Targeted support for individual pupils.</p>	<p>To close the gap between PP and Non PP attendance.</p>	<p>PP and Non-PP students.</p> <p>Persistent absence for PP students is decreased.</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>Implement PSHE withdrawals for PP eligible students to discuss attendance, address worries, provide support and set targets. Students receive positive points for good weekly attendance.</p>	<p>DfE attendance research indicates that there is clear evidence which links increased 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 month's progress (EEF).</p>	<p>Regular attendance briefings.</p> <p>Registration.</p> <p>Line management meetings.</p> <p>Weekly pastoral briefings.</p> <p>Data tracking.</p>	<p>(42% of total cost for number of PP).</p> <p>Line management meetings to discuss attendance.</p> <p>£961.30 (42% of total cost for number of PP).</p>
<p>Review and evaluation</p>	<p>PP attendance increased by 2.82% (up to point of lockdown) compared to 2019. Non PP improved by 0.53%, meaning the overall gap closed by 2.28%. PP PA decreased by 4.72% compared with 2019 with non PP decreasing by a similar amount, though the gap was reduced by 0.4%.</p>					
<p>To improve the strategies used to support PP students</p>	<p>To improve the behaviour of PP students to allow them</p>	<p>A reduction in behaviour incidents for PP students.</p>	<p>Designated Assistant Head responsible for PP.</p>	<p>Significant number of behaviour incidents carried out by PP</p>	<p>G4S behaviour module.</p>	<p>Student Support Manager,</p>



<p>to show a decrease in behaviour incidents.</p>	<p>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 support and small group sizes to have access to the ACE Centre and a personalised provision.</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>Students who are part of the ACE Centre provision have access to tailored and personalised provision.</p>	<p>An increase in non-teaching pastoral staff capacity will enable more mentoring/ preventative action/ parental contact/ restorative conversations to take place, thereby reducing the number of behaviour incidents.</p> <p>Reward policy.</p>	<p>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 expected/good behaviour. Rewards improve levels of conformity and pupil happiness.</p>	<p>Pupil Voice.</p>	<p>Progress Leaders and Behaviour Mentor salaries = £114,033.22</p> <p>(42% of total cost for number of PP)</p> <p>ACE Centre costs = £48,000</p> <p>(50% of total cost for number of PP)</p> <p>ACE Centre staffing = £116,523</p> <p>(50% of total cost for number of PP)</p> <p>Assistant Headteacher = £29,674.26 (42% of salary)</p>
---	---	---	--	---	---------------------	---

Review and evaluation	Reward data before lockdown highlighted an average difference of 10 reward points between PP and non PP students. PP students, on average, were issued with an additional C2 over the first 3 half terms. This demonstrates an improvement when compared to equivalent data from previous years.					
<b>Targeted Intervention</b>						
<b>What do we want to achieve?</b>			<b>How?</b>	<b>What is the rationale for this chosen strategy?</b>	<b>How will it be monitored?</b>	<b>Cost?</b>
<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 programmes.	PiXL  Students in Key stage 4 to be accessing GCSE POD to support the learning.  EDLounge	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 encouraged with the students.	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	PIXL = £3375  GCSE Pod = £3000  EDLounge = £3150
Review and evaluation	We participated in the PIXL wave which compares our mock performance against those nationally. Data suggests that whilst we achieved below national average, we were closer than in previous years which provides further support for the final CAG's entered. The data also identified pupil gaps in knowledge which then fed into PIXL apps that students accessed for homework and revision before lockdown. GCSE pod was used intermittently but received its main usage before exams. Assessment data shows positive PP trends across all year groups (though data is limited due to number of assessments taken before lockdown). All digital program information shared with parents and students. Will continue to be a target next year.					
Supporting the wellbeing of all students.	Correct support and guidance is provided for all students to allow them to be successful.	Students feel safe and well supported.	Students will have access to our new school counsellor.	-EEF suggests that developing social and emotional learning may lead to pupil	Intervention group registers.	School Counsellor = £33,280

	<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 equipped to cope with the everyday demands.</p> <p>Students utilise the support on offer for all examinations.</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>	<p>progress gains of up to 4 months.</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>	
Review and evaluation	58% of SPOA's completed were for PP students. Year 11 PP students attended 0.8 intervention sessions less than their non PP peers. 49% of SEND register were PP students. The percentage of pupils on the mental health register is less than the PP cohort percentage (26.5%). 59% of year 10 and 52% of year 11 pupils who received access arrangements are PP (above school average).					
Targeted additional intervention sessions.	<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>GL assessment data shows an improvement in Maths and English for the students targeted for intervention.</p>	<p>During Intervention after school on a Tuesday, appropriate individual and small group tuition will be timetabled throughout the year.</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</p>	<p>Intervention group registers.</p> <p>Comparative progress data.</p>	<p>GL assessment = £5287.50</p> <p>Extra-Curricular support = £5000</p>

				progress gains of up to 3 months.		
Review and evaluation	Year 11 students attended a total of 413 intervention sessions over the first three half terms, an average of 0.8 less than their non PP peers. The PP gap closed using CAG's, with a greater percentage of PP students making expected progress across KS3 when compared to non PP. Intervention impact data limited due to lockdown.					
Improve the progress and achievement of Year 7 PP pupils in Mathematics and English through the Direct Instruction intervention programme.	<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 lessons will be run in groups no bigger than 14 students.</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 and that the positive effects persist through high school. The positive effects occur with students of all ability levels and social backgrounds. Students exposed to Direct Instruction also have greater self-esteem and self-confidence than students in other programs, primarily</p>	<p>Ongoing assessment throughout the programme with regular monitoring and tracking of performance.</p>	<p>Direct Instruction Resources= £7817.52</p> <p>Staffing = £21,480.32</p> <p>Support Staff support = £8450.52</p> <p><b>(Already costed in Catch Up Premium and SEN notional budget).</b></p>

				because they are learning more material and understand that they can be successful students.		
Review and evaluation	DI programs were started but not finished due to lockdown. As a result, we don't have final progress statistics. GL and reading age data will be used to cross check next year. 54% of English DI participants were PP students whilst 60% of Maths were. Many pupils were still part of the program when lockdown occurred. NBA students were 2 percentage points behind the national average for NGRT tests, FSM pupils were a further 2 points behind. FSM pupils, on average were 17 months behind their chronological reading age. (NBA cohort is -14 so FSM were a further 3 months behind).					
Provision for financial hardship is in place to overcome barriers to learning and to enable engagement through the removal of barriers.	Financial Support for curriculum activities and academic resources (eg. subject trips/events, Food Technology ingredients, Art materials, uniform and subject equipment).  Financial support for uniform and PE kit.	PP students are able to access the same opportunities as their peers.  PP students have access to the correct equipment and uniform so they are ready for learning.	To reduce disadvantage by ensuring access to necessary equipment and resources.		Student Voice.  Teaching staff.	Hardship fund = £ 15,000
Review and evaluation	All PP students received their food ingredients for free and therefore all students were able to access practical lessons. Uniform provided for multiple students in addition to laptops and dongles during lockdown.					
Breakfast Club	An increased number of PP students attend Breakfast Club.	An increase in the number of PP students who attend Breakfast Club.  PP overall attendance has showed an improvement.	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	Student voice.  Attendance registers.	£225



		The attendance gap has closed between PP and non-PP students.		pupils have access to food and drink before school.		
Review and evaluation	69.2% of pupils attending Breakfast Club were PP.					

Date: 20/09/2020

Pupil Premium Leader: Simon Leach