Ascent Academies' Trust Internal Pupil Premium Grant Review
Pre Review Briefing

Portland Academy

Review date 21st February 2018
Pre Review Briefing pack circulated – 19th February 2018

Reviewers
Rachel Ireland, Executive Headteacher
Steven Murphy Deputy Headteacher

Reading / documents to inform the pre review briefing

Document	Location / circulation	Date of publication
Academy Website	http://www.portlandcollege.org/	
Previous Ofsted reports	http://www.portlandcollege.org/news/ofsted/	
Grants expenditure and review	http://www.portlandcollege.org/information/grants/	
SEF/AIP	School IP collaboration OneDrive	
SEN Board minutes	OneDrive	
Context Data	OneDrive	

Reading / documents available to access for reference purposes (not needed on the day)

Document	Location / circulation	Date of publication
DFE Guidance - PPG	https://www.gov.uk/guidance/pupil-premium-information-for-schools-and-alternative-provision-settings#using-the-pupil-premium-effectively	Updated February 2017
EEF Toolkit	https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/evidence-summaries/teaching-learning-toolkit	
Teaching Schools Council Guidance	https://www.tscouncil.org.uk/resources/guide-to-effective-pupil-premium-review/	Spring 2016
Inspection Handbook	https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/common-inspection-framework-education-skills-and-early-years-from-september-2015	December 2017
PE and Sports Premium	https://www.gov.uk/guidance/pe-and-sport-premium-for-primary-schools	October 2017
Year 7 literacy and numeracy Catch Up Grant	https://www.gov.uk/guidance/year-7-literacy-and-numeracy-catch-up-premium-guide-for-schools	October 2017
Inspection dashboard – ASP	Online through secure website	January 2018

A list of documents that may be requested to be available on the day of the review and/or for prior reading on 21st February 2018

- **Sample of leadership minutes where whole school progress is discussed and PPG.**
- **SEN team/board minutes where PPG students are discussed**
- **Academic team/board minutes where progress and PPG are discussed.**
- **En/Ma intervention timetable, sample of program of intervention, evidence of QA/T,L&A monitoring of delivery. Any assessment data pre and post interventions for a sample of students**
- **Evaluated EHCP action plan of identified students in each Key Stage.**
- **A file for thee pupils of differing SEND and abilities (one PMLD pupil please) who have accessed more than one intervention as detailed on the PPG plan for expenditure - please include their EHCP, behaviour watch, pupil profile, positive handling plan, risk assessment, academic information, attendance overview for the autumn term.**

<u>Initial questions and hypotheses focusing on the SEF and Academy Improvement Plan</u>

School SEF grade: Good
Ofsted grade: Requires Improvement with Good (L&M,PDBW)

Key Points
The PP vs non PP attendance gap was previously closing (16/17), autumn data shows there is an attendance gap between PP and non PP – what are the school doing to close this?
Students in Key Stage 3 in receipt of pupil premium do not make the same rates of progress as in KS2 and KS4 and when compared to students not in receipt of PP.
Destinations data for all students shows they are sustaining their training, employment and education provisions post 16.

Initial Questions:

- **The evaluated document for 2016/17 indicates there is a significant gap in expected progress(PP vs non PP) in maths at both key stage 3 and 4. What is the progress data telling us about students meeting and exceeding target in the autumn term 2017/18? What strategies have been used to increase the rates of progress in maths?**
- **How is current funding being used to improve the quality of T&L for students in receipt of PPG?**
- **What does the data tell us about the performance of different SEND PPG students and abilities (LA, MA, HA)?**
- **There was no significant gap in attendance rates in 2016/17, although both groups were below 95%. What is the attendance and absence rates for all groups of pupils? What impact are the chosen strategies having on individuals and groups of pupils in receipt of PP?**
- **How are the maths and English interventions planned, coordinated and quality assured?**
- **What are the qualification routes and intended outcomes for year 10 and year 11?**
- **Do class based staff know who the PP students are and plan accordingly?**

Pupil Progress PPG vs Non PPG		
Key Questions • **What is the progress data telling us about students exceeding target - does this also show a closing gap?** • **What are the school doing to address progress in maths?** • **What interventions are planned for English and maths**	**Analysis to take place:** **Progress data for the autumn term by different groups PPG vs non PPG**	
Focus	**Notes**	**Outcomes**
SLT to present pupil progress data for the autumn term by phase/SEND group PPG vs Non PPG On the day request a number of EHCP action plans and progress data for pupils in receipt of PPG from the Student Data Sheet for deeper analysis Have sight of; • A case study As requested on or before the day. • EHCP action plan • Books • Behaviour plans • EHCP • Risk Assessments • SEN Minutes	• The academic progress data has been derived from analysis on the moderated SLP targets and achievements. There are three pathways in the school which is related to student targets. The SLPs are either met, not met or • Pupil progress meetings have taken place between Middle Leaders and class teachers – a professional discussion has taken place for every pupil in relation to their autumn targets. • Those not meeting target are given additional intervention as detailed on their academic intervention plans – students in receipt of PP are identified on this plan and direct links to their SLP and the grant expenditure are detailed.	• Evaluate the impact of individual student interventions (as detailed on their SLPs) used in the autumn term. • SaLT to be deployed through PP grant to review S&L targets, activities and interventions. • SaLT to liaise with SEN team and part of the wider MDT team to address the students in KS4 who have not met their S&L target. • Review strategies for speaking and listening and revise PP plan. • Continue strategies for number, writing and reading and further involve

	- English Autumn term progress shows that - English 26% non PP met their target vs 37% PP. This is a + gap. The % of students partially meeting or not meeting showed little variance between the two groups. - Maths Number non PP 36% met their target vs 38%. This is a very small gap. The % of students partially meeting or not meeting showed little variance between the two groups. - In Reading students in receipt of PP are making better progress than those who are not, 53% vs 36%. In Speaking and listening there is a – gap between PP and non PP. 40% of non PP have met target vs 24% PP. There is very little variance between both groups in writing progress – 33% of students in receipt of PP vs 32% of non PP. - Progress in reading has seen the biggest increase September 2017 with targeted PP funding being used to develop this area, particularly strategies such as implementing the RWI program, staff CPD, resources. - The planned expenditure in September was targeting the increase in reading	families in home learning relating to these areas and speaking and listening. - Include families in the strategies in the intervention plans.

	progress and reducing the gap in maths/number progress. There is evidence of impact in both reading and the reduction in the gap in maths.	

Behaviour analysis		

Key Questions	**Analysis to take place:**	
- How well is the behaviour of different groups of pupils managed? - PPG funding is used to support the independent and assisted behaviour management of pupils, is this having an impact?	**Behaviour Watch/PI data PPG vs non PPG 16/17 and autumn 17**	

Focus	**Notes**	**Outcomes**
On the day request a number and variety of behaviour incidences from the Student Data Sheet/Behaviour Watch overview of the autumn term/PI logs for deeper analysis Have sight of: - A case study As requested on or before the day. - EHCP documents - Behaviour plans - Risk assessments - Behaviour Watch Analysis - SEN team minutes - Leadership minutes	- Evidence presented from the leadership team shows that the ongoing evaluation and analysis of behaviour is tightly managed and reviewed through the SEN team, Leadership team, behaviour manager. - OT evidence?	Review how SCERTS is being used for assessing and setting targets. Leadership to monitor the use of SCERTS

Attendance and absence data		

Key Questions	**Analysis to take place:**	
- What is the attendance and absence rates for all groups of pupils? - How many students in receipt of PPG are persistently	**Attendance and absence data for 2016/17 and autumn 2017 groups PPG vs non PPG**	

Focus	Notes	Outcomes
absent?		

Focus	Notes	Outcomes
On the day request 2 EHCP Plans & lesson 1 plans and evaluations/evidence files from the Student Data Sheet for deeper analysis Areas of inquiry could include: Looked After Children PPG by SEND Have sight of: • A Case study – following a student from EHCP outcomes to provision, progress and impact	• There is a gap between the attendance of students in receipt of PP and those not. The autumn term shows that non PP attendance was 94.72% vs 92.71%. A 2 % difference. • Persistent absence. • There are 38 students in total who were persistently absent in the autumn term, 18 of those are in receipt of PP, 10 were not. • There is a cohort of PP students below 95% and above 90% who need targeted strategies to increase their rates of attendance. • Teachers receive student attendance information and leaflets and information are sent home. Attendance is detailed on the SLPs.	• Revise grant expenditure to have greater impact upon attendance strategies to reduce the number of PP students who are Persistently absent, increase the % attendance of those who are persistently absent and increase the attendance of those who are 90%+ but below 95%. • SLT and phase leads to monitor the attendance targets set on SLPs.

Impact of PPG funding on provision for groups of pupils

Key Questions: **What is the impact of PPG funding on students with PMLD?**	**Analysis to take place:** Review the number of pupils in receipt of PPG by SEND groups Analyse the impact and expenditure on different groups including PMLD cohort

Focus	Notes	Outcomes
On the day request EHCP Plans from the Student Data Sheet for deeper analysis Areas of inquiry could include: PMLD	• MOVE program has yet to be fully developed. Training for a teacher to be a move trainer to be in place. • Rebound training has taken place and this is being used for the PMLD students in receipt of PP.	• Redeploy the funding that was for Move to • Calculate the costings to date for therapies and training and update into PP expenditure plan.

Learning Plans Have sight of: • A Case study – following a student from EHCP outcomes to provision, progress and impact		• RIR and SMU to review the impact of therapies and planned use of therapies in SLP/EHCP documents in the summer term.
Planned expenditure – evidence of impact Mid year review of funding	Evidence	Further actions
Quality of teaching for all Objective 1) To secure expected progress for PP pupils in English/Literacy. 90% of pupils in receipt of PP will make at least expected progress, those who are not making expected will have detailed intervention plans.		
To secure expected progress for PP pupils in Mathematics. 90% of pupils in receipt of PP will make at least expected progress, those who are not making expected will have detailed intervention plans.		
To provide wider curriculum opportunities and enrichment experiences to promote wellbeing, happiness and raise aspirations	A greater range of extra-curricular clubs are now on offer. These are subsidised for students who are LAC and those in receipt of PPG. Access to residential trips and visits are subsided or are cost neutral for students in receipt of PP.	Review the take up rate
To ensure vulnerable pupils are monitored and supported by school. Focus on parental engagement and early intervention strategies.		