

Pupil premium strategy statement Richard Lander School

This statement details our school's use of pupil premium (and recovery 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 effect that last year's spending of pupil premium had within our school.

School overview

Richard Lander School is founded on the principles of respect, hard work and ambition. Our aim is to enable every student to achieve to the best of their ability and to grow in confidence, self-esteem and maturity.

Through a vibrant curriculum, a wealth of extra-curricular activities and many opportunities to develop student leadership, we ensure students are well prepared for college and university beyond, keen to make a positive difference to the world in which they live. Helping students become 'the best they can be' is the hallmark of all our work. Beyond the curriculum, there is a rich offer of activities, helping students develop confidence, teamwork and commitment.

| Detail | Data |
|---|-----------------------|
| School name | Richard Lander School |
| Number of pupils in school | 1507 |
| Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils | 24% (359) |
| Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers (3 year plans are recommended) | 2021 – 2023 |
| Date this statement was published | October 2022 |
| Date on which it will be reviewed | July 2023 |
| Statement authorised by | Steve Mulcahy |
| Pupil premium lead | Kerry Towers |
| Governor / Trustee lead | Simon Griffiths |

Funding overview

| Detail | Amount |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year | £321,630 (April 22- April 23) |
| Recovery premium funding allocation this academic year | £84,150 |
| Pupil premium funding (and recovery premium) carried forward from previous years | £18,342 |
| Total budget for this academic year | £424,122 |

Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

Statement of intent

Our intention is that all our students, regardless of starting points or barriers to learning, are successful, academically, socially and emotionally. We believe that every student has something special to offer and it is important to let this gift shine and flourish; be this in academic study, on the sporting field, in the creative arena or any other aspect of school life. Our aim is to send well rounded, community minded young adults out into the next stage of their lives

The Richard Lander Vision is to be the best you can be. This is underpinned by our three core values of respect, ambition, and perseverance with an overall mission for every student to aim for excellence as every moment counts.

Our PP strategy plan aims to ensure that every child within the school has the opportunity to thrive in their area of excellence with the support, advice and guidance required to achieve. We pride ourselves on offering bespoke support tailored to the needs of the individual at the time, adapting and re modelling as required to best suit the student and their family.

Our pupil premium strategy plan works towards achieving this by taking a Universal, Targeted and Wider strategy approach, which includes identified challenges and intended outcomes for both KS4 and KS3 students. Ultimately, we want to continue making more progress with our disadvantaged students than non-disadvantaged students do nationally.

Challenges

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

| | Detail of challenge |
|---|--|
| 1 | Increasing the reading age of students who have a reading age below their chronological age |
| 2 | Increasing % of KS3 students self-referring to student support for anxiety based concerns. Continued post COVID school wide SEMH issues / socially weak communication skills |
| 3 | Not all Teachers / tutors are fully aware of who their PP students are, nor plan for them strategically. Some staff are still unaware of the reason for their students PP status and the potential issues this could pose. |
| 4 | Parental engagement is an issue with some hard to reach families (not just PP) despite regular communication and planned interventions. |
| 5 | Attendance: Increasing persistent absenteeism % post COVID lockdowns Attendance of PP students is not as high as other students in school. Persistent absence is higher for PP students than other students, with a focus on the lowest attending cohorts of Ever 6 and PLAC (previously looked after child) students. |
| 6 | Lack of exam practice, experience or preparation due to COVID lockdowns. |
| 7 | A8 and P8 gaps between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students |

Intended outcomes

This explains the outcomes we are aiming for **by the end of our current strategy plan (July 2023)**, and how we will measure whether they have been achieved.

| Intended outcome | Success criteria |
|--|---|
| 1: Improved Reading Ages | Students with a reading age below their chronological age will have increased their reading age to be working towards or at their chronological age. Particularly improving students affected by Covid-19 school closures during primary school. |
| 2: Anxiety / SEMH interventions working well | To see an increase in students having the resilience and strategies to stay in their class, engaging with first wave teaching, seeking support at appropriate times. Student feedback should report feeling less anxious and more confident in school after intervention has taken place. |
| 3: Whole school buy in | Tutors / teachers be able to identify the Pupil Premium students in their groups, having a good understanding of those students. Tutors / teachers should be able to demonstrate an understanding of why identifying PP students is so important. Teachers should demonstrate knowledge of their PP students during learning walks and produce department development plans that incorporate strategic support for their PP students. |
| 4: Parental engagement | Parents/carers should have multiple ways to contact the Pupil Premium team. The PP team should make regular communication to families throughout the academic year. Parents/Carers should feel supported by the team in a non-judgemental environment. |
| 5: Attendance | PP attendance as a whole should improve. Wider strategies implemented to improve the whole cohort and individual/small group interventions arranged for those PP students who are persistently absent from school. |
| 6: Exam exposure | All PP Year 11s sitting exams should have access to revision material and guides. Readily available advice for students in terms of exam preparation. |
| 7: Improved Disadvantaged P8 and A8 GCSE exam scores July 2023 | Narrowing of in school A8 and P8 GAP between Disadvantaged and Non- Disadvantaged students GCSE exams July 2023. |

Targets for year 11 disadvantaged pupils September 2022- July 2023

| Aim | 2022 Actual | 2022 Sisra Collaborative National | 2023 Target |
|---|--------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Progress 8 | 0.31 | -0.40 | 0.35 |
| Attainment 8 | 46.13 | 40.58 | 48 |
| Percentage of Grade 5+ in English and maths | 40.4% | 33.1% | 42% |
| Percentage of Grade 4+ in English and maths | 57.4% | 53% | 60% |
| Maths P8 / A8 | 0.02 / 8.21 | -0.39 / 7.74 | 0.2 / 9 |
| English P8 / A8 | 0.27 / 10 | -0.38 / 8.90 | 0.3 / 11 |
| Ebacc P8 / A8 | 0.21 / 12.95 | -0.46 / 11.52 | 0.25 / 14 |
| Open P8 / A8 | 0.62 / 14.97 | -0.44 / 12.54 | 0.7 / 16 |

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.

Universal: Whole school Approach Budgeted cost: **£91,799** which includes;

| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Cost | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|---|--|---------|-------------------------------|
| Non-teaching Effective Learning Mentor for both Key stages. | <p>Approach: Student drop ins, community engagement etc. parent awareness of ELM role & intervention sessions Targeted students in need from each KS In school liaison between PP students and staff.</p> <p>Evidence: EEF toolkit evidence based interventions from analysis of need. <i>Social and emotional learning (SEL) interventions seek to improve pupils' decision-making skills, interaction with others and their self-management of emotions, rather than focusing directly on the academic or cognitive elements of learning. SEL interventions might focus on the ways in which students work with (and</i></p> | £41,647 | 1-7 inclusive |

| | | | |
|----------------------|---|---------|-----------------|
| | <p><i>alongside) their peers, teachers, family or community.</i></p> <p>We have focused our work in this area on 2 of the main intervention models;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School-level approaches to developing a positive school ethos, which also aims to support greater engagement in learning. Be the best you can be ethos. Respect Attitude Perseverance. • More specialised programmes which use elements of SEL and are targeted at students with particular social or emotional needs. SEMH interventions model and flow chart. <p>Social and emotional learning, using an early intervention, mentoring model +4 months' progress for very low cost.</p> <p>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/social-and-emotional-learning</p> | | 1, 2 & 5 |
| PP curriculum budget | Book club, PP snacks, PP equipment / uniform / trips, PP music lessons, holiday hunger food packages etc. | £50,152 | 2, 3,4,5, 6 & 7 |

Targeted: Individual and small cohort support (bespoke support packages including tutoring, one-to-one support & structured interventions)

Budgeted cost: **£177,442** which includes;

| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Cost | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|---|---|---------|-------------------------------|
| Bespoke intervention packages | As required on individual basis; PP cookery club, Holiday support packages, ICT support packages etc. including CIC and PLAC bespoke packages | £61,907 | 2, 4, 5 & 7 |
| Thinking Reading Intervention English, maths and Science intervention sessions in addition to | <p>Approach: Oral language interventions refer to approaches that emphasise the importance of spoken language and verbal interaction in the classroom. They include dialogic activities.</p> <p><i>Oral language interventions are based on the idea that comprehension and reading skills</i></p> | £49,649 | 1, 5, 6 & 7 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---------|-------|
| regular curriculum offer. | <p><i>benefit from explicit discussion of either content or processes of learning, or both, oral language interventions aim to support learners' use of vocabulary, articulation of ideas and spoken expression.</i></p> <p>Evidence: EEF: Oral Language interventions +6 months' progress v low cost. https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/oral-language-interventions</p> <p>Approach: <i>One to one tuition involves a teacher, teaching assistant or other adult giving a pupil intensive individual support. It may happen outside of normal lessons as additional teaching.</i> On average, one to one tuition is very effective at improving pupil outcomes. One to one tuition might be an effective strategy for providing targeted support for pupils that are identified as having low prior attainment or are struggling in particular areas. Tuition is more likely to make an impact if it is additional to and explicitly linked with normal lessons.</p> <p>Evidence: One to one tuition +5 months' progress v moderate cost. https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/one-to-one-tuition</p> | | |
| National Tutoring Programme – school contribution | <p>The National Tutoring Programme (NTP) provides primary and secondary schools with funding to spend on targeted academic support, delivered by trained and experienced tutors and mentors. We are utilising two aspects of this strategy and for 2022-2023 have employed two academic mentors one based in English and the other in maths. We are also using Teaching Personnel to deliver online sessions mostly outside of school hours to groups of mainly three students in the EBAcc subjects.</p> | £65,886 | 6 & 7 |

Wider strategies: (related to attendance, behaviour for learning, wellbeing)

Budgeted cost: **£154,799**

| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Cost | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|---|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| PP department development plans | Whole school monitoring with a view to improved outcomes via curriculum models. | N/A | 3 & 7 |
| PP department and whole school monitoring including Learning walks, book reviews and student voice. | As above | N/A | 3 & 7 |
| PP tutor packs | Increased information sharing re need and therefore increased pastoral support available as a result. | N/A | 3, 4 & 5 |
| PP Lead and ELM available at all parents evenings and school events | Increased home to school communication, strengthening working relationships. | N/A | 3, 4 & 5 |
| PP mobile phone, so that parents and carers can text instead of call. | To help with the home to school divide that some parents face due to their own school based circumstances. | Within PP curriculum budget | 4 |
| Additional teacher in English and maths @ NQT rate with on costs. | Small class sizes, increased dedicated support for PP students. | £96,750 | 6 & 7 |
| Attendance officer | Increased support to improve attendance and strengthen home to school relationships. | N/A | 5 |
| ERWM (Emotional resilience and wellbeing mentor) | Additional pastoral support layer. | £29,964 | 2 & 4 |
| PP Lead part salary | Strategic overview of PP agenda for the school overtime. | £28,085 | 1-7 inclusive |

Total budgeted cost: £424,040

Part B: Review of the previous academic year

Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils

| Measure | 2022 | School | National Sisra Collaborative Data |
|--------------------------|---|--------|-----------------------------------|
| Average Total Progress 8 | All | 0.41 | 0.01 |
| | Disadvantaged (DC: Disadvantaged) | 0.31 | -0.4 |
| | Non-disadvantaged (DC: Other - Not Disadvantaged) | 0.43 | 0.18 |
| | GAP | -0.12 | -0.58 |

In 2022 disadvantaged students at RLS made almost three quarters of a grade more progress than disadvantaged students nationally (0.31 compared to -0.4). This is significant. In addition, our disadvantaged students made almost a third of a grade more progress than **all students** nationwide (0.31 compared to 0.01) Our in-school gap between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students is almost five times smaller than the national gap (-0.12 compared to -0.58)

| Measure | 2022 | School | National Sisra Collaborative Data |
|----------------------------|---|--------|-----------------------------------|
| Average Total Attainment 8 | All | 55.78 | 49.1 |
| | Disadvantaged (DC: Disadvantaged) | 46.13 | 40.58 |
| | Non-disadvantaged (DC: Other - Not Disadvantaged) | 57.6 | 52.65 |
| | GAP | -11.47 | -12.07 |

In 2022 disadvantaged students at RLS had an average A8 score of 46.13 compared to national disadvantaged students who achieved a score of 40.58. Our in-school gap between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged is in line with the national gap (-11.47 compared to -12.07)

| Disadvantaged Headline RLS scores 5 year trend | 2022 | 2021 | 2020 | 2019 | 2018 |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Attainment 8 | 46.13 | 41.68 | 42.96 | 43.33 | 37.16 |
| Progress 8 | 0.31 | 0.26 | -0.04 | 0.26 | -0.35 |

| GAP between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students at RLS | 2022 | 2021 | 2020 | 2019 | 2018 |
|---|--------|--------|-------|-------|--------|
| Attainment 8 | -11.47 | -17.33 | -13.8 | -10.6 | -17.52 |
| Progress 8 | -0.12 | -0.71 | -0.7 | -0.08 | -0.67 |

In every measure in the 2022 table below Richard Lander disadvantaged students are outperforming disadvantaged students nationally. The grey highlighted progress gaps are significantly positive for RLS disadvantaged students.

| Measure | 2022 RLS disadvantaged | 2022 National Collaborative disadvantaged | Gap RLS disadvantaged to National disadvantaged |
|---|------------------------|---|---|
| Progress 8 | 0.31 | -0.4 | 0.71 |
| Attainment 8 | 46.13 | 40.58 | 5.55 |
| % Students Achieving 9-5 in English and Maths | 40.40% | 33.10% | 0.073 |
| % Students Achieving 9-4 in English and Maths | 57.40% | 53.00% | 0.044 |
| Maths P8 | 0.02 | -0.39 | 0.41 |
| Maths A8 | 8.21 | 7.74 | 0.47 |
| English P8 | 0.27 | -0.38 | 0.65 |
| English A8 | 10 | 8.9 | 1.1 |
| EBACC P8 | 0.21 | -0.46 | 0.67 |
| EBACC A8 | 12.95 | 11.52 | 1.43 |
| Open P8 | 0.62 | -0.44 | 1.06 |
| Open A8 | 14.97 | 12.54 | 2.43 |
| Science Value Added | 0.352 | -0.347 | 0.699 |
| Languages Value Added | 0.074 | -0.3 | 0.374 |
| Humanities Value Added | 0.161 | -0.447 | 0.608 |

Disadvantaged Prior Attainment (PA) groups

| P8 | Richard Lander School | | National Collaborative Data | |
|-----------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| | Disadvantaged | Non-disadvantaged | Disadvantaged | Non-disadvantaged |
| Higher PA | 0.58 | 0.47 | no national data available | |
| Middle PA | 0.26 | 0.38 | no national data available | |
| Lower PA | 0.29 | 0.49 | no national data available | |

Higher PA

Higher PA disadvantaged students at RLS are making **more** progress (P8 0.58) than RLS higher PA non-disadvantaged students (P8 0.47) with a P8 positive gap of 0.11. This is excellent. There is no national data available for comparison.

Middle PA

Middle PA disadvantaged students at RLS are making less progress (P8 0.26) than RLS middle PA non-disadvantaged students (P8 0.38) with a P8 gap of -0.12. There is no national data available for comparison.

Lower PA

Lower PA disadvantaged students at RLS are making less progress (P8 0.29) than RLS lower PA non-disadvantaged students (P8 0.49) with a P8 gap of -0.20. There is no national data available for comparison.

Disadvantaged gender groups

| P8 | Richard Lander School | | National Collaborative Data | |
|--------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| | Disadvantaged | Non-disadvantaged | Disadvantaged | Non-disadvantaged |
| Female | 0.33 | 0.71 | all girls nationally 0.19 | |
| Male | 0.24 | 0.16 | all boys nationally -0.16 | |

Females

Disadvantaged females at RLS are making less progress (P8 0.33) than RLS non-disadvantaged females (P8 0.71) with a current P8 gap of -0.38. The in school female disadvantaged gap has therefore grown from 0.01 in 2019. However, RLS disadvantaged females are making **more progress than all females nationally** (P8 0.19) with a positive gap of 0.14. This is great.

Males

Disadvantaged males at RLS are making **more progress** (P8 0.24) than both RLS non-disadvantaged males (P8 0.16) with a current P8 gap of 0.08 **and all boys nationally** (P8 -0.16) with a gap of 0.4. This is excellent. The in school male disadvantaged gap of 0.08 has improved from 2019 when it was -0.24.

Disadvantaged SEN groups

| P8 | Richard Lander School | | National Collaborative Data | |
|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | Disadvantaged | Non-disadvantaged | Disadvantaged | Non-disadvantaged |
| No SEN | 0.57 (33 students) | 0.48 (227 students) | all Non SEN nationally 0.09 | |
| SEN support | -0.32 (11 students) | 0.1 (22 students) | all SEN support nationally -0.45 | |
| SEN EHCP | -0.91 (3 students) | -4.37 (1 student) | all SEN EHCP nationally -0.79 | |

Non-SEN

Non-SEN disadvantaged students at RLS made **greater** progress (P8 0.57) compared to RLS non-SEN non-disadvantaged students (P8 0.48) **and all non-SEN students nationally** (P8 0.09). This is brilliant.

SEN support

SEN support disadvantaged students at RLS made less progress (P8 -0.32) than RLS SEN support non-disadvantaged students (P8 0.1) **but more progress than all SEN support students nationally** (P8 -0.45).

SEN EHCP

The three SEN EHCP disadvantaged students at RLS made more progress (P8 -0.91) than the single RLS SEN EHCP non-disadvantaged student (P8 -4.37) but the cohort sizes are too small to make conclusive statements.

Externally provided programmes

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

| Programme | Provider |
|------------------|-------------------------|
| Thinking Reading | James Murphy Associates |

Service pupil premium funding (optional)

| Measure | Details |
|--|---|
| How did you spend your service pupil premium allocation last academic year? | We have an Ex-military allocated member of teaching staff who leads on providing support for students within the Service PP cohort. |
| What was the impact of that spending on service pupil premium eligible pupils? | Students can meet termly, placing an importance on the themes they are not alone in their situation. Students and families are offered internal support and signposted to external support avenues as required. |