

Pupil Premium Reviews Portland Academy Trust
URN 738526
LA no: 394

March 2017

Percy Hedley Teaching School.
6th March 2017

Desktop monitoring.

PP evaluation will be derived from a review of evidence to establish the current position of the school. These sources of evidence include the pupil premium strategy, which should be published on the school's website, the school's performance data and Ofsted reports. Scrutiny of these sources of evidence will identify areas of strength and weakness and, inform areas of focus during the visit.

Analysis of data, website, Ofsted reports and confirmation of additional evidence sources, including outcomes of meetings with key personnel will form the basis of additional evidence of the impact of PP on pupil outcomes.

Contextual information is an important element in SEND PP reviews and this will be part of pre visit work to inform relevant discussion.

Portland has an RI judgment following Ofsted inspection in 2015. This review will consider outcomes linked to the subsequent action plan. Since inspection the school self-evaluation, as part of the improvement cycle, is evidence of improved performance. There are a disproportionate number of boys to girls (111 boys, 47 girls) and this results in comparative data on gender being an inconsistent tool in the analysis of progress and achievement. Portland students do not attain national standards due to the severity and complexity of their needs. At KS2 100% of students have low prior attainment however 95% go on to access further education or remain in school beyond KS4.

The school works with some of the most disadvantaged students in the region as a consequence of their diagnosed SEND they are vulnerable and in need of continued high levels of care and support to access learning.

Students within Post 16 do not receive a PP grant. At a time when additional resources are required to support independence. This is a concern within SEND provision. Portland has resourced post 16 education to maximise independence within a limited resource.

16th March site visit

Interview with HT, Improvement coordinator and SLT members (HT choice), small cohort of pupils, class teacher. (Pupils-observation/ discussion appropriately)

The DHT provided answers to key queries linked to funding accountability. These have been expanded following this visit.

Overall the review will consider the following-

- What are you providing that is different for PP pupils from non-PP pupils and why?

'We are providing similar opportunities for PP and non-PP students in terms of the schools personalised approach to meeting learners needs. PP premium students gain additional support to assist in any areas of learning where they are at risk of underachievement. This provision is quantifiable and additional to any resources attached to the assessed EHCP outcomes.

This may include additional support with; academic work, behaviour for learning, sensory intolerance/ self-regulation, increased social opportunities by trying to poverty proof current opportunities, general wellbeing and implementation of therapeutic interventions. We have also worked on improving engagement and motivation to improve attendance'(SM)

- Which groups of people have made the decision on expenditure?

'DHT led a whole staff exercise in Sept 2015- this included a consideration of Sutton Trust work and use of the Endowment Foundation toolkit.... Staff rated our current strategies in terms of impact v cost. Value for money and accountability for the PP grant was analysed in order to inform priorities.

We have actively sought the involvement and views of parents and students- through questionnaires, coffee mornings, school council meetings as well as feedback gained in EHCP meetings. Advice from MDT- and the importance of early interventions by MDT have also influenced decision making'. (SM)

- Why have you chosen these particular interventions and for these periods of time?

'Consideration of the Impact v cost as well as responding to gaps and assessment information. Investigation of softer data has also identified a need to poverty proof opportunities, engage parents and improve attendance.'(SM)

- What data did you collect to provide evidence of impact?

'Pupil progress information- benchmarked using CASPA 2016- more recently IEP Individual targets monitored by SLT

Attendance info

Behaviour records

Quality of teaching- MER records

Reports form MDT

Participation in clubs/ activities

Parental engagement – attendance at parents evenings, EHCPs etc.

Provision mapping'(SM)

- What is the evidence of improvement from when the intervention started to its conclusion?

'Hard data- attendance, behaviour incidents, progress through assessments.

Softer data-

Analysis of IEP and Scerts targets- are more subjective as they involve teacher assessment- need to be quality assured – progress meetings and SEN team. MDT reports or anecdotal recording. Views of student/ parents. Evidence in work books. Intervention plans- were half termly- and associated with assessment cycle- Moving to a 4 week plan and review at the end of the 4 weeks to evaluate progress made.’(SM)

- How do you know when to stop or change an intervention?

This is part of on going evaluation with staff and systems need to be considered to identify how PP data can be triangulated with progress and achievement data more formally.

- What evaluation has there been of which current approaches are working well and whether better approaches could be used?

Further evaluation of strategies will be considered following evidence from this review.

- What focus has there been on the different approaches used and how these build up to an effective, coherent strategy?

‘Sharing good practice sessions- evaluation and pupil discussion at SEN team meetings and in class meetings. Involvement of MDT for advice- Ed psych, OT, behaviour support. Self- reflection focus of whole school development last year- involvement of the team and use of IRIS (video recording of lessons) We have looked at potential vulnerable groups however numbers are small – 1 girl has a big impact on attendance data so always have an individualised response’(SM)

Conclusions following the visit and desktop monitoring.

Portland is a school dedicated to high quality standards in education and care. The provision for 158 children and young people with severe and complex needs is undergoing change to improve the present provision and a RI Ofsted inspection grade. There is evidence of strategies in teaching, learning and assessment improving outcomes. The learning walk, scrutiny of evidence and discussions with key staff and students all provided a wealth of information on the quality of work undertaken in the school. The commitment to raising standards is palpable and it is clear there is a strong drive to improve the quality of life for some of the most vulnerable children and young people in society.

The Senior Leadership Team have carried out detailed evaluation of the schools strengths and weaknesses and this has led to targeted support for students eligible for Pupil Premium funding. Improvements in provision are on going and include curriculum review and assessment policy implementation. This adds to the vulnerability of the schools position in quantifying evidence of progress and achievement this academic year.

There is an abundance of anecdotal evidence of PP students accessing clubs and a wide range of life enhancing opportunities. Staff were clear regarding, which students were eligible for PP within class groups and understand the ideology behind the

funding initiative.

The attached PP document provides details of the work undertaken to support PP student's progress and achievement. The action plan requires completion with SLT and key staff in considering the outcomes of this review in line with curriculum changes. The review recommends further evaluation of the interventions deployed to raise standards for students receiving a PPG. Further details are included throughout this report.

SEND schools, historically, have difficulties in bench marking cohort attainment due to the individual profiles of students and the manifestation of their diagnosis. As a result validating data is problematic as a primary means of accounting for value for money. Added to this Ascent have implemented a new data tracking and assessment system, which hinders evaluation of year on year progress and achievement this academic year. However the new assessment policy is fit for purpose, in the climate of 'life without levels', and it is clear the investment will provide robust and meaningful, measurable data on children and young peoples progress and achievement, allowing for timely intervention, which will impact further.

Following detailed discussion and the scrutiny of a wide range of evidence this review has credibility and should inform further strategies to maximise student outcomes. As with any SEND evaluation and/or review context is important in order to understand pupils and schools priorities from a baseline.

Recommendations

Occupational Therapy support is in place from a private business. 'Future Steps' is a reputable service and in discussion with the OT and senior staff it is clear that specialist interventions are having a positive impact on standards of behaviour. There is evidence that OT interventions are building capacity by modeling approaches and developing staff skills.

Further discussion on this limited resource having a greater impact on a wider PP population is recommended. There is a referral system but it is unlikely that all PP students, who would benefit from input, have been assessed for support. CPD for staff and follow up activities to ensure strategies are embedded will build capacity further. Key staff would benefit from understanding sensory integration therapy, executive functioning impairment and planning for success with students who have significant attention difficulties. This includes all populations at Portland. A culture where staff feel competent and empowered to deliver therapy outcomes will support PP grant impact.

Students with severe and complex learning needs, including profound and multiple difficulties require on going analysis of needs linked to outcomes within a therapeutic environment. Creating optimum environments, for focus and engagement, using specialist equipment is key to progress or maintaining present levels of function. Linking these approaches to 'deliverables' may prove beneficial in relation to PP funding accountability.

Therapy approaches and planned strategies to support a wider population should be

included in improvement work on a whole school basis. Therapists could offer advice on how to 'grow' staff as therapy champions in key areas.

Clear lines of responsibility and a reporting system, which ensures key information on students is considered by therapists will support consistency of approach and diminish lost learning.

A review of how to link therapy targets, as integral to education reports and assessments, more cohesively to outcomes and impact will provide a greater understanding of students needs leading to targeted interventions. This will prove beneficial in supporting PP student's access to learning. Therapy assessments should focus on impact, and outcomes should be measurable to ensure progress and achievement. This recommendation is pertinent to the content of reports from other specialists deployed within school. Staff need to be able to extend learning opportunities maximising the work of specialists by sharing responsibility for SMART outcomes.

Assessments of student's difficulties in specific areas of learning, i.e. phonological awareness should further underpin interventions RWI. This should be evident in 'trails' of data in books, IEPs etc. There is high quality work being undertaken in specific areas of school and this is quantifiable.

PP interventions include music therapy. This is a substantial cost and in discussion with the DHT further consideration should be given to the impact in relation to the aims of the sessions. These outcomes could be better accessed within a more cost effective and efficient strategy.

Aims of music therapy include:

Enhance self-confidence

Promote concentration

Explore creative potential in music

Develop communication.

What overall impact does music therapy have on pupil progress and achievement? This may need considering prior to the introduction of specialist resources and expected impact should inform decisions on PP funding.

When planning interventions in learning it would be best beneficial to include evidence based practice. Tried and tested approaches, which have validated documentary evidence of impact, may provide better value for money.

This could be adopted as a principle within the Trust.

It is clear there have been changes to systems and processes in support of high quality provision. The ILPs are detailed, including PP funding amounts, and it is recommended that additional impact statements be documented over the coming weeks as a further means of assessing outcomes linked to EHCP. This should support teacher planning.

Staff are hindered by EHCP outcomes lacking credible detail. Outcomes are often open ended, which results in difficulties assessing progress towards meeting expectations. It is recommended that teachers and therapists appropriately consider

how to ensure actions, from documented outcomes, are measurable, as this will support classroom interventions and teacher planning.

Performance management targets link to improvements in teaching and learning. Could specific targets link to the PP cohort as presently the DHT has responsibility for PP standards? Middle leadership responsibility could build capacity further and embed strategies more comprehensively. For example 'pathway leads' could take a greater responsibility for PP outcomes within their strands and compare averages over time.

Supply staff inconsistencies and the number of NQTs requiring support within this highly specialist environment hinder the improvements in the quality of teaching and learning. SLT have strategies to support and are well aware that the greatest impact on PP outcomes stems from high quality teaching. CPD is planned according to evaluated need and OT training is being planned for the whole school next term.

High quality feedback at a level understood by students and clearly linked to reinforcing positive behaviours/outcomes AND giving information on next steps in learning will support progress and achievement further.

The Education Endowment Foundation provides information on PP impact versus cost and Portland have analysed information to consider improvements. A RAG rating is evident and details staff responses to planned interventions as a means of influencing further strategies. This approach could be developed further and school led enquiry based research would provide further validity and/or innovative approaches to meeting students needs.

SEND team agenda items could include fortnightly review of PP outcomes and impact. Following discussion with SLT there is an identified cohort of students at risk of underperformance who are not eligible for PP and this requires further monitoring. PP was allocated to the most disadvantaged children and young people in schools, however Portland recognize increased diligence is required to ensure all students access high quality learning.

PP policy was reviewed and some slight amendments were suggested.

It is recommended that the web site information on PP includes expected impact. ...
1: 1 support has reduced negative behaviours as reported in the behaviour log....as a result?

Agreed action points for PP strategies, from this review, could be included in Portland's 2016/7 PP plan. Key staff to consider recommendations and transform these into personalised targets for cohorts or individual students.

The academy utilises the exemplar action plan format, page 33 of the Pupil Premium Guide as a consistent means of documenting and reviewing subsequent PP grant accountability.

A follow up review visit is commissioned to consider how well recommendations are impacting upon standards.

What does Ofsted say about Pupil Premium?

“The pupil premium is making a difference in so many schools. Overall, school leaders are spending pupil premium funding more effectively, tracking the progress of eligible pupils more closely and reporting outcomes more precisely than before.”

“Head teachers know that their schools will not receive a positive judgement unless they demonstrate that they are focused on improving outcomes for pupils eligible for the pupil premium”

Portland Ofsted summary findings 2015

- Leadership and management require improvement. Leaders do not review the school’s work rigorously and good self- evaluation practices are not embedded.
- *PP funding is considered as a whole school to best inform high quality provision in meeting the needs of the most disadvantaged students in Portland SLT use data effectively to prioritise and plan outcomes.*
- Governors do not interrogate data thoroughly or hold leaders fully to account for students’ learning and progress.
- *Governors have commissioned work on accountability for PP grant funding as a supportive approach to ensuring rigour for the most disadvantaged students. The outcomes of this review will be tabled at the next Trustees meeting.*
- Information about the achievement of children in local authority care is not recorded and reported thoroughly.
- *LAC, PP funding is accounted for in terms of ILPs.*
- Not enough is being done to develop good attendance.
- The Head teacher knows what is needed to move the academy forward and her plans focus on the right things.
- *This review pursued strategies to improve attendance further and utilizing PP funding to enhance the school offer to meet the small cohort of young people who are at risk of non-attendance or whose non-attendance is a cause for concern.*
- Students’ behaviour in school and lessons is good. They enjoy school and are keen to learn.
- The quality of teaching is too variable. As a result, students do not make the progress they could.
- Not all middle leaders are driving improvements in performance well enough to eradicate weaknesses in assessment and planning.
- Sixth form teaching is inconsistent in its impact on achievement. Information about students’ prior attainment is not used well enough to ensure that students are challenged and achieve the best they can. Leaders have not done enough to tackle these issues.

In conclusion

Portland has considered the individual needs of all its eligible PP students and to some extent has provided personalised approaches to supporting progress and achievement. The gap between non-PP and PP is negligible and is strong evidence that funding is being utilised effectively. However improvements should be considered to improve outcomes further. Personalising PP targets to meet individual students needs will enable staff to provide tailored interventions to drive standards in teaching and learning.

It is clear the school has an understanding of the disadvantages of its PP students and that staff are involved in deciding best actions to ensure optimal learning. Improving review systems and including PP as an agenda item in SEND meetings will raise the profile further. Adopting a reflective approach, which automatically considers a 'so what' query, when prioritising spending, will focus staff on impact. Best practice, linking to building capacity would suggest value for money is a factor when considering the maximisation of this resource in Portland.

Utilising PP funding to further support, high quality care and well being is highly legitimate considering attendance and additional mental health needs of a small cohort of pupils.

Recommendations are included in the body of this report and if further support to consider priorities in action planning is required please do not hesitate to contact me.

It was a pleasure and privilege to review PP funding with Portland School and I hope recommendations can support the quality of provision further.