

Pupil premium strategy statement

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	962
Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils	31%
Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers (3 year plans are recommended)	3 Years
Date this statement was published	November 2022
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	£290,575
Recovery premium funding allocation this academic year	£81,420
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	£371,995

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: £40,011

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: £204,864

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: £131,297

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Expanding the provision of Lexonik and Lexonik Leap 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 the Lexonik programmes will support the successful implementation of these interventions	
Bedrock Learning programme in Y7 and 8 plus introduction of Y7-10 tutor intervention group	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: £376,172

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 2021 to 2022 academic year.

35 PP students completed the **Lexonik** programmes and the average gain on their reading age was 39mths (3yrs 3mths).

Broken down into year groups:

Year 7: 13 PP students completed the programme with an average reading age gain of 42mths (3yrs 6mths)

Year 8: 7 PP students completed the programme with an average reading age gain of 22mths (1yr 10mths)

Year 9: 9 PP students completed the programme with an average reading age gain of 39mths (3yrs 3mths)

Year 10: 3 PP students completed the programme with an average reading age gain of 75mths (6yrs 3mths)

Year 11: 3 PP students completed the programme with an average reading age gain of 34mths (2yrs 10mths)

10 PP students improved their reading age by more than 60mths (5 yrs)

The student who made the most progress, improved their reading age by 90mths (7yrs 6mths)

Bedrock had a significant impact on both PP and non-PP students – both groups showed an 18% improvement between pre-test and post-test results.

There were 51 PP students who completed **GCSE's** last academic year. They achieved a progress score of -0.36, a gap of -0.23 in comparison with non-PP students. This is a narrowing of the gap from 2021 results (-0.89).

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
Lexonik	Lexonik
Lexonik Leap	Lexonik
Bedrock	Bedrock Learning

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)

--