## Anthony Gell School - Pupil Premium statement 24-25

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 outcomes for disadvantaged pupils last academic year.

### School overview

Detail	Data
Number of pupils in school (Year 7-11)	644
Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils	27%
Academic year/years that our current pupil	2021 / 2022
premium strategy plan covers	to 2024 / 2025
Date this statement was published	31 / 10 / 24
Date on which it will be reviewed	30/09/25
Statement authorised by	Malcolm Kelly - Headteacher
Pupil premium lead	Nick Watts - Deputy Headteacher
Governor / Trustee lead	Caroline Barth

## **Funding overview**

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year	£162,750
Recovery premium funding allocation this academic year	£0
Pupil premium (and recovery premium) funding carried forward from previous years	£0
Total budget for this academic year	£162,750

# Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan Statement of intent

At Anthony Gell School, we believe all students should be entitled to achieve their potential to access successful transitions and contribute to the workplace and communities in which they live in years to come.

The school supports students to make good progress and achieve high attainment across the curriculum, and if appropriate, particularly in EBacc subjects. Our focus is supporting disadvantaged students to achieve that end, including those who have already secured high levels of attainment.

We will consider the barriers vulnerable students face, such as those whose families rely on support from social workers, or those who are young carers. Our strategy aims to support their needs, irrespective of whether they are disadvantaged or not.

Excellent teaching is at the heart of our mission. EEF research underpins our approach to the professional development of our staff, and the strategies employed by them to have the most significant impact on closing the disadvantage attainment gap. This approach will also mean that non-disadvantaged students' attainment will be sustained and improved alongside progress for their disadvantaged peers.

Our strategy aligns with plans for education recovery following the COVID-19 pandemic, inclusive of some targeted support for students who have fallen behind, including non-disadvantaged students. We will take a dynamic approach, based on individual need, rooted in diagnostic assessment, which is regularly reviewed and improved.

Our strategy aims to

- create a culture where all staff take responsibility for disadvantaged students' outcomes
- equip staff with the expertise required to provide high quality teaching
- ensure our curriculum enables disadvantaged students to thrive
- to provide the support needed to enable the disadvantaged gap to close

### Challenges

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

Challenge number	Detail of challenge
1	Reading presents a barrier to learning across the curriculum where low reading age persists. At the start of this plan period (2021), the reading age of disadvantaged students, determined by 'Accelerated Reader' lagged other students on entry. The average reading age, on entry, of disadvantaged students was currently 10 years and 10 months, compared to 12yrs and 3mths for other students in the school. A smaller number of disadvantaged students experience persistently low reading ages, and these students struggle to access the curriculum without significant intervention. Reading comprehension approaches are cited as one of the two most significant interventions likely to reduce the performance gaps, equating to 6 months of learning (Education Endowment Foundation).
	In the appendix, there is an analysis of the KS2 scaled scores for reading of the 2024 Year 11 cohort compared against English GCSE grades achieved. It is clear that the gap which exists is a contributing factor to less progress being made at GCSE including in English. Both reading and attainment in English are therefore priorities in terms of planning and actions and further progress is needed to close this gap early.
2	At the start of this plan period, the maths ability of the disadvantaged cohort lagged that of their peers. On entry, Key Stage 3 target grade distribution in Maths showed that one 30% of the disadvantaged cohort is below the national standard compared to 20% in the national 'other' (non-disadvantaged) cohort.
	In the appendix, there is an analysis of the KS2 scaled scores for maths of the 2024 Year 11 cohort compared against Maths GCSE grades achieved. The gap which exists is maintained or worsens, especially amongst lower ability disadvantaged students.

	Further action is clearly needed to ensure low ability students make better progress in maths.
3	Attendance gaps exist for the disadvantaged cohort when compared to other students. At the start of this plan, in 2021 - 2022, the overall attendance rate of disadvantaged students was 7% lower than other students. The percentage of disadvantaged students defined as 'persistent absentees' was 26% (current Years 8-11) in term 1, but this had increased to 38% in term 2. This is significantly above the persistent absentee rate for 'other' students. The outcomes of disadvantaged students lag that of 'other' students and attendance is cited as a significant barrier to achievement by the Education Endowment Foundation.
4	The incidences of negative behaviour for students in the disadvantaged cohort are greater than in the non-disadvantaged cohort by a factor of 4:1. Equally, disadvantaged students are less likely to be rewarded for positive behaviour and engagement (50% less likely to receive positive points). The use of pastoral support for individual students and families is a key part of the delivery of the pupil premium fund using the pastoral and welfare team.
5	Student engagement and, consequently, outcomes of disadvantaged students can be lower as indicated by external exam results and behaviour incidences. Metacognitive practices are identified by the Education and Endowment Foundation as high impact for low cost. The school is currently supporting the development of 'learning to learn' and quality-first teaching strategies across the curriculum to allow for improved self-regulation.

## 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		
Improved reading and comprehension across the curriculum	Reading intervention programmes will show a narrowing of the gap and improvements in reading age scores, for pupils in Key Stage 3.		
because of the implementation of reading interventions and CPD.	We will aim for a reading age gap of less than 1 year by the end of a student's time in Year 9.		
	CPD programme to centre on effective strategies which can be employed across the curriculum.		
	Demonstrable impact of interventions across Key Stages – including new Lexonik intervention.		
Numeracy interventions show a	The 'Progress 8' gap in Maths GCSE outcomes to narrow to better than national.		
sustained improvement of acquisition of maths	The 'Attainment 8' gap in Maths to narrow to better than national.		
skills, leading to improved assessment outcomes for disadvantaged students.	Key Stage 3 data analysis to show demonstrable narrowing of attainment gaps between Years 7 and 9 using in school data and tracking systems.		

Attendance of the disadvantaged cohort improves and is sustained through the period of this plan.	Attendance of 'other' students is above 95% and the attendance of the disadvantaged cohort improves to 90% or above.  Persistent absentee (PA) rates for disadvantaged students improves to not in excess of 20% (at <= 90% attendance threshold).
Behaviour for learning and behaviour management systems will show improved behaviour data for PP students and high	Behaviour for Learning data analysis to indicate that disadvantaged students are equally likely to achieve positive behaviour points (1:1 ratio) and are increasingly less likely to be awarded negative behaviour points (target area of approximately 2:1 ratio (currently 5:1 ratio), disadvantaged compared to non-disadvantaged students).
levels of contact and resource allocation (including family of schools worker) directed to disadvantaged students and their families.	Soft data will show high rates of contact with the families of disadvantaged students including number of meetings, involvement of early help interventions and student voice.  Suspension and exclusion data to reflect low levels of exclusion
Key EEF strategies to be employed by all teachers to improve specifically in the disadvantaged cohort	Impactful peer to peer CPD programme to be implemented focussing on EEF principles of best practice with a focus on formative assessment, metacognitive approaches, 5-a-day strategies, retrieval and reading and literacy support.
with and engagement rates in classroom learning.	Outcomes will be measurable in the Quality Assurance process, altered Schemes of Work, progress data, along with student and staff voice activities.

## 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: £23,458

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
EEF strategies to support disadvantaged attainment and progress including focussed work on metacognition.	EEF - metacognition EEF consider this to be one of the most important interventions in developing self-aware and reflective learners. Our CPD programme is designed to utilise the Learning Sciences to better enable	5, 4
Sharing of best practice embedded into our CPD programme.	students to learn knowledge through retrieval and interleaving practices. Spaced practice and dual-coding are considered important tools to deepen knowledge and to create learners who	

Revised QA systems mean all forms of QA focus on Pupil Premium students.  Strategies to support formative assessment	are more flexible in the digital workplace: https://www.oecd.org/site/educeri21st/4 0554221.pdf  Between 23 and 25, one of the key focus areas for our new Peer to Peer programme is behaviour for learning, inclusive of meta-cognition to support progress.  EEF research on formative assessment  EEF research points to the importance	1, 5. 4
	of effective feedback.  This year, in addition to behaviour for learning, and collaborative working, a peer-to-peer CPD programme will focus on developing strategies to further enhance feedback.	
Reading  Diagnostic testing continues to be delivered through the English curriculum.	EEF Reading Comprehension Strategies Literacy remains one of the most significant barriers to learning in the school curriculum. TES reading diagnostic tools are being introduced to better diagnose gaps and support in the creation of personalised goals around	1
Reading for pleasure and increased access to literature continues to be a focus.	comprehension, engaged reading time, and students' reading levels to keep them on the path to future success.	
Reading strategy	The use of the reading hour in our English curriculum (Key Stage 3), along with weekly reading time in tutor time intends to embed a 'best practice' model.	
Learning mentors continue with targeted support.  Better teacher awareness to	intends to embed a 'best practice' model of implementation, which, research shows, adds significant value to ability to read and improve comprehension <a href="https://p.widencdn.net/ipvvlr/R58148">https://p.widencdn.net/ipvvlr/R58148</a>	
lead to better adaptations.		
Lexonik intervention programme introduced.	Use of the Lexonik programme will be used to impact on reading.	
	https://lexonik.co.uk/independent- impact-evaluation-studies	
Faculty/subject 'pupil premium first' practices across all Key Stages.	https://educationendowmentfoundation. org.uk/education-evidence/teaching- learning-toolkit	1, 3, 4
Prioritising disadvantaged students first through a range of teaching and learning practices and classroom organisation. This involves the consistent identification of	Employing a range of teaching and learning strategies to include adjustments of seating plans, feedback of learning in lessons, targeted questioning, 1:1 intervention in lessons including work with learning mentors,	

disadvantaged students in classrooms and the implementation of additionality, whether in terms of time to work with students or to provide feedback in learning in order to bring about success.	small group work, and provision of paid for resources to support learning from home. These strategies are indicated by EEF as having moderate to high impact when delivered consistently across the curriculum.	
Improving literacy in all subject areas  in line with recommendations in the EEF Improving Literacy in Secondary Schools guidance.  Whole school literacy strategy developed and shared at Faculty and staff level with a focus on disciplinary literacy.	Acquiring disciplinary literacy is key for students as they learn new, more complex concepts in each subject:  Improving Literacy in Secondary Schools  Reading comprehension, vocabulary and other literacy skills are heavily linked with attainment in maths and English:  word-gap.pdf (oup.com.cn)	1, 2
Lead Practitioner in Inclusive Practice appointed to further promote best practice and support the work of the SENCO in targeting support for DA SEND students.	EEF research shows that SEND students are likely to suffer attainment and progress gaps at least as big as DA students.  DA students are also disproportionately likely to be SEND students.  Our lead practitioner will deliver focussed CPD throughout the year and a new faculty structure will mean QA activity focuses even more on DA students.	1,2,3,5

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

# Budgeted cost: £54,600 (Learning Mentors, Specialist TA provisions and support, SEND and SEMH)

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Literacy & numeracy interventions.  Designated colleagues will use performance/progress data (using software such as SISRA), along with 'soft' data from classroom learning to identify key cohorts for intervention.  Employing either small group	KS3 and KS4 small group and 1:1 interventions to support improved literacy. EEF One to One Tuition are considered high impact for moderate cost particularly when these are in addition to the normal teaching delivery model. Such interventions intend to identify learning gaps and to give individualised instruction to improve basic numeracy and literacy skills.	1, 2, 4,
work or one to one tuition, the		

learning mentors will work to improve targeted areas as identified in skills audits.  Cross-phase working with partner primary schools, along with working across all subjects to improve literacy and numeracy, including the use of tutor time, aims to improve basic skills and close gaps, particularly those which widened during COVID.	Small group interventions are also identified as having a moderate impact. Intensive tuition in small groups is often provided to support lower attaining learners or those who are falling behind, but it can also be used as a more general strategy to ensure effective progress, or to teach challenging topics or skills. EEF Small Group Tuition	
Targeted Faculty led interventions/tuition sessions run by faculties inclusive of specialist revision sessions in the build up to summative assessments.  This includes the use of SAM Learning and other software packages, our use of which is geared to impacting positively on DA progess.	Following data collection points, small group interventions will take place led by teachers and other support staff	1, 2, 3

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

**Budgeted cost: £84,692** some items in the activity fall as part of the wider school strategy therefore apportion little costs within this statement.

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Contingency fund to support engagement and attainment. Requests are made by staff to bid for monies to support the delivery of the curriculum and wider school opportunities along with well-being resources	This fund ensures that students from disadvantaged backgrounds can access all aspects of the curriculum, including enrichment opportunities (cultural capital).	4, 5
Attendance monitoring through the deployment of the Pastoral Managers and attendance officer	https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/school-attendance/framework-forsecuring-full-attendance-actions-forschools-and-local-authorities	3, 4, 5
The Pastoral Managers, along with the tutor system, delivers first day response and longer-term interventions to improve student attendance. The	There is a clear link between school attendance, attainment and examination outcomes. The Key - report on attendance and attainment	

response requires consistent communication and delivery of support to students and families to break the cycle of absence which is greater in the disadvantaged cohort than national 'others'		
Behaviour for learning management through the Pastoral Managers. The delivery of behaviour interventions with students and their families who display higher level and persistent behaviour concern. The development of House and School Ethos to celebrate positive behaviour alongside the above. Appointment of an additional Inclusion Manager	EEF Behaviour interventions Behaviour interventions are seen as having moderate impacts. More specialised programmes targeting students with specific behavioural issues may improve student behaviour.  Approaches to developing a positive school ethos or improving discipline across the whole school which also aim to support greater engagement in learning  The creation of a new role supporting primarily disadvantaged students who face social and emotional barriers, inclusive of targeted support and additional curriculum provision.	4, 3
Deployment of the Family of Schools Workers to work with the families of vulnerable students to improve engagement	Early intervention services directed toward families with more complex needs can benefit the child at school by providing support for the family including behaviour management, safeguarding, family communication and accessing basic multiagency services.	3, 4, 5
Year 11 Mentoring scheme To ensure DA students in Year 11 have bespoke support the extended leadership team mentor students, coordinating support around access arrangements, additional resourcing and pastoral provision. And, ensuring enhanced communication with parents.	EEF evidence outlines the impact of mentoring schemes and enhanced communication with DA parents.	1,2,3,4,5
Appointment and action of three DA leads:	EEF evidence outlines the impact of mentoring schemes, timely interventions	1,2,3,4,5

The Key Stage 3 DA Lead will focus on coordinating and monitoring the impact of reading interventions at Key Stage 3,  The Key Stage 4 DA Monitoring Lead will track the progress of DA students in	and enhanced communication with DA parents.	
Year 10 and Year 11,  The Key Stage 4 DA Pastoral Lead will take specific action further to meetings with the DA Monitoring Lead to ensure that pastoral barriers to progress are reduced.		
Adventure Unlocked – partnership working with a specialist outdoor education instructor who is running sessions disproportionately comprised of disadvantaged students.	The EEF recommend using outdoor education as a means of improving disadvantaged student engagement.	3,4,5
Outdoor Education Coordinator – appointed to coordinate a range of activities including Duke of Edinburgh and sailing trips which are disproportionately accessed by disadvantaged students.	The EEF recommend using outdoor education as a means of improving disadvantaged student engagement	3,4,5

Total budgeted cost: £162,750 out of £162,750

# Part B: Review of the previous academic year Outcomes for disadvantaged student

#### **Overall outcomes**

After growing significantly during and after covid, the gap between the Progress 8 and Attainment 8 scores of our disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students has started to come back down. In 2024, the gap between DA students and the non-disadvantaged group remains wider than leaders would have hoped at this stage of the five-year strategic cycle at Progress 8 -0.9. This does represent an improvement on the previous year.

Importantly, the absolute Progress 8 of this group is much better than in previous years (**-0.38** in 2024 compared to -0.77 in 2023 and -0.87 in 2019). When compared to the national performance of the disadvantaged group in 2023 (-0.57), we can see the overall P8 of our disadvantaged cohort is likely to

be better than this when performance tables are published later this year. For reference, the national disadvantaged gap was -0.74 in 2023.

This improvement, and the reviews we have undertaken, demonstrate that many of the school's strategies (such as mentoring and the focus on formative assessment) have had a positive impact on DA progress. However, there is also evidence (as mentioned above) that

See <u>DfE guidance</u> for more information about KS4 performance measures.

#### **Behaviour**

Our monitoring of behaviour data demonstrated that student behaviour improved last year, but challenges around wellbeing and mental health remain higher than before the pandemic. Disadvantaged students have been disproportionately impacted in this regard and the school's pastoral systems are increasingly coping well with the challenges presented – especially following further investment.

DA students do remain disproportionately more likely to be suspended, but our rates of suspension are well below those of similar schools meaning we suspend fewer disadvantaged students less frequently than other schools.

Disadvantaged students at AGS are also as likely to be rewarded as their peers and are more likely to attend rewards trips and engage with our outdoor education programme.

#### **Attendance**

There are case studies demonstrating the success of our attendance and pastoral team's very positive impact with individual students and families last year, but overall, disadvantaged students remain more likely to be absent, and much more likely to be persistently absent.

Need some data input here.

#### **Reading and literacy**

Last year, reviews of IDL and learning mentor interventions revealed a lack of sustained impact over time.

The school has acted to replace accelerated reader with other baselining software, we are also Lexonik and have appointed a Lead Practitioner in Inclusive Practice will focus intervention work at those who struggle with reading at Key Stage 3. Furthermore, we have appointed a DA lead for reading and literacy at Key Stage 3. CPD this year has focussed on reading with all colleagues trialling a range of strategies. There will be a lag regarding the impact of much of this work.

#### **Numeracy**

Analysis of PP Numeracy interventions demonstrates that there was a mixed impact with case studies of DA students having achieved a positive progress 8. These students tended to be in higher ability groups and lower ability DA students fared less well in GCSEs. Moving forward, numeracy interventions and the work of the faculty mentor will focus on those lower ability students. Overall, maths remains a focus for development regarding disadvantaged students, with the gap in maths larger than in other subjects within the school.

#### **MOVING FORWARD**

The above results mean that we are not at present on course to achieve the outcomes that we set out to achieve by 2024/25, with outcomes in maths, improvements in reading and attendance becoming key priorities for this academic year. We have reviewed our strategy plan and made changes to how we intend to use some of our budget this academic year, as set out in the Activity in This Academic Year

section above. The Further Information section below provides more details about our planning, implementation, and evaluation processes.

## Service pupil premium funding

### How our service pupil premium allocation was spent last academic year

We set up clubs for all children and ensure service children are included or offered a place in addition to enrichment activities such as music lessons and cultural visits. This supports friendships between service students. Pastoral staff are available to support service students with anxiety and loss when a family member is deployed. We can offer support through funding requests if appropriate.

#### The impact of that spending on service pupil premium eligible students

All service children attended class visits and other educational experiences offered; and they can make additional requests for support where appropriate and as such feel supported by Anthony Gell. Staff notice an improvement in their engagement socially and in lessons as a result.

## Further information (optional)

#### Planning, implementation, and evaluation

In reviewing our current pupil premium strategy, we evaluated why activity undertaken in the previous year had not had the degree of impact that we had expected.

The above endeavours are further to research on other schools' provision where those schools have seen significantly improved outcomes for PP students. We used the <u>EEF's implementation guidance</u> to help us develop our strategy and will continue to use it through the implementation of our activities.

We have also had support from the school's trust-based SIP who has reviewed approaches and supported the school's strategic planning.

**Appendix** 

#### **Exam Cohort 2024**

An analysis of the relationship between Key Stage 2 National Test Data and GCSE Exam Results

This analysis compares the relationship between:

- Key Stage 2 Scaled Score in Reading and GCSE English Language
- Key Stage 2 Scaled Score in Maths and GCSE Maths

#### **Data Tables:**

	PP (Number of students)	Non-PP (Number of students)	PP %	Non- PP %	Differen ce (%)
Reading Low PA	9	18	29	17	-12
Reading Middle PA	16	53	52	50	-2
Reading High PA	6	35	19	33	14
Reading AS	22	88	71	83	12
Maths Low PA	8	15	25	15	-10
Maths Middle PA	21	70	66	70	4
Maths High PA	3	21	9	21	12
Maths AS	24	91	75	91	16

English Language U-3	13	22	38	23	-15
English Language 4-6	17	66	50	70	20
English Language 7-9	4	24	12	25	14
English 4+	21	90	62	95	33
English Language SPI	-0.35	0.39	47	62	15
Maths U-3	17	20	50	18	-32
Maths 4-6	13	62	38	56	18
Maths 7-9	4	29	12	26	14
Maths 4+	17	91	50	82	32
Maths SPI	-0.62	0.33	32	59	26

<sup>\*</sup>Yellow highlights indicate data shown as a % of the cohort to achieve this standard

#### Findings:

#### Reading:

- 6) Prior attainment distribution (low, middle high) shows a skew toward higher proportions of students defined as PP in the low PA group and lower proportions in the high PA group.
- 6) The proportion of students achieving the national standard (scaled score of 100) is 71% for the DA group compared to 83% in the non-DA group. The reading gap seen in this measure is 12%, arguably narrow.
- 6) Regarding students who did not gain a standard pass of 4 in English language, a third of DA students did not achieve this measure. Compared to just under a 1/5<sup>th</sup> of the non-DA cohort. The gap is similar to that seen in the low PA group. Therefore, little change occurred over time for this group, GCSE results mirrored PA.
- 6) Regarding students who gained grades 4-6, interestingly, this included the same proportion of DA students who were in the middle PA group (approx. 50% by both measures), however, the gap widens

- when compared to the non-DA group (70% of the non-DA group achieved grades 4-6 whilst 50% of the non-DA cohort were in the middle PA group.
- 6) For those in the high PA reading group, the gap in proportions of those students who go on to achieve the highest grades remains consistent the gap remains at 14%.
- 6) In terms of SPI almost half the DA cohort go on to achieve positive subject progress, compared to nearly 2/3rds of the non-DA group.

#### Maths:

- 6) Prior attainment distribution (low, middle high) shows a skew toward higher proportions of students defined as PP in the low PA group and lower proportions in the high PA group. This is consistent with the Reading data above.
- 6) The proportion of students achieving the national standard (scaled score of 100) is 75% for the DA group compared to 91% in the non-DA group. The reading gap seen in this measure is 16%, as with reading this is arguably narrow.
- 6) Regarding students who did not gain a standard pass of 4 in Maths, a half of DA students did not achieve this measure. Compared to approx. a 1/5<sup>th</sup> of the non-DA cohort. The gap has widened quite significantly to that seen in the low PA group (32% compared to 10%).
- 6) Regarding DA students 38% achieved grades 4-6 in GCSE outcomes, compared to 56% in the non-DA group. When compared to the middle PA group (66%-70% of each cohort respectively) the gap has widened again from 4% to 18%
- 6) For those in the high PA reading group, the gap in proportions of those students who go on to achieve the highest grades remains broadly consistent the PA gap for the high PA was 12% and the outcomes gap for grades 7-9 of this cohort was 14%.
- 6) In terms of SPI a 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of the DA cohort go on to achieve positive subject progress, compared to 60% of the non-DA group. This is a wider gap than in the reading data.

This analysis has informed CPD at faculty and whole school level.