



**SECONDARY  
PUPIL PREMIUM  
POLICY**

**2017 - 2018**



Description	Tag
The Principal of the academy	Delia Smith
The academic year	2017/18
Chair of Governors	Patrick Wall
The academy name	Ark Academy

## POLICY INFORMATION

### Named personnel with designated responsibility

Academic year	Designated Senior person	Deputy Designated Senior person	Nominated Governor	Chair of Governors
2017/18	Delia Smith	Aishling Ryan		Patrick Wall

### Policy review dates (frequency of review: tbc)

Review Date	Changes made	By whom
October 2017	Policy reviewed	Delia Smith

# INTRODUCTION

---

The Pupil Premium was introduced to help schools to close the attainment gap between disadvantaged pupils and their peers. It is based on eligibility for Free School Meals (NB – this is a means-tested measure, not related to Universal Infant Free School Meals (UIFSM) or the school meals provided free-of-charge to primary school pupils in areas such as Southwark).

In the 2016 to 2017 financial year, schools will receive the following funding for each child registered as eligible for free school meals at any point in the last 6 years:

- £935 for pupils in year 7 to year 11

Schools will also receive £1,900 for each pupil who has left local-authority care because of 1 of the following:

- adoption
- a special guardianship order
- a child arrangements order
- a residence order

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/pupil-premium-information-for-schools-and-alternative-provision-settings>

Each school must publish an account of their Pupil Premium spending each academic year. As a minimum, the same information should be reported to governors. This must include:

- The school's Pupil Premium allocation for the current academic year
- Details of how the school intends to spend the allocation
- Details of how the school spent its previous academic year's allocation
- How it made a difference to the attainment of disadvantaged pupils

## YEAR 7 LITERACY AND NUMERACY CATCH-UP PREMIUM (SECONDARY SCHOOLS)

---

### **Background**

The literacy and numeracy catch-up premium gives schools additional funding to support year 7 pupils who did not achieve at least level 4 in reading and/or maths at the end of key stage 2 (KS2).

### **Reporting / publication requirements**

The school must publish details of how it spends this funding and the effect this has had on the attainment of the pupils who attract it.

The following must be included:

- Year 7 literacy and numeracy catch-up premium allocation for the current academic year
- Details of how the school intends to spend the allocation
- Details of how the school spent the previous academic year's allocation
- How it made a difference to the attainment of the pupils who attract the funding

## PUPIL PREMIUM STRATEGY STATEMENT: SECONDARY

---

Summary Information					
School	ARK ACADEMY				
Academic Year	2017/18	Total PP budget	413,600	Date of most recent PP Review	10/2017
Total number of pupils	1126	Number of pupils eligible for PP	431	Date for next internal review of this strategy	2/2018

Current Attainment		
	Pupils eligible for PP (your school)	Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)
% of PP pupils achieving 9-4 in English & Maths	73%	77%
% of PP pupils achieving 9-5 in English & Maths	46%	70%
Progress 8	+0.3	+0.6
Attainment 8	4.7	5.5

<b>Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)</b>		
<b>In-school barriers</b> (issues to be addressed in school, such as poor literacy skills)		
A	Literacy skills on entry to Year 7 are lower which slows progress across the curriculum and remain lower than in KS3 than required for new GCSE curriculum	
B	Some higher attaining pupils on entry who are eligible for PP are making less progress than other high ability students. Also a specific group of middle attaining PP pupils on entry of black/black British boys make less progress than peers	
C	A higher percentage of PP students experience social, emotional and mental health issues (SEMH) which affects behaviour and attendance and therefore has a detrimental effect on progress	
<b>External barriers</b> (issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)		
D.	1. Lack of support with learning at home and a lack of engagement of parents of pupils who are most vulnerable to underachievement.	
	2. A higher percentage of students in older years (Yrs 9-11) have affiliations with, or are strongly influenced by, gang culture leading to disaffection from school.	
	3. There are increasing numbers of social care involvement with a significant minority of families.	
<b>Desired outcomes (desired outcomes and how they will be measured)</b>		Success criteria
A	Improved literacy/reading skills for pupils eligible for PP in Year 7	PP pupils inY7 make rapid progress by the end of the year, so that all PP pupils at least meet access to curriculum reading age of 9.6 years
B	Improved rates of progress for specific sub groups of PP students: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High attainers on entry</li> <li>• Middle attainers on entry, black british boys who are making less progress than peers</li> </ul>	Such pupils make as much progress as non PP students by end of KS4 in maths and English and are as successful in Ebacc subjects and in overall progress 8 and attainment 8 scores.
C	SEMH issues of identified groups of PP students are further addressed	Fewer behaviour incidents recorded for these pupils

Planned Expenditure						
Academic year	2017/18					
i. Quality of teaching for all						
Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	What is the evidence and rationale to inform this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	Review	Cost
Improve reading outcomes in Year 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue Lexia Programme in Year 7</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Programme implemented successfully last year</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All new Year 7 tutors trained</li> <li>All students attend weekly post school session</li> </ul>	HOY/ Lexia Co-ord	Jan and July 2018	49,500
Improve staff understanding and delivery of literacy across subjects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whole staff training on close reading</li> <li>Whole school approach to tier two vocabulary teaching</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Training in close reading had impact in 2016/2017 in post 16 teaching.</li> <li>Staff recognise need to increase academic reading in subjects and expand in order to improve access to curriculum</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Academy Improvement Plan priority</li> <li>Whole school training followed by pilots on vocab.com in History and English</li> </ul>	VP T&L	Jan and July 2018	10,000
Expand curriculum time in Year 7 and 8 English Improve grammar teaching accuracy and English language	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expand curriculum time from 5ppw to 6ppw</li> <li>Enable focus on grammar</li> <li>English department delivery pre work on grammar on daily basis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build on SPAG work from primary and ensure spiralled through curriculum</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All English staff trained in delivery focus on co-planning</li> <li>Tracking of pre work and daily follow up</li> </ul>	HOD English	After assessment points	45,000

Planned Expenditure						
Academic year	2017/18					
i. Quality of teaching for all (continued)						
Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	What is the evidence and rationale to inform this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	Review	Cost
Improve outcomes across KS3&4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Six form intake into 7 classes Year 7 – 11</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Better quality of teaching focussed on needs of students.</li> <li>More personalised use of support for students with higher levels of needs, faster progression and higher attainment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Co-planning time and deployment of experienced teachers</li> <li>Co-teachers trained by experienced staff.</li> </ul>	VP Curr. & ass		50,000
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supported in key groups by co-teachers for groups with greatest needs</li> </ul>			HOD		110,000
<b>Total budgeted cost</b>						<b>£264,500</b>

**Planned Expenditure 2017/18**

**ii. Targeted Support**

<b>Desired outcome</b>	<b>Chosen action / approach</b>	<b>What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?</b>	<b>How will you ensure it is implemented well?</b>	<b>Staff Lead</b>	<b>When will you review?</b>	<b>Cost</b>
Extend literacy support to key underachieving groups in Year 8	<b>In Year 8</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 30 students identified</li> <li>• 15 students Lexia continue</li> <li>• 7 students in small group reading</li> <li>• 7 EAL targeted support (17 PP Students)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lexia impact from Year 7</li> <li>• Focus on students in Year 8 who remain at low reading age</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Year 8 teachers trained on Lexia</li> <li>• SENCO and EAL lead experienced at delivery</li> <li>• Small group work</li> <li>• Additional time identified in curriculum (P7)</li> </ul>	VP T&L	Jan and July 2018	25,000
<b>Year 9</b> – Improve literacy for group of low literacy students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 groups identified and withdrawn from MFL (2ppw) for additional literacy support</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading ages low</li> <li>• English grade low and progress slow</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SOW planned and progress reviewed at key assessment points</li> </ul>	EAL Co-ord. SENCO	Jan and July 2018	10,000
EAL withdrawal Years 7 – 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small group and 1:1 support for students with very low levels of English</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students unable to access full curriculum due to language barriers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experienced EAL staff</li> <li>• Analysis of progress at each key assessment point</li> </ul>	EAL Co-ord.	Jan and July 2018	32,000
<b>Total cost:</b>						<b>£67,000</b>



**Planned Expenditure 2017/18**

**ii. Targeted Support**

<b>Desired outcome</b>	<b>Chosen action / approach</b>	<b>What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?</b>	<b>How will you ensure it is implemented well?</b>	<b>Staff Lead</b>	<b>When will you review?</b>	<b>Cost</b>
Improved outcomes for KS4 students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Academic catch up/support sessions in additional timetable time (P.7) with key staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rational based on previous cohort progress. Focussed on underperforming Pupil Premium and/or high attaining on entry who are under performing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key staff focus on small group of students</li> <li>- Targeted in Autumn 2017 in <b>Year 11</b> 199 students targeted for range of subjects of these 126 are pupil premium students</li> <li>- In <b>Year 10</b> 59 out of 114 students targeted are pupil premium</li> <li>Subjects offered will change in spring term</li> </ul>	Assistant Principal	Jan and April 2018	£45,000
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Saturday and holiday sessions for targeted students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on previous experience, additional time for students who are under performing or disengaged who might not revise if left to own devices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Well publicised, promoted and parents informed. Key staff lead sessions</li> </ul>	Assistant Principal	Jan and April 2018	£15,000
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mentoring of targeted KS4 students by staff and sixth formers</li> <li>1:1 With closely matched mentors (29 students all PP)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rationale based on previous cohort provision and progress (see GCSE results 2017)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Post mocks an additional 'harder to reach group' is identified</li> <li>All experienced mentors</li> <li>Attendance at mentoring is tracked</li> </ul>	Assistant Principal	Jan and April 2018	£20,000
<b>Total cost:</b>						<b>80,000</b>

iii. Other Approaches						
Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?	Cost
Support for underachieving SEMH students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dedicated behaviour mentors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In school support to provide stability, advice and strategies for vulnerable students often with severely dysfunctional lives. In 2016/2017 69 students were mentored of whom 48 are PP.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Experience of team</li> </ul>	Assistant Principal	Termly	52,000
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Counselling support/ TAMHS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduction in behaviour incidents, exclusions and improved attendance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data evidence</li> </ul>			14,000
<b>Total cost:</b>						<b>£66,000</b>

Review of Expenditure				
Previous Academic Year		2016/17		
(i) Quality of Teaching for all				
Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost
Improved Year 7 literacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lexia reading programme across Year 7 in additional period for all student</li> <li>Staff intensive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Average reading age increased from 102.7 in September to 104.2 in July</li> <li>90 of 177 registered as PP in Year 7 increased from 102.5 to 103.4</li> <li>87% reading on or above 9 year 7 months</li> <li>45 students finished programme, 47 nearly competed (on level 4 or 5)</li> <li>Spike in Lexia useage over school holidays encouraged by targeted awards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lexia proved a challenge for even highest attaining students and should therefore continue</li> <li>13% of students remain &lt;9 years 7 months acceptable reading age.</li> <li>1:1 Provision for weakest students needs reviewing</li> <li>Need to carry programme into Year 8 for identified group (16 are PP)</li> <li>Identified 3 groups totalling 29 students</li> </ul>	49,500
Improve reading engagement across KS3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Train all tutors in KS3 in development of reading techniques</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English department worked closely with library</li> <li>Whole school Literacy Festival – successful in raising profile of reading</li> <li>Increase in take up of library books during week – went up by 45% during and two weeks after festival</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approach was too loose and required a wide variety of staff maintain a log with limited time</li> <li>Difficult to maintain library uptake after Festival ends</li> <li>Further training needed on literacy and academic reading embedded into subject areas (planned for 2017/2018)</li> <li>We will re-launch the reading log in final week before half term. Log will delivered through English lesson then tutor time</li> </ul>	10,000

Review of Expenditure				
Previous Academic Year		2016/17		
(i) Quality of Teaching for all (continued)				
Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost
Benefit from KS2 literacy developments to improve literacy teaching in KS3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to cross-observe Years 5-7 develop shared understanding of literacy strategies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Year 7 and Year 6 teachers observed English lessons. Increased understanding of key programmes in primary Talk for Writing</li> <li>Literacy Day with Year 7 and 6 students took place</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Broad lessons learned</li> <li>Not enough detailed work</li> <li>More detailed specific planning required built into planning strategy for cross phase development</li> <li>Now key issue in Academy Improvement Plan 2017/2018</li> </ul>	10,000
Improved outcomes in GCSE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Six form intake into 7 classes Years 7-11</li> <li>Additional teacher capacity supporting groups with greatest need</li> <li>Close vetting of maths/English groups</li> <li>Co-teaching and TAs deployed to support sets with highest needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved progress and attainment in Year 11 GCSE</li> <li>75% (5% increase) in students attaining pass both English and maths</li> <li>Progress in both English and maths is above the national and maths significantly better</li> <li>Significant gains in English Literature (82%)</li> <li>Increase in percentages of 5+ strong passes (9-5) enabling more student to be eligible for sixth form</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>KS4 approaches are working well</li> <li>Increase focus on progress/attainment in KS3 now we have better understanding of 9:1</li> </ul>	50,000
				140,000
<b>Total budgeted cost</b>				<b>£259,000</b>

Review of Expenditure				
Previous Academic Year	2016/17			
(ii) Targeted Support				
Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost
Improve outcomes for targeted KS4 students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1:1 academic mentoring of key students, 47 students in Year 11 (36 PP)</li> <li>Moving forward programme post mock 1</li> <li>Study support programme in Year 10 and 11 and holiday revision programmes</li> <li>Focus on key students successful in either English or maths but not both</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>56% of year group were Pupil Premium</li> <li>Increased percentage of PP students achieved both English and maths at grade 4+73% (only 2% lower than whole cohort)</li> <li>Excellent buy in from majority mentored</li> <li>All PP students with high attainment on entry were allocated specific targets by class teacher post mocks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focussing on fewer students in specific categories improved impact</li> <li>Identify key underachievers earlier in KS4</li> </ul>	20,500
				60,500
Additional set in Year 7 for students needing literacy/numeracy catch up				19,000
<b>Total budgeted cost :</b>				<b>£100,000</b>

Review of Expenditure				
Previous Academic Year		2016/17		
(iii) Other approach				
Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost
Improved engagement of underachieving Somali heritage students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mentoring/1:1 alternative provision for disaffected students in danger of permanent exclusion</li> <li>Strong contact/relationship with hard to reach parents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>X students received either 1:1 Mentoring or a period of time at Bright Education</li> <li>Y students remained on track to take GCSEs at Ark</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify students as early as possible in Year 10 (this is a provision for KS\$0)</li> </ul>	40,000
Support for students with SEMH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dedicated behaviour mentors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In school support to provide stability, advice and strategies for vulnerable students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data evidence</li> </ul>	52,00
<b>Total budgeted cost :</b>				<b>£92,000</b>

## Performance of Pupils in Receipt of Pupil Premium at the end of KS4

<b>PERFORMANCE OF PP ELIGIBLE PUPILS AT THE END OF KS4 – ATTAINMENT 2016 – 2017</b>					
Average Progress 8 score of PP pupils	2015	<b>0.4</b>	Estimated Progress 8 score of PP pupils	2017	<b>0.3</b>
	2016	<b>0.22</b>			
Average Attainment 8 score of PP pupils	2015	<b>5.1</b>	Average Attainment 8 score of PP pupils	2017	<b>4.7</b>
	2016	<b>5.1</b>			
% of PP pupils achieving A*-C in English & Maths	2015	<b>56%</b>	% of PP pupils achieving 9 - 4 in English & Maths	2017	<b>73%</b>
	2016	<b>65%</b>			
			% of PP pupils achieving 9 - 5 in English & Maths	2017	<b>46%</b>
% of PP pupils achieving English Baccalaureate	2015	<b>33%</b>	% of PP pupils achieving English Baccalaureate	2017	<b>26%</b>
	2016	<b>35%</b>			
% of PP pupils achieving 5 A*-B	2015	<b>38.60%</b>	% of PP pupils achieving 5+ 9-4 inc E&M	2017	<b>66%</b>
	2016	<b>41.50%</b>			
English – Expected Progress KS2 to 4	2015	<b>65%</b>			
	2016	<b>82%</b>			
English – Exceeding Expected Progress KS2 to 4	2015	<b>25%</b>			
	2016	<b>48%</b>			
Maths – Expected Progress KS2 to 4	2015	<b>90%</b>			
	2016	<b>87%</b>			
Maths – Exceeding Expected Progress KS2 to 4	2015	<b>47%</b>			
	2016	<b>51%</b>			
<b>DIMINISHING THE DIFFERENCES (difference +/- between PP and non-PP pupils) 2015 2016</b>					
Average Progress 8 score of PP and non-PP pupils	2015	<b>-0.2</b>	Average Progress 8 score of PP and non-PP pupils	2017	<b>-0.3</b>
	2016	<b>-0.22</b>			
Average Attainment 8 score of PP and non-PP pupils	2015	<b>-0.8</b>	Average Attainment 8 score of PP and non-PP pupils	2017	<b>-0.8</b>
	2016	<b>-0.4</b>			
% of pupils achieving A*C in English & Maths	2015	<b>-19%</b>	% of pupils achieving 9 - 4 in English & Maths	2017	<b>-4%</b>
	2016	<b>-8%</b>			
% of PP pupils achieving English Baccalaureate	2015	<b>-22%</b>	% of PP pupils achieving English Baccalaureate	2017	<b>-21%</b>
	2016	<b>-7%</b>			
% of pupils achieving 5 A*-B	2015	<b>-29.50%</b>	% of PP pupils achieving 5+ 9-4 inc E&M	2017	<b>-10%</b>
	2016	<b>-3.30%</b>			

