

Pupil premium strategy statement

Before completing this template, you should read the guidance on [using pupil premium](#).

Before publishing your completed statement, you should delete the instructions (text in italics) in this template, including this text box.

This statement details our school's use of pupil premium (and recovery premium for the 2021 to 2022 academic year) 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 effect that last year's spending of pupil premium had within our school.

School overview

| Detail | Data |
|---|--------------------|
| School name | The Bourne Academy |
| Number of pupils in school | 964 |
| Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils | 37% |
| Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers (3 year plans are recommended) | 3 Years |
| Date this statement was published | November 2021 |
| Date on which it will be reviewed | November 2024 |
| Statement authorised by | Mark Avoth |
| Pupil premium lead | Ashley St John |
| Governor / Trustee lead | Henry Bishop |

Funding overview

| Detail | Amount |
|---|----------|
| Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year | £298,915 |
| Recovery premium funding allocation this academic year | £45,385 |
| Pupil premium funding carried forward from previous years (enter £0 if not applicable) | £0 |
| Total budget for this academic year If your school is an academy in a trust that pools this funding, state the amount available to your school this academic year | £344,300 |

Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

Statement of intent

We want all disadvantaged students to achieve as well as their peers. Consequently, all students should receive quality first teaching along with targeted interventions to close existing gaps. Our plan focuses on developing teacher pedagogy and providing a broad package of targeted academic support, in conjunction with an enhanced pastoral system to ensure students are in school and actively engaged with their learning.

Challenges

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

| Challenge number | Detail of challenge |
|------------------|---|
| 1 | Tendency towards passive learning, poor functional spoken English and limited understanding of success criteria |
| 2 | Potential impact of 2 x National lockdowns combined with a lack of engagement from a minority of parents |
| 3 | Inability of some students to access the curriculum (particularly tier 2 and 3 language) |
| 4 | Ensuring enough time is given for staff professional development |
| 5 | Ensuring the consistency and quality of teaching across the Academy |
| 6 | Ensuring disadvantaged pupils attend regularly and are properly equipped |

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 |
|---|--|
| Disadvantaged students achieve a positive progress score | 2022 (and subsequent) performance data |
| Disadvantaged students achieve just as well as non-disadvantaged (attainment 8) | 2022 (and subsequent) performance data |
| Disadvantaged students achieve just as well as non-disadvantaged (Percentage of grade 5+ in EM) | 2022 (and subsequent) performance data |

| | |
|---|--|
| Narrow P8 and Att. 8 gap between boys and girls | 2022 (and subsequent) performance data |
| Increase % of PP EBacc entries | 2022 (and subsequent) performance data |

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: £40,013.70

| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|--|--|-------------------------------|
| Embedding MELC principles in all lessons – specific focus on Questioning, Modelling and Practice | <p>The EEF guide to the Pupil Premium states that good quality teaching is disproportionately beneficial to disadvantaged students.</p> <p>The EEF toolkit indicates that effective feedback, mastery activities and metacognition has very high impact for very low cost.</p> | 1. |
| Introduction and consistent use of Knowledge Organisers in Y7 and 8 | <p>The EEF toolkit indicates that effective feedback, mastery activities and metacognition has very high impact for very low cost</p> | 1. |
| Introduction of Thursday morning Pedagogy sessions | <p>The EEF guide to the Pupil Premium states that good quality teaching is disproportionately beneficial to disadvantaged students.</p> <p>The EEF toolkit indicates that effective feedback, mastery activities and metacognition has very high impact for very low cost</p> | 1. |
| Peer development drop-ins and increased scrutiny by SLT | <p>The EEF guide to the Pupil Premium states that good quality teaching is disproportionately beneficial to disadvantaged students.</p> <p>The EEF toolkit indicates that effective feedback, mastery activities and metacognition has very high impact for very low cost</p> | 1. |

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

Budgeted cost: £138,606.51

| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|---|--|-------------------------------|
| Targeted tutoring programme for under-achieving PP students in English, Maths and Science | The EEF toolkit indicates that one to one tuition has a high impact for moderate cost | 2. |
| Targeted EMS teaching residential for under-achieving Y11 students | The EEF toolkit indicates that one to one tuition has a high impact for moderate cost | 3 |
| Ensure Y11 have a dedicated non-teaching Head of Year (outside of the House system) | A dedicated, non-teaching member of staff with sole responsibility for Y11 will support the successful implementation of all interventions | 2 & 6 |
| All Y11 PP students receive an academic mentor | The EEF toolkit indicates that mentoring positively impacts student performance | 2. |
| All Y11 PP students below target grade to attend additional learning sessions | The EEF toolkit indicates that extending the school day has a moderate impact on student outcomes | 2. |
| Expansion of Y11 tutor groups offering targeted academic support | The EEF toolkit indicates that effective feedback, mastery activities and metacognition has very high impact for very low cost | 2. |

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

Budgeted cost: £166,711.35

| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|---|--|-------------------------------|
| Expanding the provision of Lexonic within all year groups, combined with embedding and further resourcing the tutor reading programme | The EEF toolkit indicates that reading comprehension activities have very high impact for low cost | 3. |
| Allocated non-teaching member of staff to | A dedicated, non-teaching member of staff with sole responsibility for reading | 3. |

| | | |
|--|---|-------|
| administrate and implement the above programmes | and Lexonics will support the successful implementation of these interventions | |
| Bedrock Learning programme | Draws from extensive research illustrating the importance of teaching vocabulary and the best way to do this – available on ‘Bedrock Learning’ website | 1 & 3 |
| Appoint extra Pastoral Support Worker to support wellbeing, excellent behaviour and attendance | Internal data indicates a sharp rise in mental health and CSC referrals over the pandemic | 6 & 2 |
| Weekly attendance panels attended by all HoH/Head of Y11 | Dfe research clearly indicates that poor attendance has a negative impact on student performance | 6 & 2 |
| Appointment of Academy’s own Educational Social Worker | Internal data indicates a sharp rise in mental health and CSC referrals over the pandemic | 6 & 2 |
| Use of Private Educational Psychologist to fill gap in services from Local Authority | The Social and Emotional wellbeing in secondary education Public Health guideline (PH20, 2009) references the importance of schools accessing suitable Ed. Psych. support | 2 & 3 |
| All students to be provided with a free breakfast | Numerous studies referenced by NICE (National Institute for Health and Care Institute) reference the positive impact of school breakfasts | 6 & 2 |
| Creation of Primary-modelled ‘Learning Link’ class for Y7’s unable to access the curriculum | Students will not benefit from quality first teaching if they are unable to access lessons. | 3 |
| Discretionary pastoral budget (for uniform, transport, equipment and trips) administered by Vice Principal | Students will not benefit from these and other Academy activities if they are unable to access them | 6 & 2 |

Total budgeted cost: £345,331.56

Part B: Review of outcomes in the previous academic year

Pupil premium strategy outcomes

This details the impact that our pupil premium activity had on pupils in the 2020 to 2021 academic year.

Due to COVID-19, performance measures have not been published for 2020 to 2021, and 2020 to 2021 results will not be used to hold schools to account. Internal data from the Academy indicates that disadvantaged students were more adversely affected by the pandemic than other students, illustrated by a gap in their attainment and progress - this is in line with the national picture.

Externally provided programmes

Please include the names of any non-DfE programmes that you purchased in the previous academic year. This will help the Department for Education identify which ones are popular in England

| Programme | Provider |
|----------------------------------|---------------|
| Science mastery | Tassomai |
| Targeted online maths assessment | Hegarty Maths |

Service pupil premium funding (optional)

For schools that receive this funding, you may wish to provide the following information:

| Measure | Details |
|--|---------|
| How did you spend your service pupil premium allocation last academic year? | n/a |
| What was the impact of that spending on service pupil premium eligible pupils? | n/a |

Further information (optional)

| |
|--|
| |
|--|