

# Pupil premium strategy statement – Glossopdale School and Sixth Form

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	1256
Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils	346/1256 = 27.5%
Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers ( <b>3 year plans are recommended</b> )	2023-24 2024-25 2025-26
Date this statement was published	October 2023
Date on which it will be reviewed	January 2024
Statement authorised by	Debbie McGloin
Pupil premium lead	Caroine Jesson
Governor / Trustee lead	Ian McGarry

## Funding overview

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year	£336376
Recovery premium funding allocation this academic year	£89700
Pupil premium (and recovery premium*) funding carried forward from previous years ( <i>enter £0 if not applicable</i> )	£0
<b>Total budget for this academic year</b>	<b>£426076</b>

# Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

## Statement of intent

Our core purpose is to support students of all abilities and backgrounds to develop high aspirations and achieve their potential. We encourage all students to work hard and aim high in order to succeed both academically and personally. For disadvantaged students the challenges faced in achieving these aims are greater. We consider the context of the school, the students within it and the specific challenges faced by them. We look to the best evidence available when making decisions about using Pupil Premium funding to overcome these challenges. The challenges are varied and there is no “one size fits all”, so we provide bespoke support for individuals

### Principles

- Pupil Premium funding is used to support any student or groups of students the school has legitimately identified as being disadvantaged.
- Quality first, responsive teaching has a disproportionately positive affect on disadvantaged students, so this is a major focus of our support for disadvantaged students
- Appropriate additional provision is made for disadvantaged students via assessing individual needs and implementing strategies
- Additional provision is prioritised to those students most in need (limited funding and resources means that not all disadvantaged students will be in receipt of additional provision at one time)

The priority for improving the progress of disadvantaged students is improving the quality of teaching in every classroom. There are a number of whole school strategies that are intended to improve teaching, specifically to support disadvantaged students.

1. High expectations: embedding consistency in expectations and learning habits will support the most vulnerable learners and improve classroom behaviour. Deliberate Practice will embed and improve staff understanding and eradicate variability.
2. Pedagogy: making excellence the norm in all classrooms as a result of carefully selected, deliberate pedagogical strategies by supporting every subject teacher’s development through Instructional Coaching and other carefully selected CPD will improve the progress of disadvantaged students
3. Literacy: embedding DVI, reading and writing strategies consistently school wide will support all students in all subjects, particularly supporting disadvantaged learners who are more likely to join Glossopdale with weaker literacy skills
4. Curriculum: each subject’s content and structure continue to be reviewed and improved in order to be both ambitious for all students and to embed long-term learning. This includes the opportunity after each data entry for subject teachers to identify Wave 1 interventions to address gaps and misconceptions.

There will also be specific interventions put in place for disadvantaged students to improve knowledge and skills and address gaps and misconceptions. In 2022, the proportion of disadvantaged students arriving in Year 7 who have not made expected progress at KS2 is higher than in previous years, for Reading, Writing and Maths. The gap between disadvantaged students and non-disadvantaged students is especially wide in writing and even more so in Maths. Targeted support will include:

- Additional Maths intervention for Year 7 students, as well as students still not working at expected levels in Y8 and 9
- KS3 Literacy intervention to support students' progress in all subjects
- KS3 and 4 intervention in English, Maths and Science
- Additional English, Maths and Science tutoring for students following Alternative Provision

Attendance of disadvantaged students is significantly below that of non-PP students, and persistent absence is considerably higher. Additional PP funding will be used to support students and families with improving attendance and therefore disadvantaged students' learning.

Remaining funds will be used for a variety of objectives to improve disadvantaged students' learning, for example with uniform, ingredients for Food Technology, to improve participation in extra-curricular activities and learning resources.

## Challenges

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

Challenge number	Detail of challenge
1	<p><b>Disadvantaged students typically have more difficulty developing and maintaining strong learning habits compounded by lower self regulation skills and in some cases combined with a chaotic family background and/or SEMH difficulties leads to lower attainment and progress</b></p> <p><u>KS2 data for Y7 intake vs national:</u>            In 2023, 31% (81/264) of Y7 were D. Disproportionately more D students were NSR compared to ND students [1,2,3]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 42% of the students below 100 in KS2 reading were D (24/57)</li> <li>● Overall 37% (30/81) of D students and 20% (37/183) of ND students were NSR in reading, compared to 27% of students nationally</li> <li>● 54% of the students below 100 in KS2 maths were D (38/71)</li> <li>● Overall 53% (43/81) of D students and 20% (37/183) of ND students were NSR in reading, compared to 27% of students nationally</li> </ul> <p><u>KS4 data vs national in 2023</u>            In 2023, 30% (63/208) of Y11 leavers were D. These students made significantly worse progress and attainment compared to ND peers [4,5]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● P8 for D students was -0.81 compared to ND in school P8 of -0.06, and national figures of -0.41 (D) and 0.18 (ND)</li> <li>● A8 for D students was 33.1 compared to ND in school A8 of 46.5, and national figures of 38.4 (D) and 49.9 (ND).</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % Basics 5+ for D students was 21% compared to 41% ND in school, and national figures of 29% (D) and 51% (ND).</li> <li>• % Basics 4+ for D students was 35% compared to 67% ND in school, and national figures of 49% (D) and 72% (ND).</li> <li>• %EBacc (standard pass) for D students was 3% compared to 14% ND in school, and national figures of 14% (D) and 27% (ND).</li> </ul> <p><u>FTS data vs national 2022/23</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Y7-11: 17.6% of disadvantaged students received a FTS at GS in 22-23 compared to 6.3% of non-disadvantaged students. Nationally, the suspension rate was 4.2% in 21/22.</li> <li>• Y7-13: 17.3% of disadvantaged students received a FTS at GS in 22-23 compared to 5.6% of non-disadvantaged students. Nationally, the suspension rate was 16% in 21/22.</li> </ul> <p><u>THRIVE points [6]</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Over the academic year 22/23 32% of all students were D. Overall 168185 positive THRIVE points were awarded, but disproportionately more were awarded to ND students: 22% to D students (37747), and 78% to ND students (130438). This means on average D students were awarded 94 THRIVE points whereas ND students were awarded 153 THRIVE points.</li> </ul>
2	<p><b>Lower literacy levels (specifically vocabulary deficit, weak reading, writing and oracy skills) leading to difficulty accessing the curriculum across all subjects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 42% of the disadvantaged students at Glossopdale school started Y7 with a KS2 reading SAT score below 100.</li> <li>• Between 25% and 47% of the current year groups had KS2 SATs reading scores below 100. For disadvantaged students, these proportions are between 35% and 64%.</li> <li>• NGRT data shows 35% of the 2023 Y7 intake had a standard age score below 100. For disadvantaged students, the proportion below 100 was 67%.</li> </ul>
3	<p><b>Low attendance resulting in gaps in learning</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attendance for disadvantaged students in 22-23 at GS was 82.5% compared to 89.98% for non-disadvantaged students. National average attendance was 90.7%. Persistent absence of disadvantaged students at GS was 48.5% at the end of 22/23, and PA for non-disadvantaged students was 32.8%. PA nationally was 28.3%</li> <li>• In 2023, Glossopdale students with 90%+ attendance (130 students), achieved a P8 +0.25, however, the 79 students who had below 90% attendance had a combined P8 score of -1.30. This shows the local impact of attendance on progress. The pattern holds for disadvantaged students; those with an attendance of above 90% had a combined P8 score of -0.26, much higher than the combined P8 of -0.80 for all disadvantaged students.</li> </ul>

## 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
<p>Glossopdale school supports disadvantaged students to develop strong learning habits and self regulation skills, whilst minimising the effects of chaotic family backgrounds and/or SEMH difficulties leading to good attainment and progress</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● P8 for disadvantaged students matches or exceeds P8 for non-disadvantaged students nationally</li> <li>● A8 for disadvantaged students matches or exceeds A8 for non-disadvantaged students nationally</li> <li>● Average number of THRIVE points for disadvantaged students matches or exceeds the average number for non-disadvantaged students</li> <li>● Average number of FTS, C4 and C3 for disadvantaged students matches or is below the average number for non-disadvantaged students</li> <li>● Learning walk reports show culture and learning routines embedded across the curriculum</li> <li>● Work scrutiny reports show no, or positive difference in disadvantaged student's work when compared with their ND peers.</li> <li>● Average number of negative HW points for disadvantaged students matches or is below the average number for non-disadvantaged students</li> </ul>
<p>Disadvantaged students who enter Glossopdale school with lower literacy levels (specifically vocabulary deficit, weak reading, writing and oracy skills) are systematically supported to improve these skills resulting in all students accessing the curriculum across all subjects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Reading age of disadvantaged students matches or exceeds their chronological age</li> <li>● Curriculum planning explicitly identifies tier 2 and tier 3 vocabulary to be taught</li> <li>● Learning walk reports show DVI and reading/writing strategies embedded across the curriculum</li> <li>● Work scrutiny shows extended writing and literacy marking/response embedded across the curriculum</li> <li>● QofE reviews demonstrate support for literacy in all subjects</li> </ul>
<p>Disadvantaged students attend school regularly and those with historic poor attendance are supported by Glossopdale school to eradicate gaps in learning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Attendance for disadvantaged students matches or exceeds that for non-disadvantaged students nationally</li> <li>● Persistent absence for disadvantaged students matches or is below persistent absence for non-disadvantaged students nationally</li> <li>● Average number of lates for disadvantaged students matches or is below the average number for non-disadvantaged students</li> <li>● Average number of truancy incidents for disadvantaged students matches or is below the average number for non-disadvantaged students</li> <li>● Gaps in learning are systematically identified and impactful interventions are implemented by teachers (e.g through messy marking or interim assessment and planning day work)</li> </ul>

## 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: £119760

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
<p><b>Developing high quality teaching, assessment &amp; a curriculum which responds to the needs of students</b> via ensuring classroom and whole school practice that <u>maximises productivity, and minimises wasted time</u>; specifically line up, do now, non verbal signals, warm/strict, positive framing, classroom expectations via On Tour, subject QA, SLT QA and curriculum review</p>	<p>The <u>Sutton Trust report</u> explains that high quality teaching will have the biggest effect on students' outcomes. The <u>social mobility report of 2014</u> states that schools must have an "incessant focus on the quality of teaching and learning". David Didau states that if schools clearly specify their curriculum related expectations, "getting this right will disproportionately benefit the most disadvantaged students".</p> <p>The behaviour curriculum at Glossopdale draws on the <u>EEF Improving behaviour in schools guidance</u> which recommends teaching learning behaviours alongside managing misbehaviour (recommendation 2), teaching classroom management strategies to support good behaviour (recommendation 3) using simple approaches as part of regular routine (recommendation 4) and states that consistency is key (recommendation 6).</p>	1
<p><b>Developing high quality teaching, assessment &amp; a curriculum which responds to the needs of students</b> via ensuring staff apply the Glossopdale <u>T&amp;L framework</u> clearly, explicitly and consistently; via On Tour, subject QA, SLT QA and curriculum review</p>	<p>Our T&amp;L draws on the EEF review of evidence in <u>Cognitive Science in the classroom</u>. At Glossopdale we are embedding many of the cognitive science based strategies into our curriculum, for example spaced learning, interleaving, retrieval practice, managing cognitive load, working with schemas, multimedia learning including dual coding. These approaches are also endorsed by the <u>Great Teaching Toolkit Evidence Review</u>.</p> <p>Our T&amp;L framework has developed through the mindset of teaching all students, not some (<u>Tom Sherrington</u>) and is structured with six themes: securing attention, checking prior learning, questioning, practice &amp; rehearsal, formative assessment, scaffolds.</p> <p>The next stage of our curriculum development is to ensure knowledge is connected vertically, horizontally and diagonally to ensure clear schema are built up in students' memory.</p>	1

<p><b>Developing high quality teaching, assessment &amp; a curriculum which responds to the needs of students</b> via <u>reducing class size</u> for the most disadvantaged</p>	<p>The DfE report of 2015 cites the strategy used in schools that has been the most successful in addressing disadvantaged underachievement is small group teaching. At Glossopdale we provide <u>small group tuition</u> targeted at pupils' specific needs. To do this we employ a KS2 Maths specialist and a KS2 English specialist. Diagnostic assessment is used to assess the best way to target support within the these groups.</p>	<p>1 and 2</p>
<p><b>Providing professional development on evidence-based approaches</b> via <u>internal T&amp;L CPD</u> on a weekly basis</p>	<p>“Ensuring an effective teacher is in front of every class, and that every teacher is supported to keep improving, is the key ingredient of a successful school and should rightly be the top priority for Pupil Premium spending.” <u>EEF Guidance report.</u></p> <p>The <u>EEF Effective Professional Development guidance</u> clearly states that professional development needs to focus on mechanisms such as revisiting prior learning, goal setting, providing feedback, and action planning. Our weekly CPD sessions combined with annual appraisal allows these mechanisms to be enacted. Annual appraisal sets motivating goals linked to the SIP. Weekly briefings, deliberate practice and meetings build knowledge, develop techniques &amp; embed practice (recommendation 2). These mechanisms are carefully built into the school routine (recommendation 3).</p>	<p>1</p>
<p><b>Providing professional development on evidence-based approaches</b> via <u>internal literacy CPD</u> on selected strategies for improving vocabulary, reading comprehension and extended writing</p>	<p>Literacy is key to learning across all subjects in secondary school” <u>EEF KS4 Literacy guidance.</u> To ensure good literacy for all students, <u>disciplinary literacy</u> is being built into curriculum plans for every subject (recommendation 1) and explicit vocabulary instruction (DVI) is part of tutorials and lessons (recommendation 2). Complex academic text reading (recommendation 3), strategies for breaking down writing tasks (recommendation 4) and combining writing with reading in all subjects (recommendation 5) are the next steps in literacy CPD and curriculum development.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p><b>Providing professional development on evidence-based approaches</b> via <u>internal subject specific CPD</u> in Maths focussed on consistency of Mathematical pedagogy</p>	<p>A consistent, evidence based approach to Maths pedagogy is needed to enable students in every group to succeed. Weekly Maths CPD drawing on the <u>EEF Improving Maths in KS2 &amp; 3 guidance report</u> will ensure this consistency. The CPD draws o four recommendations within this report: use assessment to build upon pupils existing knowledge &amp; understanding (1), use manipulatives &amp; representations (2), teach strategies for solving problems (3) and use tasks &amp; resources to challenge and support (6)</p>	<p>1</p>

<p><b>Mentoring &amp; Coaching</b> on a weekly basis for every member of teaching staff through StepLab</p>	<p>A meta-analysis by <u>Kraft et al.</u> (2018) found an overall positive effect of teacher coaching programmes - an effect that potentially out-performs other forms of teacher development or school-based interventions. As such we employ instructional coaching as one method of teacher development.</p> <p>As the <u>EEF Effective Professional Development guidance</u> recommends focussing on the mechanisms, our instructional coaching (in the Paul Bambrick-Santoyo approach) has been built into the weekly cycle at Glossopdale, supported by the online platform StepLab. All staff are coached and have a coachee and these relationships build, motivate, develop &amp; embed the professional learning (recommendation 2).</p>	<p>1</p>
---	--	----------

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

Budgeted cost: £ 143855

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number addressed
<p><b>1:1 and small group tuition</b> in Maths within the classroom and in English both in the classroom and as extraction</p>	<p>In Maths, well structured interventions to provide additional support (recommendation 7 of the <u>EEF Improving Maths in KS2 &amp; 3 guidance report</u>) is recognised as effective in improving progress. To enact the details of this recommendation, we use TAs to add value to teachers and help pupils develop independent learning skills (recommendations from the <u>EEF Making Best use of TAs Guidance</u>). This guidance is also utilised in the in class English tuition.</p> <p>The in-class aspect of this targeted intervention is ensures all pupils have access to high quality teaching (<u>EEF SEND in mainstream schools guidance</u>) whilst also gaining the benefits from effective tutoring as outlined in <u>Making a difference with effective tutoring guidance</u></p> <p>The extraction element of this targeted intervention is provided for those students who are assessed as needing additional support, and is focussed on individual needs (as per <u>EEF KS4 Literacy guidance</u> recommendation 7)</p>	<p>1 and 2</p>

<p><b>Small group tuition</b> via after school intervention across the curriculum and via internal AP in the THRIVE centre</p>	<p>Targeted small group activities in areas of need to complement our high quality teaching for both SEND and non-SEND students is organised on a needs basis and staffed appropriately to ensure success ( <u>EEF SEND in mainstream schools guidance</u> recommendation 4)</p> <p>In addition, the THRIVE centre provides tailored approaches to meet the needs of individuals who have behaviour has been a barrier to good progress (recommendation 5 of <u>EEF Improving behaviour in schools guidance</u>)</p>	<p>1, 2 and 3</p>
<p><b>1:1 and small group tuition</b> for selected students forming the RPG groups</p>	<p>Students are selected to become part of the RPG group based on their internal assessment and A2L. The RPG group is then supported on a small group and 1 to 1 basis by an AAHT; This support focuses on metacognition and self regulation(<u>high impact strategies according to the EEF</u>). Students are monitored weekly and met fortnightly to discuss aspects of their learning and supported to improve.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p><b>Interventions to support language development, literacy &amp; numeracy</b> via Fresh Start literacy, Accelerated reader and buddy reading</p>	<p><u>EEF KS4 Literacy guidance</u> states that high quality literacy interventions need to be proactively planned and timed in line with need (recommendation 7). Accelerated reader has a +3 months impact under best condition with Y7 students (<u>AR efficacy trial</u>) and we use this programme for all Y7's.</p> <p>For students who need to practise reading we use buddy reading. This is a peer tutoring system where younger readers are paired with trained older buddies based on <u>peer tutoring</u> impact evidence (+5 months).</p> <p>For those with greater need, <u>Fresh Start</u> literacy has been shown to have a +3 months impact (<u>ES efficacy trial</u>) and this is implemented with great care to Y7 to avoid the pitfalls found in the <u>second trial</u>.</p>	<p>1 and 2</p>
<p><b>Activity and resources to meet the specific needs of disadvantaged students with SEND</b> via internal AP using AQA Units, ASDAN and entry level qualifications</p>	<p>For some students who are disadvantaged with SEND we complement their normal teaching with carefully selected 1:1 and small group activities leading towards alternate qualifications (based on (recommendation 4 of <u>EEF SEND in mainstream schools guidance</u>)</p>	<p>1 and 2</p>
<p><b>TA deployment &amp; interventions in small groups or 1-2-1</b> to support SEMH needs and develop self regulation</p>	<p>High quality structured interventions based on good evidence where explicit connections between intervention &amp; classroom teaching delivered by TAs are beneficial in supporting progress (<u>EEF Making Best use of TAs Guidance</u>). Interventions that meet this criteria are implemented for students with SEMH needs. These include art therapy for students with ACES (<u>EEF/Manchester University</u>), and social and emotional learning approaches (<u>EEF</u>) like emotional literacy, anger gremlins and anxiety gremlins.</p>	<p>1</p>

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

Budgeted cost: £ 162461

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
<p><b>Supporting students' social, emotional and behavioural needs</b> through YM support, Inclusion Manager and FSW</p>	<p>Staff who have in depth knowledge of the context of each student is a proactive element of securing good conditions for learning (EEF Improving behaviour in schools guidance, <a href="#">recommendation 1</a>). To this end the school invests in non-teaching members of staff who, alongside teachers, provide the supportive pastoral relationships, both developing and sharing depth knowledge of each pupil in order to secure the good behaviour that is "central to a good education " (<a href="#">DFE</a>)</p> <p>Students (and their families) who require more intensive support gain it through our FSW as recommendation 4 of <a href="#">Working with parents to support children's Learning guidance</a>)</p>	1
<p><b>Supporting attendance</b> through Attendance officers and AHT attendance</p>	<p>The <a href="#">DfE</a> report of 2015 states that "schools which have been more successful in raising the performance of disadvantaged pupils have put the basics in place (especially addressing attendance and behaviour)". The EEF's <a href="#">Rapid Evidence Assessment - Attendance interventions</a> recognises that the quality of evidence for attendance improvements but that there is some promising evidence for strategies that include parental engagement and targeting individual causes. To this end, the school invests in an attendance team to support student attendance.</p>	3
<p><b>Extracurricular activities</b> through funding for visits, discretionary fund for high cost trips, music lessons and transition events</p>	<p>The <a href="#">DfE</a> report of 2018 cites that removal of financial barriers is one of four key principles in the leadership and infrastructure of addressing social disadvantage. We use some funding to secure student places in <a href="#">Arts Participation</a> and <a href="#">Physical Activity</a>.</p>	1
<p><b>Breakfast clubs &amp; meal provision</b> by providing breakfast</p>	<p>The <a href="#">DfE</a> report of 2018 cites that removal of financial barriers is one of 4 key principles in the leadership and infrastructure of addressing social disadvantage. Providing free breakfast helps alleviate financial pressure and can have a positive impact on learning (<a href="#">Magic Breakfast</a>)</p>	1

**Total budgeted cost: £ 336376**

## Part B: Review of the previous academic year

### Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils

Intended outcome	Success criteria
Improve P8 for disadvantaged students	<p>Gap between PP and non-PP narrows to below the national average.</p> <p>Outcome: Not met. 2023 P8 for disadvantaged students was -0.79 at Glossopdale compared to <u>-0.57</u> for disadvantaged students and <u>0.17</u> for non-disadvantaged students nationally.</p>
Improve A8 for disadvantaged students	<p>A8 for disadvantaged students increases to at least 40</p> <p>Outcome: Not met. 2023 A8 for disadvantaged students was 31.7 compared to <u>34.9</u> for disadvantaged and <u>50.2</u> for non-disadvantaged students nationally.</p>
Increase the number of rewards disadvantaged students earn	<p>Reduce the gap between the average rewards achieved by PP and non-PP students to 0</p> <p>Outcome: Not met. Over the academic year 22/23 on average D students were awarded 94 THRIVE points whereas ND students were awarded 153 THRIVE points<sup>[6]</sup></p>
Improve disadvantaged students' attendance	<p>Increase PP attendance to at least 93%</p> <p>Outcome: Not met. Attendance for disadvantaged students in 22-23 at GS was 82.5% compared to 89.98% for non-disadvantaged students. National average attendance was 90.7%. Persistent absence of disadvantaged students at GS was 48.5% at the end of 22/23, and PA for non-disadvantaged students was 32.8%. PA nationally was 28.3%</p>
Decrease FTSs for disadvantaged students	<p>% of disadvantaged students receiving FTSs reduces to below 10%.</p> <p>Outcome: Not met. Y7-11: 17.6% of disadvantaged students received a FTS at GS in 22-23 compared to 6.3% of non-disadvantaged students. Nationally, the suspension rate was 4.2% in 21/22.</p>
Improve participation in extra-curricular and rewards trips for disadvantaged students	<p>% of students attending rewards trips and attending extra-curricular activities is at least 30% PP.</p> <p>Outcome: Not met. Of the students attending rewards trips and attending extra-curricular activities at GS, 25% were disadvantaged students in 22/23</p>
Develop curriculum plans to more precisely and effectively support disadvantaged students' needs	<p>Student Progress Plans and Curriculum Reviews indicate that teachers identify, plans and deliver precise Wave 1 interventions to support the progress of disadvantaged students</p> <p>Outcome: Met. Quality of Education reviews indicate that subject teachers are more skilled in using evidence-informed strategies and</p>

	in-class interventions. Student Progress Plans are monitored and re-teaching strategies such as modelling and use of the visualiser are used more confidently. Whole school learning routines: Do Now, non-verbal signals and questioning have been developed and are used effectively in most subjects
Improve the Alternative Provision curriculum to support the academic needs of the most vulnerable disadvantaged learners	PP students in Alternative Provision follow a range of courses, including GCSE English, Maths and Science, to provide skills and qualifications to enable the students to pursue suitable education and employment. Outcome: Met. THRIVE students had access to GCSE English, Maths and Biology or Physics through teachers and HLTAs. All graded in English, 2 of 5 graded in maths and 4 of 5 graded in science
Improve the social and emotional resilience of disadvantaged students, developing more robust and effective meta-cognition and self-regulation	Teachers and pastoral staff develop greater expertise in using evidence-based strategies and systems so that all students are capable and keen to learn, act on feedback and work independently at home and at school. Outcome: Partially met. EBSA training for pastoral staff, THRIVE/YM solution focussed coaching training, in use daily with students. Case studies show impact on individuals but not on all students.

## 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

