6. Planned expenditure for 2018/19.

Number of students:

	Income per pupil	Number of Pupils
Pupil premium students	£935	172
Looked after Children	£1900	6
Services students	£300	9
Predicted Pupil premium Funding		£174,920

7. Action plan for Pupil Premium Spending 2018/19

The spending has been split into three key areas:

A: Achievement: Improving attainment and progress.

B: Welfare and improving attendance and behaviour.

C: Enrichment and improving access.

Achievement: Improving attainment and progress.

Intervention	Actions	Research (Source: EEF foundation)	Spending	Monitoring and Review
Smaller class sizes for KS4 Maths and English students	• Increase the proportion of PP students who are taught in classes of less than 20 to ensure that they receive individualised support for their studies. • Allows teachers to adjust their teaching styles to allow more teaching to be focussed on meeting the needs of more students. • Greater depth of feedback and more personalised feedback can be given in smaller classes.	• Overall, there is a relatively consistent finding that smaller classes are associated with slightly higher attainment when other factors are controlled for and when class sizes have been deliberately reduced in experimental evaluations. • One difficulty in interpreting the evidence about class size is that many countries or schools already teach lower-attaining pupils in smaller groups. • The strongest evidence comes from research into primary schools in the USA where the benefits appear to be sustained for three to four years when classes are reduced below 18. There is some evidence that pupils in disadvantaged areas in the UK benefit from classes of fewer than 20 pupils in primary schools.	Spending on staffing £40,000	Through assessment point data in standard reports. Learning walks

| Extending school time | • Use of after school library provision to all students to revise in quiet area after school.
• Staff time to publicise after school revision to students.
• Staff time to organise period 6 (compulsory after school revision) for PP students.
• Use of holiday time to provide catch up and intervention for under-performing students. | • The research also indicates that attracting and retaining pupils in before and after school programmes is harder at secondary level than at primary level. To be successful, any increases in school time should be supported by both parents and staff, and extreme increases (for example more than nine hours of schooling per day in total) do not appear to be additionally beneficial.
• In addition to providing academic support, some school programmes aim to provide stimulating environments and activities or develop additional personal and social skills. These programmes are more likely to have an impact on attainment than those that are solely academic in focus. However, it is not clear whether this is due to the additional activities or to improved attendance and better engagement.
• The evidence indicates that, on average, pupils make two additional months' progress per year from extended school time and in particular through the targeted use of before and after school programmes. There is some evidence that disadvantaged pupils benefit more, making closer to three months' additional progress. There are also often wider benefits for low-income students, such as increased attendance at school, improved behaviour, and better relationships with peers. | Staff time = £5,000 | SLT to monitor whole school |

Identifying PP students in most need of funding.	• All staff in all departments to identify students who needs extra support and intervention in areas such as attendance, effort, homework, literacy, numeracy and behaviour (RAG rating) • Document analysed and as a result key students identified at class, department and whole school level.	• There is no evidence base on Identifying PP students in most need of funding.	Staff time to complete and analyse £1,000	Documents complete. Key students identified.
External revision Input	• Students to attend English and maths PIXL conferences • Students attend PIXL higher education courses. • Students to attend NLEC revision events, funded by the school, including nightclub.	• There is no evidence base on external revision input.	Transport costs and staff time for conferences + conference fees = £3000.	AK to monitor working alongside subject leaders as PIXL lead
Departmental interventions	• Subject leaders to bid for money in order to improve PP outcomes in their subject area. • Students to have the opportunity to be given to purchase revision materials and stationery.	• There is no evidence base on departmental interventions.	Up to £1000 per department x 10 = £10,000	Subject leader to monitor PP performance in standards reports Line Manager to monitor academic progress in meetings Requests to AK to liaise with RH – PM to track

Greater information sharing.	• Staff to have a "Barriers" to learning" document where they are able to clearly understand the current progress of each student and their barriers to learning, including any pastoral support. • Staff use the above document and their knowledge of students to produce context sheets in lessons where specific interventions are put in place to improve provision for these students. • SLT to review context sheets and share examples of good practice. • Staff as a result are more aware of students' challenges and plan accordingly.	• There is no evidence base on greater information sharing.	Staff time To create, develop and monitor £3,000	Assessment data Learning walks SLT to review.
Tutor time intervention of English, Maths and Science	• English, Maths, RE and Science teacher removed from tutor time • Small group of students removed from Tutor Time. • PLC's to inform nature of intervention	• There is no evidence base on use of tutor time.	Cost of staffing: £3,000	Reviewed at leadership level half termly – departmentally every 4 weeks Students determined by AK through assessment data.
Timetable changes to improve performance	• Students underperforming in option subjects to be removed in order to improve performance in English and Maths, especially Key Marginal students at grade 5.	• There is no evidence base on timetable changes.	Cost of staffing £5000	AK to liaise with subject leaders and to compile alternative provision for students

| Improve quality of feedback for PP students | • Introduction of PP first so that feedback is given to PP students first.
• Whole staff INSET on PP first.
• All staff aware of the impact of quality feedback on the progress of PP students.
• Extra consideration should be given to the progress in books of PP students. | • Feedback studies tend to show very high effects on learning. However, it also has a very high range of effects and some studies show that feedback can have negative effects and make things worse. It is therefore important to understand the potential benefits and the possible limitations of feedback as a teaching and learning approach. In general, research-based approaches that explicitly aim to provide feedback to learners, such as Bloom's 'mastery learning', tend to have a positive impact. Feedback has effects across all age groups. Research in schools has focused particularly on its impact on English, mathematics and, to a lesser extent, science.
• Research evidence about feedback was part of the rationale for Assessment for Learning (AfL). One evaluation of AfL indicated an impact of half of a GCSE grade per student per subject is achievable, which would be in line with the wider evidence about feedback.
• Other studies reporting lower impact indicate that it is challenging to improve the quality of feedback in the classroom. This has also been demonstrated in a recent EEF pilot study where teachers tried to apply the evidence on feedback through an action research approach. | Staff time for feedback and INSET: £3,000 | Learning walks

Work scrutiny

Student feedback.

Departmental meetings. |

| Reading | • Students assessed in Year 7 baseline to ascertain reading age.
• Students in Y7 given homework relevant to a subject that is specific to reading.
• PIXL reading programme in use in school with those students who are behind.
• Extra set in Year 7 English to accelerated progress in Reading | • On average, reading comprehension approaches deliver an additional six months' progress. Successful reading comprehension approaches allow activities to be carefully tailored to pupils' reading capabilities, and involve activities and texts that provide an effective.
• Many of the approaches can be usefully combined with Collaborative learning techniques and Phonics to develop reading skills. The use of techniques such as graphic organisers and drawing pupils' attention to text features are likely to be particularly useful when reading expository or information texts.
• There are some indications that computer-based tutoring approaches can be successful in improving reading comprehension (although the evidence is less robust in this area), particularly when they focus on the development of strategies and self-questioning skills.
• Comparative findings indicate that reading comprehension approaches appear to be more effective than Phonics or Oral language approaches for upper secondary pupils, for both short-term and long-term impact. However, supporting struggling readers is likely to require a coordinated effort across the curriculum and a combination of approaches. | Staff time: £10,000

Cost of materials: £2,000

Cost of Y7 baseline £2,000

Total: £14,000 | English department meeting.

Progress data

Reading data at beginning and end of year. |

| Use of digital technologies | • Funding of GCSE pod for PP students in Y11 to allow them to use independent learning strategies to improve attainment.
• Use of PIXL apps in areas such as Maths, English Literature and Geography.
• Use of other in school applications including Kerboodle and Mathswatch.
• Use of ICT facilities in school to allow students access to digital technologies. | • Studies consistently find that digital technology is associated with moderate learning gains: on average, an additional four months' progress. However, there is considerable variation in impact.
• Evidence suggests that technology approaches should be used to supplement other teaching, rather than replace more traditional approaches. It is unlikely that particular technologies bring about changes in learning directly, but some have the potential to enable changes in teaching and learning interactions. For example, they can support teachers to provide more effective feedback or use more helpful representations, or they can motivate students to practise more.
• Studies suggest that approaches which individualise learning with technology (such as one to one laptop provision where pupils work through learning activities at their own pace, or individual use of drill and practice software) may not be as helpful as small group learning with technology or the collaborative use of technology.
• There is clear evidence that digital technology approaches are more beneficial for writing and mathematics practice than spelling and problem solving, and there is some evidence that they are more effective with young learners. | Cost of subscriptions

£6,000 | Assessment Point outcomes.

Through department meetings.

Student feedback. |

Peer tutoring of Year 11 students.	• Year 12 students from JLC to tutor key marginal PP students in Year 11. • PP students arranged in small groups, intervention to be completed every Tuesday. • Y12 students to work weekly one to one with PP students who are in danger of falling behind. • Monitored by staff who are present during the sessions. • Y12 students are given areas of weakness of students by staff. • Y12 plan sessions assisted by St Bede's Maths department.	• Overall, the introduction of peer tutoring approaches appears to have a positive impact on learning, with an average positive effect equivalent to approximately five additional months' progress. Studies have identified benefits for both tutors and tutees, and for a wide range of age groups. Though all types of pupils appear to benefit from peer tutoring, there is some evidence that pupils who are low-attaining and those with special educational needs make the biggest gains. • Peer tutoring appears to be particularly effective when pupils are provided with support to ensure that the quality of peer interaction is high: for example, questioning frames to use in tutoring sessions, and training and feedback for tutors. In cross-age peer tutoring some studies have found that a two-year age gap is beneficial and that intensive blocks of tutoring are more effective than longer programmes. • Peer tutoring appears to be more effective when the approach supplements or enhances normal teaching, rather than replaces it. This suggests that peer tutoring is most effectively used to consolidate learning, rather than to introduce new material.	Payment to two Y12 students: £10 per session x 40 sessions + 26% oncosts = £1008 Costs of DBS and pre-employment checks: £200 Cost of SB staff to organise: £500 Total: £1708	Monitoring of progress by department Reviewed at each assessment point AK to coordinate and monitor

Welfare and improving attendance and behaviour.

Mentoring	• Meeting with mentors • All Y11 assigned a mentor for the year. • Regular meetings with mentors • Interventions as a result of discussions to be personalised • Point of contact for all staff. • Organisation of mentoring for FORCE students.	• On average, mentoring appears to have little or no positive impact on academic outcomes. The impacts of individual programmes vary. Some studies have found positive impacts for pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds, and for non-academic outcomes such as attitudes to school, attendance and behaviour. However, there are risks associated with unsuccessful mentor pairings, which may have a detrimental effect on the mentee, and some studies report negative overall impacts. • School-based mentoring programmes appear to be less effective than community-based approaches, possibly because school-based mentoring can result in fewer opportunities for young people to develop more lasting and trusting relationships with adult role models. • Programmes which have a clear structure and expectations, provide training and support for mentors, and use mentors from a professional background, are associated with more successful outcomes.	Organisational costs of FORCE: £1,000 Cost of tutoring – staff time = £2,000 Total: £3,000	Monitored throughout and data at each assessment point AK to meet with mentors regularly

| Engagement with parents | • English, Maths and Science information evening.
• Y11 parents evening for PP students.
• Administration time for contacting parents in respect of attendance and lates.
• Arrange an afternoon/ afterschool session for PP parents specifically to discuss ways to help
• Use of mentors, house leaders and EWO to engage with parents.
• Y7 surgery to focus on PP parents to increase engagement so they meet specifically with HL. | • Although parental engagement is consistently associated with pupils' success at school, the evidence about how to improve attainment by increasing parental engagement is mixed and much less conclusive, particularly for disadvantaged families.
• Two recent meta-analyses from the USA suggested that increasing parental engagement in primary and secondary schools had on average two to three months' positive impact. There is some evidence that supporting parents with their first child will have benefits for siblings. However, there are also examples where combining parental engagement strategies with other interventions, such as extended early years provision, has not been associated with any additional educational benefit. This suggests that developing effective parental engagement to improve their children's attainment is challenging and needs careful monitoring and evaluation.
• Parents' aspirations also appear to be important for pupil outcomes, although there is limited evidence to show that intervening to change parents' aspirations will raise their children's aspirations and achievement over the longer term.
• EEF has tested a number of interventions designed to improve pupils' outcomes by engaging parents in different types of skills development. The consistent message from these has been that it is | % of EWO wages

% of SLO wages.

Staff time

Parent event costs

£16,000 | Line Manager meetings with Attendance Officer and EWO

AK to monitor House Leader and mentor communications with Parents and act on outcomes |

		difficult to engage parents in programmes. A trial which aimed to prompt greater parental engagement through text message alerts delivered a small positive impact, at very low cost.		
Team around the child	• The academy to develop the Pastoral team which interventions to be quicker and have greater impact. • Tracking of behaviour of PP students and sharing of good practice. • Attendance officer tracking the lateness and absence of PP students and informing parents straight away when students are not and if necessary conducting home visits. • EWO and Assistant safeguarding officer working extremely closely with vulnerable PP students who are in danger of either not attending school or having extreme problems at home. • EWO and safeguarding team to work closely with parents of vulnerable PP students.	• On average, SEL (Social and Emotional Learning) interventions have an identifiable and valuable impact on attitudes to learning and social relationships in school. They also have an average overall impact of four months' additional progress on attainment. • Although SEL interventions are almost always perceived to improve emotional or attitudinal outcomes, not all interventions are equally effective at raising attainment. Improvements appear more likely when SEL approaches are embedded into routine educational practices and supported by professional development and training for staff. In addition, the implementation of the programme and the degree to which teachers are committed to the approach appear to be important. • SEL programmes appear to be particularly beneficial for disadvantaged or low-attaining pupils. • SEL approaches have been found to be effective in primary and secondary schools, and early years setting.	% of KH wages = £7,000	C Poms House leaders to monitor using go4schools LB to lead tracking and monitoring

| Behaviour Interventions | • Use of external agencies and consultants to work with PP students who have the most challenging behaviours.
• Use of House Leaders and SLT time to provide intervention to behaviours of PP students, including the use of parental support.
• Use of time for analysis of behaviour of PP students.
• Use of behavioural support worker in school to support PP students in the classroom. | • Evidence suggests that, on average, behaviour interventions can produce moderate improvements in academic performance along with a decrease in problematic behaviours. However, estimated benefits vary widely across the categories of programme described above. Impacts are larger for targeted interventions matched to specific students with particular needs or behavioural issues than for universal interventions or whole school strategies. School-level behaviour approaches are often related to improvements in attainment, but there is a lack of evidence to show that the improvements are actually caused by the behaviour interventions, rather than other school interventions happening the same time. Parental and community involvement programmes are often associated with reported improvements in school ethos or discipline and so are worth considering as alternatives to direct behaviour interventions.
• Approaches such as improving teachers' behaviour management and pupils' cognitive and social skills seem effective.
• The majority of studies report higher impact with older pupils. There is some anecdotal evidence about the benefits of reducing problematic behaviour of disruptive pupils on the attainment of their classmates, but this is an understudied dimension in evaluations of behaviour. | % of HL + SLT wages = £3,000

Cost of external support = £3,000

Behaviour worker = £15,000

Total: £21,000 | |

Enrichment and improving access.

Breakfast club	• Extend Breakfast club to more days. • Publicise it to more students who would benefit through tutors and HL. • Use forum to publicise interventions from Science/ English / Maths • Ask other staff to assist with organisation.	• There is no evidence base on ring-fenced funding for breakfast club.	Materials: £2,000	KBa meet with SL and TH regularly
Engaging with force	• Identify PP students who are in the postcodes identified • Review impact • Organisational time.	• There is no evidence base on ring-fenced funding for engaging with FORCE.	Staff time organisation = £1,000	Review of effectiveness through questionnaires and exit data.
Educational Visits	• Briars trip • Ski trip • German / French trips • Art trip to the deep	• There is no evidence base educational visits.	£5,000	Requests sent to AK – liaise with RH – PM to track
Outdoor adventure Learning	• Y11 students to participate in revision weekend in May at PGL adventure centre in Lincolnshire.	• Overall, studies of adventure learning interventions consistently show positive benefits on academic learning. On average, pupils who participate in adventure learning interventions make approximately four additional months' progress. There is also evidence of an impact on non-cognitive outcomes such as self-confidence. • The evidence suggests that the impact is greater for more vulnerable students and older learners (teenagers), longer courses (more than a week), and those in a 'wilderness' setting, though other types of intervention still show some positive impacts.	£1,000	Requests sent to AK – liaise with RH – PM to track

		• Overall, studies of adventure learning interventions consistently show positive benefits on academic learning. On average, pupils who participate in adventure learning interventions make approximately four additional months' progress. There is also evidence of an impact on non-cognitive outcomes such as self-confidence.		
Increasing engagement in extracurricular activities.	• Track the engagement of PP students with extra-curricular activities. • Publicise the provision specifically to vulnerable PP students.	• There is no evidence base on increasing engagement in extracurricular activities.	Staff Time £1,000	DF to monitor PP involvement.
Increase in Arts participation	Music workshop • Music service day of trying musical instruments for KS3 • Students invited to try instruments • Music lessons in groups provided with the use of musical instruments • Possible formation of brass band/ wind band as a result Music Peripatetic lessons • Students studying music provided with help paying for Peripatetic lessons Taiko Drumming Workshop • Workshop run by external agency in November	• Overall, the impact of arts participation on academic learning appears to be positive but low. Improved outcomes have been identified in English, mathematics and science. Benefits have been found in both primary and secondary schools, with greater effects on average for younger learners and, in some cases, for disadvantaged pupils. • Some arts activities have been linked with improvements in specific outcomes. For example, there is some evidence of a positive link between music and spatial awareness and between drama and writing. • Wider benefits such as more positive attitudes to learning and increased well-being have also consistently been reported	£154.80 per child for 36 hours tuition x 20 students = £3,096 £130 x 7 KS3 pupils = £910 £390 x 7 KS4 pupils= £2730 £250 +£125 cover = £375 Total: £6201	Subject leader to monitor PP performance in standards reports Line Manager to monitor academic progress in meetings DFi in implementing and evaluating Evaluation by students

Increase aspirations through effective Careers Advice	• Engagement with York St John University for KS3 students to experience university. • Extra one to one careers interview for PP students to track application process. • Use of careers advisor to help with transition to post 16 • Use of careers advisor to allow students to experience possible career paths • Work in PSHCE to target PP students and work with them on developing pathways. • Launch of NLEC Health Academy, any associated costs will be met by the school.	• The relationship between aspirations and attainment is complex but, on average, interventions which aim to raise aspirations appear to have little or no positive impact on educational attainment. This may seem counterintuitive but there are three main reasons why this might be the case. • First, evidence suggests that most young people already have high aspirations, suggesting that much underachievement results not from low aspiration but from a gap between aspirations and the knowledge, skills, and characteristics required to achieve them. Second, where pupils do have lower aspirations, it is not clear that any targeted interventions have consistently succeeded in raising their aspirations. Third, where aspirations begin low and are successfully raised by an intervention, it is not clear that an improvement in learning necessarily follows. As a result it may be more helpful to focus directly on raising attainment. In aspiration programmes which do raise attainment, additional academic support is generally present.	Career Advisor time = £5,000	Maintain strong destination data. KG to monitor that interviews take place.

Transportation costs.	• To ensure that if PP are unable to afford travel to and from school then this will be funded. • No students are unable to attend after school revision or extra-curricular activities because they cannot afford transport home. • To ensure that all PP students are able to travel safely to and from school.	• There is no evidence base on transportation costs.	£2000	`Requests to AK to liaise with RH – PM/CG to track
Other spending				
Bespoke interventions for extenuating circumstances	• Students to access funds based on an individual needs basis	• There is no evidence base on interventions in extenuating circumstances.	£5,000	Requests to AK and RH on individual basis
Funding for LAC students	• Ring-fenced funding for the exclusive use of LAC students. • Funding given through PP bidding process by staff.	• There is no evidence base on ring-fenced funding for LAC students.	£5,000	Requests to AK and RH on individual basis
Total funding available			**£174,920**	
Total Spent			**£174,909**	

8. Date of next Pupil Premium review

Tuesday 16th October 2018