# Pupil premium strategy statement – The Bourne Academy

Before completing this template, read the Education Endowment Foundation’s [guide to the pupil premium](https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/using-pupil-premium) and DfE’s [pupil premium guidance for school leaders](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65cf69384239310011b7b91f/Using_Pupil_Premium_-_Guidance_for_School_Leaders.pdf), which includes the ‘menu of approaches’. It is for school leaders to decide what activity to spend their pupil premium on, within the framework set out by the menu.

All schools that receive pupil premium are required to use this template to complete and publish a pupil premium statement on their school website by 31 December every academic year.

If you are starting a new pupil premium strategy plan, use this blank template. If you are continuing a strategy plan from last academic year, you may prefer to edit your existing statement, if that version was published using the template.

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

This statement details our school’s use of pupil premium 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 outcomes for disadvantaged pupils last academic year.

## School overview

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Detail | Data |
| Number of pupils in school | 966 |
| Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils | 33% |
| Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers **(3-year plans are recommended – you must still publish an updated statement each academic year)** | 3 Years |
| Date this statement was published | November 2024 |
| Date on which it will be reviewed | December 2027 |
| Statement authorised by | Mark Avoth |
| Pupil premium lead | Ashley St John |
| Governor / Trustee lead | Jonny Timms |

## Funding overview

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Detail** | **Amount** |
| Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year | £332,468 |
| 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* | £332,468 |

# 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 and cultural capital opportunities 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, low literacy levels and limited understanding of success criteria |
| 2 | Inability of some students to access the curriculum (particularly tier 2 and tier 3 language) |
| 3 | Ensuring enough time is given for staff development |
| 4 | Ensuring the consistency and quality of teaching across the Academy |
| 5 | Ensuring disadvantaged pupils attend regularly and are properly equipped |
| 6 | Inability to access the curriculum due to emotional dysregulation |
| 7 | A lack of cultural capital for the majority of disadvantaged students |

## 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 | 2027 (due to future measures in 2025 and 2026) |
| Disadvantaged students achieve as well as non-disadvantaged (attainment 8) | 2025 (and subsequent) performance data |
| Disadvantaged students achieve as well as non-disadvantaged (Percentage of grade 5+ in EM) | 2025 (and subsequent) performance data |
| Narrow P8, attainment and 5+ EM gap between disadvantaged boys and girls | 2025 data onwards (2027 for P8) |
| Disadvantaged students achieve better than their peers nationally | 2025 (and subsequent) performance data |
| Disadvantaged students attend as often as non-disadvantaged students | 2025 (and subsequent) attendance data |

## Activity in this academic year

This details how we intend to spend our pupil premium funding **this academic year** to address the challenges listed above.

### Teaching (for example, CPD, recruitment and retention)

Budgeted cost: £*40,336*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
| Embedding MELC (Making Every Lesson Count) principles in all lessons | The EEF guide to the Pupil Premium states that good quality teaching is disproportionately beneficial to disadvantaged students. The EEF toolkit indicates that effective feedback, mastery activities and metacognition has very high impact for very low cost. | 1, 2, 3 and 4 |
| Production and consistent use of Knowledge Organisers, expanding to all of KS3 and KS4 | The EEF toolkit indicates that effective feedback, mastery activities and metacognition has very high impact for very low cost | 1, 2, 3 and 4 |
| Weekly Thursday morning Pedagogy sessions | The EEF guide to the Pupil Premium states that good quality teaching is disproportionately beneficial to disadvantaged students. The EEF toolkit indicates that effective feedback, mastery activities and metacognition has very high impact for very low cost | 1, 2, 3 and 4 |
| Peer development drop-ins and increased scrutiny by SLT | The EEF guide to the Pupil Premium states that good quality teaching is disproportionately beneficial to disadvantaged students. The EEF toolkit indicates that effective feedback, mastery activities and metacognition has very high impact for very low cost | 1, 2 and 4 |

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

Budgeted cost: £116,625

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
| Ensure Y11 have a dedicated non-teaching Head of Year  | A dedicated, non-teaching member of staff with sole responsibility for Y11 will support the successful implementation of all interventions | 2, 5 and 6 |
| All Y11 PP students below target grade to attend coursework catch-up sessions | The EEF toolkit indicates that extending the school day has a moderate impact on student outcomes | 1 and 2 |
| Most Y11 PP students below target grade to attend holiday and weekend sessions | The EEF toolkit indicates that effective feedback, mastery activities and metacognition has very high impact for very low cost | 1 and 2 |

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

Budgeted cost: £179,382

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
| Expanding reading provision beyond Lexonik Leap with the introduction of Reading plus, combined with embedding and further resourcing the tutor reading programme, increasing provision for our most challenged readers | The EEF toolkit indicates that reading comprehension activities have very high impact for low cost | 1, 2, 6 and 7 |
| Allocated non-teaching member of staff to administrate and implement the above programmes, driven by data | A dedicated, non-teaching member of staff with sole responsibility for reading and the reading programmes will support the successful implementation of these interventions | 1, 2 and 6 |
| Implementation of a graduated reading strategy to ensure students reading ability is assessed at least one per year, and students of all reading abilities make progress through targeted intervention | The EEF toolkit indicates that reading comprehension activities have very high impact for low cost | 1, 2 and 6 |
| Bedrock Learning programme in Y7 and 8 | Draws from extensive research illustrating the importance of teaching vocabulary and the best way to do this – available on ‘Bedrock Learning’ website. Cultural capital gained from reading texts across a range of disciplines | 1, 2, 6 and 7 |
| Appointment of extra Pastoral Support Worker to support wellbeing, excellent behaviour and attendance | Internal data indicates a sharp rise in mental health and CSC referrals over and since the pandemic | 5 and 6 |
| Weekly attendance panels attended by all Heads of Year | Dfe research clearly indicates that poor attendance has a negative impact on student performance | 5 and 6 |
| Employment of Academy’s own Educational Social Worker | Internal data indicates a sharp rise in mental health and CSC referrals over and since the pandemic | 5 and 6 |
| 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 | 1, 2, 4 and 6 |
| 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 | 5 and 6 |
| Primary-modelled class for Y7 students unable to access the curriculum – ‘The Link’ | Students will not benefit from quality first teaching if they are unable to access lessons | 1, 2 and 6 |
| BRIDGE support for students focusing on additional literacy intervention | Students will not benefit from quality first teaching if they are unable to access lessons. | 1, 2 and 6 |
| 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 | 5 and 6 |
| Establishment of a wellbeing tutor group to provide a ‘soft start’ for vulnerable students | Internal data indicates a sharp rise in mental health and CSC referrals which is impacting attendance | 5 and 6 |
| Participation in the Dorset Boys Impact Hub | Internal data indicates disadvantaged boys underachieve in comparison to girls. They are also more likely to be suspended/removed from lessons. The Hub uses research-based activities to close these gaps. | 5 and 6 |
| All Y11 Disadvantaged students to be provided with a revision resources pack covering all subjects | Students will not be able to revise effectively without additional resources | 2 and 4 |
| All Disadvantaged students to receive a 25% reduction on paid Academy trips | It is widely accepted that a person’s level of cultural capital is an indicator of how well they are able to succeed academically and engage in wider society  | 5 and 7 |
| All Disadvantaged students to receive a 50% reduction on peripatetic music lessons | There is clear evidence that playing a musical instrument can impact positively on academic performance | 5 and 7 |

**Total budgeted cost: £336,343**

# Part B: Review of the previous academic year

## Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils

|  |
| --- |
| **Progress and attainment**Progress 8 for Disadvantaged students was -0.89.The gap between Disadvantaged and other students was -0.78. The national gap in 2023 was -0.74.41% of disadvantaged students achieved 4+ English and Maths (68% other students).24% of disadvantaged students achieved 5+ English and Maths (42% other students).**Attendance**Attendance of disadvantaged students was 87.1% in comparison with an Academy attendance of 91.1%The FFT disadvantaged national figure was 86.8%Disadvantaged attendance was significantly above FFT national for whole school, Y7 and Y10. Disadvantaged attendance was significantly below FFT national for Y11. **Reading****26** PP students completed the Lexonik Advance programmes and the average gain on their reading age was **45mths (3yrs 9mths).**Broken down into year groups:Year 7: **19** PP students completed the programme with an average reading age gain of **40mths (3yrs 4mths)**Year 8: **1** PP student completed the programme with an average reading age gain of **31mths (2yrs 7mths)**Year 10: **3** PP student completed the programme with an average reading age gain of **50mths (4yrs 2mths)**Year 11: **3** PP students completed the programme with an average reading age gain of **72mths (6yrs)****12** PP students improved their reading age by more than **60mths (5 yrs)**The 2 PP students who made the most progress, improved their reading age by **83mths (6yrs 11mths)**In addition to this we had 11 PP students complete the Lexonik Leap programme and 7 PP students receive support from 6th Formers via the Bourne Readers intervention.**3-year Summary*** Previous progress and attainment data, particularly 22-23, indicated that the intended academic outcomes of the plan were being successfully met
* Progress and attainment data for 23-24 was disappointing. It remains, however, an anomaly across several years of upward trajectory
* There were a number of very complex (with significant external involvement) Y11 disadvantaged students in 23-24 who achieved poorly for a number of reasons, including poor attendance. However, current Y11 data indicates that the gap is reducing
* Whilst there has been evidence of improving the reading ages of students, the numbers involved have been relatively small as a consequence of staffing issues and the choice of programmes. This has been changed in the new plan
* Although the attendance of disadvantaged students has been consistently above national, it is still too low. It remains an area of focus
* Behaviour data shows a decline in disadvantaged student suspensions, but disadvantaged students are still more likely to be suspended. The Academy continues to develop bespoke approaches in this area, particularly around mental health and other pastoral support. Lack of support from external agencies remains an issue
 |

## Externally provided programmes

*Please include the names of any non-DfE programmes that you used your pupil premium to fund in the previous academic year.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Programme | Provider |
| Science mastery | Carousel |
| Targeted online maths assessment | SPARX |
| Online reading programme  | Lexonik |
| Online reading programme | Reading plus |
| Bedrock | Bedrock Learning |

## Service pupil premium funding (optional)

|  |
| --- |
| *For schools that receive this funding, you may wish to provide the following information:* **How our service pupil premium allocation was spent last academic year** |
|  |
| **The impact of that spending on service pupil premium eligible pupils** |
|  |

# Further information (optional)

|  |
| --- |
|  |