

## Pupil premium strategy / self- evaluation (secondary)

1. Summary information					
School	Scarborough UTC				
Academic Year	18/19	Total PP budget	<a href="#">£38 000</a>	Date of most recent PP Review	
Total number of pupils	149	Number of pupils eligible for PP	37	Date for next internal review of this strategy	<a href="#">04/19</a>

2. Current attainment		
	Pupils eligible for PP (your school)	Pupils not eligible for PP (national average 2016/17)
Progress 8 score average (Year 11 PPE)	-1.36	0.11
Attainment 8 score average (Year 11 PPE)	33.2	49.8
Progress 8 score average (Year 10 Autumn)		0.11
Attainment 8 score average (Year 10 Autumn)		49.8

Other attainment data. Note that P8 performance as reported in SISRA and national tables cannot accurately be applied to SUCT cohorts whom the college has only taught for the last two years of the five year P8 period. However, the differences noted below are still significant indicators of the difference in performance between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils within the college.

**Year 11 PPEs:** For this cohort 1 student is 1.3%. One disadvantaged pupil is 4.5% of that sub-group.

	Disadvantaged	Non-disadvantaged	National non-disadvantaged (national disadvantaged)
Positive P8 in English	33%	41%	
Positive P8 in mathematics	19%	21%	
9-5 in English and mathematics	5 (23%)	13 (25%)	49% (24%)
9-4 in English and mathematics	7 (32%)	20 (38%)	71% (44%)
9-7 English	5 (22%)	11 (20%)	
9-7 mathematics	2 (9%)	4 (7%)	
9-5 English	9 (41%)	27 (51%)	
9-5 mathematics	5 (23%)	14 (26%)	
9-4 English	12 (58%)	36(68%)	

9-4 mathematics	8 (36%)	21 (40%)	
Average entries per student (GCSE only)	9.8 (7.9)	10.0 (9.8)	

### 3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)

#### Academic barriers *(issues to be addressed in school, such as poor literacy skills)*

<b>A.</b>	A significant number of disadvantaged students have low literacy levels. Many do not read well and require support in their writing to be able to communicate their knowledge and understanding clearly and confidently.
<b>B.</b>	A significant number of disadvantaged students have less learning resilience and staying power. This is often shown through giving up on difficult tasks, not always reflecting on outcomes and feedback and taking appropriate actions, and not seeing the long-term benefits of making an extra effort now.
<b>C.</b>	Attainment at the end of KS2 is broadly similar for PP and non-PP, with a slightly higher number of non-PP with the highest levels. By the time they enter the college at the start of year 10, GL assessments show that non-PP students have begun to move ahead of PP students. So PP students starting at the college in year 10 have a prior attainment deficit compared to their non-PP peers, even though at the end of KS2 they were broadly in line.

#### Additional barriers *(including issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)*

<b>D.</b>	<p>1. Attendance is an issue for some PP students. In year 10, one of the two PP girls has very poor attendance. In year 11 there is poor attendance in the PP boys group. 8 of the 17 have attendance below 90%, and 15 of the 17 have attendance below that of non-PP year 11 boys (95.1%).</p> <p>2. Geographical issues – many students travel long distance to the college. This adds considerably to their already longer day (up to an additional 2½ hours for the furthest). This means that they have less time for homework and independent study. It also means that attendance is “binary” – if they are late for the college bus, or have a medical appointment, they cannot get to college so are absent (rather than just late or miss one session).</p> <p>3. Access to appropriate IT equipment. While almost all students have access to reliable internet connections, either through home internet access or mobile data, not all have access to a device suitable for completing college work electronically. With much work set and shared digitally, this might put them at a disadvantage.</p>
-----------	--

### 4. Intended outcomes *(specific outcomes and how they will be measured)*

#### Success criteria

<b>A.</b>	Literacy levels will improve for PP students. This will be measured through RA test before and after intervention and through improving grades, particularly in English but across all subjects.	Clear, measurable improvements in reading scores, as well as a greater proportion of PP students reaching or exceeding their targets. The difference
-----------	--	--

		between SUCT PP students and non-PP students nationally gets smaller.
<b>B.</b>	PP students will demonstrate greater staying power and learning resilience, as measured through improving ATL scores, better focus in lessons (more positive points for learning-related characteristics) and ultimately better results (though apportioning grade improvements to specific actions is a highly imprecise science).	More PP students are among those students with highest ATL scores and highest number of positive learning points. Improved grades (interims, PPE, Final). The difference between SUCT PP students and non-PP students nationally gets smaller.
<b>C.</b>	Teachers identify gaps in prior knowledge and understanding effectively and provide teaching and intervention that addresses these, so that these students do not fall further behind their peers. This will provide them with a stronger foundation for their further learning.	The achievement differences between SUCT PP students and non-PP students reduces, in the context of achievement rising for all. The difference between SUCT PP students and non-PP students nationally gets smaller.
<b>D.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Attendance of PP students improves, so that they do not miss vital learning time.</li> <li>2. All PP students have equal access to and opportunity to complete the required independent study and homework, and are able to (and enabled to) catch up with work when missed in school.</li> <li>3. All PP students have access to appropriate electronic devices to complete the work set.</li> </ol>	Attendance improves towards national. No gaps in homework or classwork for PP students who live at a distance from the college.

## 5. Planned expenditure

**Academic year**

**2018/19**

The three headings enable you to demonstrate how you are using the Pupil Premium to improve classroom pedagogy, provide targeted support and support whole school strategies.

### i. Quality of teaching for all

Action	Intended outcome	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
Developing the overall quality of teaching so that it addresses the needs and barriers of all learners, including those of PP students. This will be achieved through the on-going professional development programme, individual teacher support and by the recruitment of high quality teaching staff. Particular focus on feedback and questioning.	As a result of improving quality of teaching and learning, PP students make consistently strong progress; interventions are timely and effective.	Quality first teaching is, according to the available evidence, one of the best ways to ensure that all students make good progress. Feedback – EEF Toolkit high impact/low cost	Development programmes are planned into the calendar and evaluated and reported back to the governing board. Performance management processes will support and challenge the development of individual teachers. The college's normal monitoring and evaluation processes will indicate where the action is having the required effect.	NGR	Termly, with student progress also measured at data drops.
Ensuring that appropriate accurate tracking is in use by all subject areas so that the progress of PP students is regularly monitored against challenging targets (not fixed thresholds) and interventions are timely and effective.	All teachers, middle leaders and senior leaders have an accurate picture of the progress being made by PP students, and that the impact of intervention can be seen.	Being able to identify gaps in learning early and put intervention in place quickly prevents student falling behind. Challenging targets creates an aspirational culture for PP students, so that each is supported towards their potential, not just helped over a particular threshold that might limit their outcomes.	Subject meeting minutes showing discussion of progress. Normal monitoring and evaluation processes will show that teachers know their students well and will show how intervention is being used. Tracking systems will feed into a college-wide tracking process that will support intervention planning and QA of teaching and learning outcomes.	LKI	Through regular QA process, through pre-planned data drop analysis processes.

Leadership capacity. Invest in high quality directors of study who will drive improvement in their areas, supported by additional senior leadership capacity to kick-start or rapidly improve existing systems and processes. Support leadership development for middle leaders. Specific senior leadership champion of PP students.	Middle leaders become “the engine room of improvement”, and are well-supported and appropriately challenged by senior colleagues to constantly strive for improvement.	Strong and consistent leadership underpins successful improvement. Best practice as identified in <a href="#">The Pupil Premium: How schools are spending the funding successfully to maximise achievement, Ofsted</a> , is to ensure that there is a real drive from the very top.	Through effective LM processes, including at governor level. Evaluate the impact of middle leader development programmes.	LKI, RFE	Interim senior leadership capacity in place by Oct 2018. Permanent capacity by Jan 2019. Evaluating the impact of middle leader development programmes through normal PM process.
<b>Total budgeted cost</b>					<b>£15,000</b>
<b>ii. Targeted support</b>					
<b>Action</b>	<b>Intended outcome</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 implementation?</b>
Implementation of reading catch-up programme	Identify students whose reading age is behind where it should be and as a result of direct support and intervention see those scores improve.	Poor reading ability is a significant barrier to access the whole curriculum, and improving this key skill will help students to achieve well in all of their learning. EEF Toolkit – High impact/low cost	Capacity and time will be provided for specialist staff to lead and deliver the programme. Starting, interim and end scores will be analysed to check for impact.	HBR (RWH)	Half-termly
Delivery of targeted external intervention programmes, including PET-Xi for mathematics, to boost confident, plug gaps and deepen knowledge.	PP Students' confidence and outcomes improve.	Where students have reached year 11 and there are performance gaps, intensive intervention programmes can build confidence and improve outcomes. The college has previous experience of these programmes having a positive effect.	Students will be targeted based on current outcomes. Performance before and after intervention will be monitored, as well as improvement over longer term (between data drops) – though it is hard to isolate the impact of a particular short intervention over the longer period.	JCO, DoS, RFE(PP)	At end of each intervention and at data drops.

Delivery of 1:1 and small group intervention/tuition over medium term to provide targeted support where gaps in learning are identified.	Catch-up achieved for targeted students.	While evidence suggests that 1:1 is low impact for high cost, within our context of some available teaching capacity, the cost can be kept down.	Outcomes before, during and after any programme to be analysed	RFE, DoS	After each intervention programme and at data drops.
<b>Total budgeted cost</b>					<b>£12,000</b>

### iii. Other approaches

<b>Action</b>	<b>Intended outcome</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 implementation?</b>
Implementation of increased attendance intervention and pastoral support.	Investigate, challenge and support attendance issues more effectively so that attendance of targeted students improves.	Students need to be in school to learn. Particular pockets of poor attendance emerge from analysis and identified students can be identified and supported. The process often uncovers underlying barriers to attendance that appropriate pastoral support and other intervention can help to overcome.	Regular evaluation of attendance intervention to assess impact.	JCO	Half-termly attendance data, plus on-going attendance checks for targeted students.
Developing a strong independent study and homework culture, based on a clear policy that is well implemented by staff.	All students, including PP students, develop good habits of independent study. This will help them to prepare for examinations, to meet deadlines and to be more effective in future study.	Research shows that well-planned independent study can be moderate impact for low cost. Some PP students do not have well-developed independent study habits, and do not necessarily have a home environment that is conducive to doing so. Clear high expectations and monitoring of completion can help to motivate them.	Through normal monitoring and evaluation processes, including work scrutiny that always includes PP students in the sample.	JCO/NGR	Through each planned work scrutiny cycle.
Ensuring that IT devices are available for home use by those who need them.	All PP students have access on a par with their peers to digital learning.	While digital technology is considered in research to be moderate impact for moderate cost, the college has a significant focus on digital learning platforms and it is important that no student is left out of this for want of a device. There is no additional cost in the current financial period.	Through normal monitoring and evaluation processes.	NGR	On-going

Total budgeted cost

£8000

**6. Review of expenditure**

Previous Academic Year

(£34,595)

**i. Quality of teaching for all**

Action	Intended outcome	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
Development of quality of T&L, with a focus on quality feedback, sharing of clear learning outcomes.	Improved standards of T&L for all students results in better engagement, increased progress and improved student outcomes.	College data shows that the quality of T&L started to improve where there was stable staffing. The impact on outcomes for disadvantaged students is harder to evaluate. Outcomes were very poor for the entire year 11 cohort. As a group disadvantaged students did less well than their peers and achieved well below national non-disadvantaged. 2018 was the first set of results for the college, so it is not possible to describe a trend over time.	There is no doubt that the improvements in T&L are having some impact, but much of this work started late in the year, and its impact will more readily be seen in the following year's outcomes. Development of T&L practice will continue as a high priority.	£2000 (Contribution from PP)
<a href="#">Directors of Subject (x4)</a> appointed in year to increase leadership capacity to drive development of T&L	Stronger leadership of T&L development to support action above.	See above	See above.	£5000 (Contribution from PP)
Development of middle leaders	To drive improvement of T&L, data tracking, accountability.	Difficult to isolate impact, particularly without data over time to see trends. This is a medium term programme so expect to see impact over longer period of time.	Middle leaders have become a strong force for improvement in the college, so this work will continue. Many have signed up to two year development programmes to which the college is happy to be committed.	£6000 (Contribution from PP)

**ii. Targeted support**

Action	Intended outcome	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

Increased pastoral capacity <a href="#">Pastoral managers x2</a> ) to support improvement of attendance and reduce the impact of social/emotional barriers.	Attendance of disadvantaged students improves.	There was some improvement for some targeted students, including for students who are not disadvantaged.	Much of the practice developed this year will be further developed and sharpened into the next year. More precise impact measurement is needed, which will be built into the next cycle.	£5000 (Contribution from PP)
Appointment of TAs – support on literacy	Improve literacy levels for all students, including disadvantaged.	Action started too late to have measurable impact within year.	TA's will form a key part of next year's reading/literacy intervention programme.	£7000 (Contribution from PP)

### iii. Other approaches

Action	Intended outcome	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
Laptops available to disadvantaged learners to enable them to access the highly digital parts of the curriculum.	To ensure that there is not a technology barrier to learning.	Difficult to determine specific impact, given the generally poor outcomes.	There has been some shift towards more paper-based work for all but use of IT in the curriculum remains strong and it is clear that students have benefitted from having devices that they could not otherwise afford (or would not be a financial priority for their families).	£5000 (Contribution from PP)
Trips and visits support	To make sure that all students can participate in enrichment and curriculum trips, regardless of financial circumstances.	All students who needed to or who wanted to go on trips were able to do so – there was a level playing field for access.		£2000 (Contribution from PP)
Hardship support	To remove the day to day barriers, by purchasing essential items that students otherwise cannot have.	Smoothed the daily lives of students so that they could engage and participate on equal terms.		£2595



## 7. Additional detail