

Pupil premium strategy statement – St Paul’s Way 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 outcomes for disadvantaged pupils last academic year.

School overview

Detail	Data
Number of pupils in school	1194 (Years 7-11)
Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils	44%
Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers	2023-24
Date this statement was published	December 2023
Date on which it will be reviewed	December 2024
Statement authorised by	Nicholas John
Pupil premium lead	Gwilym Goulson
Governor / Trustee lead	Jennifer Cox

Funding overview

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year	£649,980
Recovery premium funding allocation this academic year <i>Recovery premium received in academic year 2023/24 cannot be carried forward beyond August 31, 2024.</i>	£174,432
Pupil premium funding carried forward from previous years (<i>enter £0 if not applicable</i>)	N/A
Total budget for this academic year <i>If your school is an academy in a trust that pools this funding, state the amount available to your school this academic year</i>	£824,412

Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

Statement of intent

St Paul's Way is committed to providing effective resources and ensuring vital support is in place to raise the progress of disadvantaged pupils of all abilities and to diminish any differences between disadvantaged students and non-disadvantaged students.

Our belief is that our disadvantaged pupils should achieve in line with all our pupils and that disadvantage should not be a barrier to our pupils' success.

This document details the planned spend of the Pupil Premium Grant and Recovery Premium fund for 2023-24 and the challenges we seek to overcome in planning this spending.

Measures have been adapted to consider the specific impact of Covid 19 on our pupils, in particular the impact on suspensions and safeguarding and wellbeing.

Challenges

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

Challenge number	Detail of challenge
1	PP Pupils have lower literacy levels
2	PP Pupils have lower attendance than non-pp
3	PP Pupils have higher incidents of Fixed Term Suspensions
4	PP Pupils have lower progress at KS4
5	High levels of social and emotional needs, particularly for vulnerable pupils with complex family needs

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 literacy rates for PP Pupils	An improvement in literacy rates for PP students and a narrowed gap in literacy rates between PP and Non-PP students.

Improved attendance of PP Pupils	Maintain higher than national average attendance for PP students and narrow gap in attendance between PP and Non-PP students.
Reduced suspensions for PP Pupils	A reduction in suspensions for PP students and a narrowed gap in suspensions between PP and Non-PP students.
Improved progress at KS4 for PP Pupils	Rates of progress to remain above national average for PP students at KS4 and narrow the gap between PP and Non-PP students.
Improved framework for social emotional support for PP pupils with complex family needs	An established system of support via school for social and emotional needs for PP pupils in complex family structures.

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: £197,198

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
<i>Coaching</i>	<p>Action:</p> <p>To improve teaching through Instructional Coaching Programme</p> <p>Rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers can only improve or attend to a few elements of their practice at a time: they need to be given manageable steps at a high frequency (weekly or fortnightly) Teachers need to be shown the gap between their practice and improved practice – coaches are trained to model the action steps given to them in their coaching conversation Teachers need opportunities to rehearse before they go “live” in the classroom. This is achieved through 	1 & 4

	<p>deliberate practice with the coach where they practise their action steps and the coach gives feedback against set success criteria. This ensures the action step is correctly implemented and behaviour starts to become habituated scripts the coaching conversations. StepLab also tracks the conversations and feedback for analysis, quality assurance and scaffolding</p> <p>Description of Intervention:</p> <p>All teachers are coaching fortnightly by a trained coach they are given bitesize action steps that are high leverage and manageable and supported by the StepLab platform. Teachers are modelled their actions steps and engage in deliberate practice with their coach before entering the classroom.</p>	
<i>Whole class tutor time reading</i>	<p>Action:</p> <p>KS3 tutors read a range of challenging and diverse novels, following the school's Register Read Rally programme, to increase fluency and enjoyment of reading.</p> <p>Rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people who enjoy reading very much are nearly five times as likely to read above the expected level for their age compared with young people who do not enjoy reading at all • Researchers from the National Literacy Trust found that only 3 young people in 10 were reading daily in their own time and this decreases with age • Developing a love of reading can be more important for a child's educational success than their family's socio-economic background. OECD, 2002 <p>Description of Intervention:</p> <p>Form tutor reads to tutees x3 per week from class novel, students follow the text via guided reading.</p>	1
<i>Smaller class sizes for core subjects</i>	<p>Action:</p> <p>Create an additional three classes with reduced student numbers for lower attaining students in Year 8 for Maths and Science, and Year 9 for Maths, English and Science.</p> <p>Rationale:</p> <p>By deploying smaller class sizes, students with the most need will receive focused support and intervention.</p>	1 & 4

	<p>Education Endowment Fund (EEF) Teaching and Learning Toolkit:</p> <p>Reducing class size EEF (educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reducing class size has a small positive impact of +2 month, on average. 2. Smaller classes only impact upon learning if the reduced numbers allow teachers to teach differently – for example, having higher quality interactions with pupils or minimising disruption. 3. The gains from smaller class sizes are likely to come from the increased flexibility for organising learners and the quality and quantity of feedback the pupils receive <p>Description of Intervention:</p> <p>Smaller class sizes, often combined with an LSA, to ensure that lower attaining students have more time with their teacher and higher quantity of feedback on their learning.</p>	
--	--	--

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

Budgeted cost: £24,452

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
<p><i>Director of Literacy & HAPs (25%)</i></p>	<p>Action:</p> <p>Appoint a Director of Literacy to lead literacy development and the tutor time reading programme.</p> <p>Rationale:</p> <p>Education Endowment Fund (EEF) Teaching and Learning Toolkit:</p> <p>Reading comprehension strategies EEF (educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reading comprehension strategies are high impact on average (+6 months). 2. It is important to identify the appropriate level of text difficulty, to provide appropriate context to practice the skills, desire to engage with the text and enough challenge to improve reading comprehension. 3. Effective diagnosis of reading difficulties is important in identifying possible solutions, particularly for older struggling readers. Pupils can struggle with decoding 	<p>1 & 4</p>

	<p>words, understanding the structure of the language used, or understanding particular vocabulary, which may be subject-specific.</p> <p>4. A wide range of strategies and approaches can be successful, but for many pupils they need to be taught explicitly and consistently.</p> <p>Description of intervention:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Oversee and support the library team to develop a positive reading culture for all students. ● Work with the wider curriculum team to develop a strategy that ensures teachers: develop the key skills of reading, writing and oral communication, to enable pupils to access different areas of the curriculum; teach in a way that enables the most able to excel. 	
<i>KS3 Literacy Interventions</i>	<p>Action:</p> <p>Identify students with lower literacy levels and use Lexia programme during tutor time to improve literacy levels. Train teachers to deliver the intervention.</p> <p>Rationale:</p> <p>Education Endowment Fund (EEF) Teaching and Learning Toolkit:</p> <p>Reading comprehension strategies EEF (educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk)</p> <p>5. Reading comprehension strategies are high impact on average (+6 months).</p> <p>6. It is important to identify the appropriate level of text difficulty, to provide appropriate context to practice the skills, desire to engage with the text and enough challenge to improve reading comprehension.</p> <p>7. Effective diagnosis of reading difficulties is important in identifying possible solutions, particularly for older struggling readers. Pupils can struggle with decoding words, understanding the structure of the language used, or understanding particular vocabulary, which may be subject-specific.</p> <p>8. A wide range of strategies and approaches can be successful, but for many pupils they need to be taught explicitly and consistently.</p> <p>Description of Intervention:</p> <p>Target students in Year 7-10 receive intervention using Lexia three times per week for 30 mins during tutor time. Data is analysed half-terminally and group changes made accordingly.</p>	1 & 4
<i>Brilliant Club</i>	<p>Action:</p> <p>A group of PP students in Year 8 and 9 take part in the Brilliant Club programme each year.</p>	4

	<p>Rationale:</p> <p>In the UK today, a young person's chances of accessing life-changing higher education remain linked to their socioeconomic background. Whilst there has been an increase in progression to university over time, research shows that there are deep-rooted inequalities in accessing the most selective institutions, which are renowned for their positive impact on young people's futures.</p> <p>https://thebrilliantclub.org/evaluation/programmes-evaluation/</p> <p>Description of Intervention:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupils visit a highly-selective partner state schools university where they receive tailored information, advice and guidance. • In groups of up to six, pupils take part in seven university-style tutorials delivered by a researcher on courses which are based on academic research and range across STEM, the humanities and social sciences. • Pupils complete a challenging final assignment of between 1,000-2,500 words, depending on their age group, which is marked on a university-style grading scheme. • Pupils visit a second highly-selective university for a celebratory graduation event, which we invite parents and carers to join. 	
--	--	--

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

Budgeted cost: £608,566

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
<i>Student Achievement Coordinators x5</i>	<p>Action:</p> <p>Establish a team of Student Achievement Coordinators (SACs) who monitor the progress, attendance, behaviour and wellbeing of students in each year group, identifying students for small group-based interventions.</p> <p>Rationale:</p> <p>By deploying a team of Student Achievement Co-ordinators, students will receive focused support and intervention.</p>	2, 3 & 5

	<p>Education Endowment Fund (EEF) Teaching and Learning Toolkit:</p> <p>Social and emotional learning EEF (educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) interventions have an identifiable and significant impact on attitudes to learning, social relationships in school, and attainment itself, on average around 3 to 4 months’ additional progress” • “evidence suggests that behavioural interventions can produce large improvements in academic performance along with a decrease in problematic behaviours” (+4 months) • “Overall absence rates are higher for pupils who are eligible for and claiming free school meals – 7.2 per cent compared to 4.0. They are over twice as likely to be persistently absent (21.6 per cent compared with 8.1)” • “Specifically, pupils with no absence are 1.5 times more likely to achieve 5+ GCSEs A*-C or equivalent and 2.8 times more likely to achieve 5+ GCSEs A*-C or equivalent including English and mathematics than pupils missing 15-20 per cent of KS4 lessons. The difference in achievement is also evident with the English Baccalaureate, where pupils with no absence are around 10.2 times more likely to achieve the English Baccalaureate than pupils missing 15-20 per cent of KS4 lessons. The relationship between absence and KS4 attainment remained similar over the past five academic years”. <p>Description of Intervention:</p> <p>One Student Achievement Coordinator in each year group to work closely with the Year Team Leader to ensure that PP students identified as being at risk of exclusion and/or making less than expected progress receive relevant and impactful pastoral support programmes to reduce the risk of exclusion and improve progress.</p>	
<p><i>Senior Pastoral Lead</i></p>	<p>Action:</p> <p>SLT lead for Intervention and Attendance</p> <p>Rationale:</p> <p>Department for Education: Supporting the attainment of disadvantaged pupils (publishing.service.gov.uk)</p>	<p>2, 3 & 5</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● “A whole-school approach promoting learning which sets high aspirations for all pupils” ● “Leaders can adopt specific behaviours to improve outcomes for disadvantaged pupils in their school.” ● “It’s not just what you do; it’s also the way that you do it. Schools can improve their effectiveness by focusing on the depth and quality of their support strategies.” ● “Senior leaders in more successful schools ensure that staff are willing to do whatever it takes to help each pupil to succeed. They hold every staff member accountable for pupils’ progress. They train staff to provide high quality feedback to pupils and adopt the same approach themselves when providing feedback to staff.” <p>Description of Intervention:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SLT lead appointed to drive Year Inclusion Meetings ● Develop and improve existing policy for Persistent Absent students ● Monitor and improve the quality of internal and external interventions ● Audit and assess the impact of tiered interventions at SPWT ● Lead on the whole school Attendance Policy and systems and processes for tracking, monitoring and intervening for key pupils at risk of low attendance 	
<p><i>Attendance Officer</i></p>	<p>Action:</p> <p>To ensure that there is a clear programme of intervention for students eligible for PP with low attendance.</p> <p>Rationale:</p> <p>In-school and national trends show that students eligible for PP tend to have lower attendance than students not eligible for PPG. By ensuring that there is a member of staff responsible for attendance, they will have the responsibility and accountability for improving attendance outcomes for students.</p> <p>DFE statistics 2022/23: Pupil absence in schools in England, Autumn and spring term 2022/23 – Explore education statistics – GOV.UK (explore-education-statistics.service.gov.uk)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● “The overall absence rate for pupils who are eligible for free school meals was 10.9% across autumn and 	<p>2</p>

spring terms 2022/23, up from 10.4% in the same period in the previous year. This compares to 6.0% for those pupils who were not eligible for free school meals, a decrease from 6.4% for the same period in 2021/22”

- “35.7% of pupils who were eligible for free school meals were persistently absent across the autumn and spring terms 2022/23 combined, an increase from 35.4% in 2021/22. This compares to 15.9% of pupils who were not eligible, a decrease from 17.9%”

2022 Government White Paper:

[The link between absence and attainment at KS2 and KS4, Academic year 2018/19 – Explore education statistics – GOV.UK \(explore-education-statistics.service.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/white-papers/2022/06/23/the-link-between-absence-and-attainment-at-ks2-and-ks4)

- “Pupils with higher attainment at KS2 and KS4 had lower levels of absence over the key stage compared to those with lower attainment.”
- “Pupils who did not achieve the expected standard in reading, writing and maths in 2019 had an overall absence rate of 4.7% over the key stage, compared with 3.5% among pupils who achieved the expected standard and 2.7% among those who achieved the higher standard.”
- “Pupils who did not achieve grade 9 to 4 in English and maths GCSEs in 2019 had an overall absence rate of 8.8% over the key stage, compared with 5.2% among pupils who achieved a grade 4 and 3.7% among pupils who achieved grade 9 to 5 in both English and maths.”
- “Generally, the higher the percentage of sessions missed across the key stage at KS2 and KS4, the lower the level of attainment at the end of the key stage.”
- “Among pupils with no missed sessions over KS2, 83.9% achieved the expected standard compared to 40.2% of pupils who were persistently absent.”
- “Among pupils with no missed sessions over KS4, 83.7% achieved grades 9 to 4 in English and maths compared to 35.6% of pupils who were persistently absent.”

Description of Intervention:

Employ an additional member of staff within the attendance team whose remit will be to ensure that there is support available for students eligible for pupil premium to ensure that they attend school regularly and that their attendance is kept above 96%.

<p><i>Attendance Welfare Advisor</i></p>	<p>Action:</p> <p>To ensure that there is a clear programme of intervention for students eligible for PP who have attendance below 90%.</p> <p>Rationale:</p> <p>In-school and national trends show that students eligible for PP tend to have lower attendance than students not eligible for PPG. By ensuring that there is a member of staff responsible for attendance, they will have the responsibility and accountability for improving attendance outcomes for students.</p> <p>2022 Government White Paper: The link between absence and attainment at KS2 and KS4, Academic year 2018/19 – Explore education statistics – GOV.UK (explore-education-statistics.service.gov.uk)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● “Pupils with higher attainment at KS2 and KS4 had lower levels of absence over the key stage compared to those with lower attainment.” ● “Pupils who did not achieve the expected standard in reading, writing and maths in 2019 had an overall absence rate of 4.7% over the key stage, compared with 3.5% among pupils who achieved the expected standard and 2.7% among those who achieved the higher standard.” ● “Pupils who did not achieve grade 9 to 4 in English and maths GCSEs in 2019 had an overall absence rate of 8.8% over the key stage, compared with 5.2% among pupils who achieved a grade 4 and 3.7% among pupils who achieved grade 9 to 5 in both English and maths.” ● “Generally, the higher the percentage of sessions missed across the key stage at KS2 and KS4, the lower the level of attainment at the end of the key stage.” ● “Among pupils with no missed sessions over KS2, 83.9% achieved the expected standard compared to 40.2% of pupils who were persistently absent.” ● “Among pupils with no missed sessions over KS4, 83.7% achieved grades 9 to 4 in English and maths compared to 35.6% of pupils who were persistently absent.” <p>Description of Intervention:</p>	<p>2</p>
--	--	----------

	Employ an AWA for an additional day whose remit will be to ensure that there is support available for students eligible for pupil premium to ensure that they attend school regularly and that their attendance increases to above 90%.	
<p><i>Student Support Assistants x 2</i></p>	<p>Action:</p> <p>Establish a team of Student Support Assistants who mentor PA students, identifying students for small group-based interventions. They also support site supervision model to ensure high expectations on-site of all students.</p> <p>Rationale:</p> <p>By deploying a team of Student Support Assistants, students will receive focused support and intervention.</p> <p>Education Endowment Fund (EEF) Teaching and Learning Toolkit:</p> <p>Social and emotional learning EEF (educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) interventions have an identifiable and significant impact on attitudes to learning, social relationships in school, and attainment itself, on average around 3 to 4 months’ additional progress” • “evidence suggests that behavioural interventions can produce large improvements in academic performance along with a decrease in problematic behaviours” (+4 months) • “Overall absence rates are higher for pupils who are eligible for and claiming free school meals – 7.2 per cent compared to 4.0. They are over twice as likely to be persistently absent (21.6 per cent compared with 8.1)” • “Specifically, pupils with no absence are 1.5 times more likely to achieve 5+ GCSEs A*-C or equivalent and 2.8 times more likely to achieve 5+ GCSEs A*-C or equivalent including English and mathematics than pupils missing 15-20 per cent of KS4 lessons. The difference in achievement is also evident with the English Baccalaureate, where pupils with no absence are around 10.2 times more likely to achieve the English Baccalaureate than pupils missing 15-20 per cent of KS4 lessons. The relationship between absence and KS4 attainment remained similar over the past five academic years”. 	2 & 3

	<p>Description of Intervention:</p> <p>Two Student Support Assistants to work closely with the SLT lead for Site Supervision and Senior Pastoral Lead to ensure that PP students identified as being at risk of low attendance receive relevant and impactful pastoral support programmes</p>	
<p><i>Mentoring Lead / Reset Room Manager</i></p>	<p>Action:</p> <p>Mentoring Lead / Reset Room Manager to manage all aspects of the Reset Room including coordinating the curriculum offer, timetable, and behaviour routines. Also to design, implement and evaluate the mentoring provision at SPW.</p> <p>Rationale:</p> <p>The department for Children, Schools and Families published 'internal exclusion guidance' https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/712/1/DCSF-00055-2010.pdf in 2010:</p> <p>"As part of a whole school approach to behaviour and attendance, internal exclusion offers immediate, short-term provision in order that learning and teaching for the majority of pupils can continue uninterrupted. 'Remove rooms' should be used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for pupils who have been internally excluded and referred through the correct channels • when a potentially explosive situation can be resolved by placing pupils in the remove room • in line with the school's behaviour policy <p>Pupils should understand that they will be required to complete set work whilst excluded from class and this work should be provided by teachers. Pupils should also be encouraged to reflect on the reasons for their internal exclusion.</p> <p>The remove room may be located within a classroom in a quiet area of the school, be a separate room within the school or in a separate building with its own entrance. A limit should be set regarding the number of pupils that can be in the remove room at any one time as overcrowding will diminish the positive effect this sanction can have."</p> <p>Description of Intervention:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To design, implement and evaluate the timetable for the Reset Room provision 	<p>2, 3 & 5</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To ensure curriculum provision is robust and aligned with faculty provision to minimise lost learning for students. • To lead on accurate tracking and analysing of data in order to implement medium and long-term strategic development and reduce repeat referrals. • To ensure suitable adaptations to meet the needs of key student groups across all rooms e.g. EHCP and other vulnerable groups • To design, deliver and evaluate SPW Assertive Mentoring program for Individual and groups of students • To support the delivery of the whole school Personal Development program 	
<p><i>Counselling Service</i></p>	<p>Action:</p> <p>Deployment of a targeted counselling service and small group interventions for the duration of the academic year.</p> <p>Rationale:</p> <p>There is a strong body of research to support the idea that emotional stress and anxiety are limiting factors on learning and attendance at school. The aim of the counselling service is to address and ultimately remove these barriers.</p> <p>Education Endowment Fund (EEF) Teaching and Learning Toolkit:</p> <p>Social and emotional learning EEF (educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Parental involvement is consistently associated with pupils’ success at school. The impact of parents’ aspirations is also important.” (+3 months) • “SEL interventions have an identifiable and significant impact on attitudes to learning, social relationships in school, and attainment itself, on average around 3 to 4 months’ additional progress” • “Evidence suggests that behavioural interventions can produce large improvements in academic performance along with a decrease in problematic behaviours” (+4 months) <p>Description of Intervention:</p> <p>A counsellor on site at SPWT to support students. The counsellor sees pupils from across Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4.</p>	<p>5</p>

Total budgeted cost: £830,215

Part B: Review of the previous academic year

Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils

Teaching Outcomes

KS4 Attainment:

- Attainment 8 score overall was 5.5. This is 0.9 higher than national and 0.7 higher than Tower Hamlets
- Attainment 8 score for English was 6.0. This is 1.1 higher than national and 0.7 higher than Tower Hamlets
- Attainment 8 score for Maths was 5.3. This is 0.5 higher than national and 0.7 higher than Tower Hamlets
- Attainment 8 score for EBACC was 5.1. This is 0.5 higher than national and 0.6 higher than Tower Hamlets
- Attainment 8 score for “other qualifications” was 5.8. This is 1.2 higher than national and 1.1 higher than Tower Hamlets
- Attainment 8 score for PP students was 5.3. This is 1.8 higher than national and 0.7 higher than Tower Hamlets
- The gap with non-PP students for Attainment 8 is -0.4 . This is the same as Tower Hamlets and -1.1 compared to national

KS4 Progress:

- Progress 8 score overall was $+0.50$. This is $+0.53$ higher than national and $+0.30$ higher than Tower Hamlets
- Progress 8 score for English was $+0.67$. This is $+0.71$ higher than national and $+0.32$ higher than Tower Hamlets
- Progress 8 score for Maths was $+0.35$. This is $+0.37$ higher than national and $+0.18$ higher than Tower Hamlets
- Progress 8 score for EBACC was $+0.25$. This is $+0.28$ higher than national and $+0.18$ higher than Tower Hamlets
- Progress 8 score for “other qualifications” was $+0.73$. This is $+0.77$ higher than national and $+0.52$ higher than Tower Hamlets
- Progress 8 score for PP students was $+0.33$. This is $+0.93$ higher than national and $+0.21$ higher than Tower Hamlets
- The gap with non-PP students for Progress 8 is 0.33 . This is $+0.37$ compared to national and $+0.13$ compared to Tower Hamlets

Activity	Evidence of Impact	Challenge number addressed																																																																																																																
<i>Coaching</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since coaching was introduced in 2021, there have been 1,829 coaching lesson observations which teachers have received feedback from. • Of these, 1,440 coaching action steps have been achieved • Only one teacher has been put on a support plan since coaching began. After weekly coaching, this was resolved and they were taken off 	1 & 4																																																																																																																
<i>Whole class tutor time reading</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cohort mean standard age scores have increased to significantly higher than the national average • Rates of progress are higher than National average • Year 7 2022-23: EOY Pending • Year 8 2022-23: +6.4 since start of year 7. <p>Table below shows progress from the end of year 7</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="427 999 1203 1218"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Progress category</th> <th>National</th> <th>Group (Start poi</th> </tr> <tr> <th>%</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Much higher than expected progress</td> <td>10%</td> <td>11%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Higher than expected progress</td> <td>15%</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Expected progress</td> <td>50%</td> <td>61%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lower than expected progress</td> <td>15%</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Much lower than expected progress</td> <td>10%</td> <td>8%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="427 1261 1203 1458"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Very low</th> <th colspan="3">Below average</th> <th colspan="2">Average</th> <th colspan="2">Above average</th> <th rowspan="2">Very high</th> </tr> <tr> <th><74</th> <th>74–81</th> <th>82–88</th> <th>89–96</th> <th>97–103</th> <th>104–111</th> <th>112–118</th> <th>119–126</th> <th>>126</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4%</td> <td>7%</td> <td>12%</td> <td>17%</td> <td>20%</td> <td>17%</td> <td>12%</td> <td>7%</td> <td>4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4%</td> <td>3%</td> <td>3%</td> <td>4%</td> <td>18%</td> <td>32%</td> <td>21%</td> <td>11%</td> <td>5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Year 9 2022-23: +2.4 since start of year 7</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="427 1574 1190 1765"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Very low</th> <th colspan="3">Below average</th> <th colspan="2">Average</th> <th colspan="2">Above average</th> <th rowspan="2">Very high</th> </tr> <tr> <th><74</th> <th>74–81</th> <th>82–88</th> <th>89–96</th> <th>97–103</th> <th>104–111</th> <th>112–118</th> <th>119–126</th> <th>>126</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4%</td> <td>7%</td> <td>12%</td> <td>17%</td> <td>20%</td> <td>17%</td> <td>12%</td> <td>7%</td> <td>4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6%</td> <td>2%</td> <td>4%</td> <td>11%</td> <td>21%</td> <td>18%</td> <td>17%</td> <td>13%</td> <td>8%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="427 1807 1177 2027"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Progress category</th> <th>National</th> <th>Group (Start poi</th> </tr> <tr> <th>%</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Much higher than expected progress</td> <td>10%</td> <td>17%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Higher than expected progress</td> <td>15%</td> <td>18%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Expected progress</td> <td>50%</td> <td>47%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lower than expected progress</td> <td>15%</td> <td>9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Much lower than expected progress</td> <td>10%</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Progress category	National	Group (Start poi	%	%	Much higher than expected progress	10%	11%	Higher than expected progress	15%	10%	Expected progress	50%	61%	Lower than expected progress	15%	10%	Much lower than expected progress	10%	8%	Very low	Below average			Average		Above average		Very high	<74	74–81	82–88	89–96	97–103	104–111	112–118	119–126	>126	4%	7%	12%	17%	20%	17%	12%	7%	4%	4%	3%	3%	4%	18%	32%	21%	11%	5%	Very low	Below average			Average		Above average		Very high	<74	74–81	82–88	89–96	97–103	104–111	112–118	119–126	>126	4%	7%	12%	17%	20%	17%	12%	7%	4%	6%	2%	4%	11%	21%	18%	17%	13%	8%	Progress category	National	Group (Start poi	%	%	Much higher than expected progress	10%	17%	Higher than expected progress	15%	18%	Expected progress	50%	47%	Lower than expected progress	15%	9%	Much lower than expected progress	10%	10%	1
Progress category	National		Group (Start poi																																																																																																															
	%	%																																																																																																																
Much higher than expected progress	10%	11%																																																																																																																
Higher than expected progress	15%	10%																																																																																																																
Expected progress	50%	61%																																																																																																																
Lower than expected progress	15%	10%																																																																																																																
Much lower than expected progress	10%	8%																																																																																																																
Very low	Below average			Average		Above average		Very high																																																																																																										
	<74	74–81	82–88	89–96	97–103	104–111	112–118		119–126	>126																																																																																																								
4%	7%	12%	17%	20%	17%	12%	7%	4%																																																																																																										
4%	3%	3%	4%	18%	32%	21%	11%	5%																																																																																																										
Very low	Below average			Average		Above average		Very high																																																																																																										
	<74	74–81	82–88	89–96	97–103	104–111	112–118		119–126	>126																																																																																																								
4%	7%	12%	17%	20%	17%	12%	7%	4%																																																																																																										
6%	2%	4%	11%	21%	18%	17%	13%	8%																																																																																																										
Progress category	National	Group (Start poi																																																																																																																
	%	%																																																																																																																
Much higher than expected progress	10%	17%																																																																																																																
Higher than expected progress	15%	18%																																																																																																																
Expected progress	50%	47%																																																																																																																
Lower than expected progress	15%	9%																																																																																																																
Much lower than expected progress	10%	10%																																																																																																																

<p><i>Smaller class sizes for core subjects</i></p>	<p>The below set 5 classes made a net improvement with their scaled score compared to KS2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Year 8 Maths: +24 • Year 8 Science: +17 • Year 9 English: +20 • Year 9 Maths: +34 • Year 9 Science: +12 <p>Overall cohort's subject scaled score compared to KS2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Year 8 Maths: +0.5 • Year 8 Science: +0.5 • Year 9 English: +0.2 • Year 9 Maths: +0.5 • Year 9 Science: +0.4 	<p>1 & 4</p>
---	---	------------------

Targeted Academic Support Outcomes

Activity	Evidence of Impact	Challenge number addressed								
<p><i>KS3 Literacy Interventions</i></p>	<p>108 students identified for intervention</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="395 1146 1040 1545"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="395 1146 778 1314">Strand</th> <th data-bbox="778 1146 1040 1314">% moved into Intermediate/Advanced</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="395 1314 778 1391">Word study</td> <td data-bbox="778 1314 1040 1391">20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="395 1391 778 1467">Grammar</td> <td data-bbox="778 1391 1040 1467">11%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="395 1467 778 1545">Comprehension</td> <td data-bbox="778 1467 1040 1545">18%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Year 8 2022-23</p> <p>The mean standard age score for this group is now significantly higher than the national average.</p>	Strand	% moved into Intermediate/Advanced	Word study	20%	Grammar	11%	Comprehension	18%	<p>1 & 4</p>
Strand	% moved into Intermediate/Advanced									
Word study	20%									
Grammar	11%									
Comprehension	18%									

	Very low	Below average		
	<74	74–81	82–88	
	4%	7%	12%	
	4%	3%	3%	
Year 9 2022-23				
The mean standard age score for this group is significantly higher than the national average.				
	Very low	Below average		
	<74	74–81	82–88	
	4%	7%	12%	
	6%	2%	4%	
<i>Brilliant Club</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 14 students participated on the Scholars Programme in 2022-23 55% were eligible for Pupil premium The indicators show that students at SPW had significantly higher attendance at 90% 100% of students submitted a final assignment 			4

Wider Strategies Outcomes

Activity	Evidence of Impact	Challenge number addressed
<i>Student Achievement Coordinators x5</i> Establish a team of Student Achievement Coordinators (SACs) who monitor the progress, attendance,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall attendance was 95.1% despite the Covid pandemic (1.8% of absences Covid related compared to 1% at National and Tower Hamlets) 	2, 3 & 5

<p>behaviour and wellbeing of students in each year group, identifying students for small group-based interventions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall attendance was 4.1% higher than national and 1.8% higher than Tower Hamlets • The gap between PP and non-PP was 1.2%, an increase of 0.2% • This is compared to a national gap of 7.4% and a Tower Hamlets gap of 1.9% • Persistent Absenteeism dropped from 9.4% to 9.1%. This is 19.2% lower than national and 11.6% lower than Tower Hamlets • 11% reduction in suspensions in 2022-23 • 5% reduction in the number of different students receiving a suspension • 5 managed moves last year, compared to 12 the previous year. 4 of the 5 managed moves were consented to in the previous academic year • 0 direct transfers last year, compared to 5 in the previous year 	
<p><i>Senior Pastoral Leader</i> Establish a Senior Leader responsible for intervention and attendance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall attendance was 95.1% despite the Covid pandemic (1.8% of absences Covid related compared to 1% at National and Tower Hamlets) • Overall attendance was 4.1% higher than national and 1.8% higher than Tower Hamlets • The gap between PP and non-PP was 1.2%, an increase of 0.2% • This is compared to a national gap of 7.4% and a Tower Hamlets gap of 1.9% • Persistent Absenteeism dropped from 9.4% to 9.1%. This is 19.2% lower than national and 11.6% lower than Tower Hamlets • 11% reduction in suspensions in 2022-23 	<p>2, 3 & 5</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5% reduction in the number of different students receiving a suspension • 5 managed moves last year, compared to 12 the previous year. 4 of the 5 managed moves were consented to in the previous academic year • 0 direct transfers last year, compared to 5 in the previous year 	
<p><i>Attendance Officer</i></p> <p>To ensure that there is a clear programme of intervention for students eligible for PP with low attendance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall attendance was 95.1% despite the Covid pandemic (1.8% of absences Covid related compared to 1% at National and Tower Hamlets) • Overall attendance was 4.1% higher than national and 1.8% higher than Tower Hamlets • The gap between PP and non-PP was 1.2%, an increase of 0.2% • This is compared to a national gap of 7.4% and a Tower Hamlets gap of 1.9% • Persistent Absenteeism dropped from 9.4% to 9.1%. This is 19.2% lower than national and 11.6% lower than Tower Hamlets 	2
<p><i>Attendance Welfare Advisor</i></p> <p>To ensure that there is a clear programme of intervention for students eligible for PP who have attendance below 90%.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Persistent Absenteeism dropped from 9.4% to 9.1%. This is 19.2% lower than national and 11.6% lower than Tower Hamlets • 15 referrals were made to the AWA last year. Of which, 7 were closed • The remaining 8 require more time to improve attendance 	2
<p><i>Student Support Assistants x 2</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall attendance was 95.1% despite the Covid pandemic (1.8% of absences Covid related compared to 1% at National and Tower Hamlets) 	2 & 3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall attendance was 4.1% higher than national and 1.8% higher than Tower Hamlets • The gap between PP and non-PP was 1.2%, an increase of 0.2% • This is compared to a national gap of 7.4% and a Tower Hamlets gap of 1.9% • Persistent Absenteeism dropped from 9.4% to 9.1%. This is 19.2% lower than national and 11.6% lower than Tower Hamlets • 11% reduction in suspensions in 2022-23 • 5% reduction in the number of different students receiving a suspension • 5 managed moves last year, compared to 12 the previous year. 4 of the 5 managed moves were consented to in the previous academic year • 0 direct transfers last year, compared to 5 in the previous year 	
<i>Mentoring Lead / Reset Room Manager</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11% decrease in suspensions last year • 16% decrease in suspensions for escalation, by failing in the Reset Room • 5% reduction in the number of different students receiving a suspension • 5 managed moves last year, compared to 12 the previous year. 4 of the 5 managed moves were consented to in the previous academic year • 0 direct transfers last year, compared to 5 in the previous year 	2, 3 & 5
<i>Counselling Service</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 126 students received individual counselling support 	5

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The average number of sessions provided was 15• On entry to counselling the average YP core score was 16.60 which dropped to 10.46 after the intervention• Case studies available upon request	
--	--	--