Pupil premium strategy statement

This statement details our school's use of pupil premium (and recovery premium for the 2021 to 2022 academic year) 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

Detail	Data
School name	Colne Valley High School
Number of pupils in school	1388
Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils	25%
Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers **(3 year plans are recommended)**	21/22 to 24/25
Date this statement was published	October 2021
Date on which it will be reviewed	July 2022
Statement authorised by	Jimmy Christian Principal
Pupil premium lead	Aaron Kay Vice Principal
Governor / Trustee lead	Amanda Kenningley Governor

Funding overview

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year	£ 325,655 (- £153,149 to provide free school meals)
Recovery premium funding allocation this academic year	£ 50,025
Pupil premium funding carried forward from previous years (enter £0 if not applicable)	£ 0
Total budget for this academic year If your school is an academy in a trust that pools this funding, state the amount available to your school this academic year	£ 222,531

Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

Statement of intent

Our intention is that all students are given the same opportunity to "be the best that can be" irrespective of the background challenges that they face. Our primary focus is to remove barriers in order to support all students to access high quality teaching. Evidence shows that the biggest impact on all students, including those who are disadvantaged, is access to teaching.

We have found that those students who attend, behave well and show a good attitude to learning consistently achieve well. Therefore, it is our intention to allow all students, but particularly disadvantaged students, the best possible chance of achieving this by targeting support strategies as outlined below.

While the activities below are heavily focussed on improving outcomes for disadvantaged students, it is important to note that this is also paralleled with both wider academic recovery for all students and the maintaining of non-disadvantaged attainment.

The activities we will undertake, as a response to the challenges identified, are based on our school cohort specifically. They are a result of diagnosing the issues our students face and using strong evidence to focus on solutions to those issues. The most significant of these barriers fall under the "wider" support and there is therefore a larger focus on these areas. These complement the strategies around teaching and intervention and will be monitored and reviewed regularly to ensure that they are being implemented effectively and having impact. This is a whole school strategy and is based on all staff identifying barriers and intervention being initiated at the earliest possible opportunity.

Challenges

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

Challenge number	Detail of challenge
1	Attendance of disadvantaged students has historically been below that of their non-disadvantaged peers. Differences over the last three years have been 3.4% (2018/19), 3.7% (2019/20) and 6.9% in the last academic year which was significantly impacted on through Covid. Persistent absenteeism is also higher in the disadvantaged cohort. While this number is harder to calculate due to the pandemic, the latest figures showed that approximately 23% of the disadvantaged cohort were PA compared to 10% of the non-disadvantaged cohort.
2	The Attitudes to Learning of the disadvantaged cohort are lower overall than non-disadvantaged students. Our internal data broadly suggests that disadvantaged students average an AtL score of around 2.9, whereas non-disadvantaged average around 3.1. The amount students who average a 3

	overall in their AtL is 5% lower for the disadvantaged cohort, 79% compared to 84%. This further impacts, much like attendance, on the students "access" to Quality First Teaching.
3	Internal data suggests that the behaviour of disadvantaged students potentially impacts on their progress as a result lost learning. Disadvantaged students are disproportionally represented in many of the standard markers, for example, suspension (twice as likely to receive one or more than one), removals from class (nearly three time more likely to be removed) and general detentions (twice as likely to receive).
4	Observations and discussions with students (evidenced through well-being referrals) have shown an increase in students presenting with social and emotional issues, in particular low-level anxieties and low self-esteem.
5	Reading ages of disadvantaged students are lower than those of their peers and this impacts on their ability to access the curriculum. Observations and assessments suggest that this remains as a challenge throughout school. On entry to Year 7 (2021/2022), 60% of our disadvantaged pupils arrive below age-related expectations compared to 34% of their peers. This gap remains steady during pupils' time at our school.
6	National studies have shown that gaps in knowledge have been affected more significantly for disadvantaged families as a result of the pandemic. Engagement and uptake with online learning was lower in the disadvantaged cohort despite provisions being put in place and consequently the gaps in knowledge are wider.
7	The attainment levels of the disadvantaged cohort are lower to start with on entry to school

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
To improve attendance for all students, reducing the gap between disadvantaged students and non-disadvantaged.	Levels of attendance increase year on year by academic year 24/25: Attendance rates for all students to be above national average and disadvantaged students to be no more than 2% below national average for non-disadvantaged students. The percentage of students who are PA to be below national average and the percentage of disadvantaged students classed as PA to be within 7% of national average for non-disadvantaged.
The gap between Attitude to Learning scores will reduce	During the academic year 24/25 CF scores throughout the year will show that there is no significant gap between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students No more than 0.1 difference on average score for the overall cohorts No more than 4% difference in total numbers achieving averaging a 3 overall for AtL.

Disadvantaged students will not be disproportionally represented in behaviour data	Suspension figures for the disadvantaged cohort will be within 10% of the national average.
	In school data in relation to behaviour data will show that students who are disadvantaged will be no more than 1.5 times likely to receive
To achieve and sustain improved wellbeing for all pupils, including those who are disadvantaged.	High levels of student wellbeing from the academic year 24/25 demonstrated by:
	Qualitative data from student voice, student and parent surveys and teacher observations.
	Significant increase in participation in enrichment activities, particularly among disadvantaged pupils.
Student reading ages and comprehension across KS3 improves for all students but particularly those who are disadvantaged	Reading ages for those who are assessed will move closer to their chorological age. The gap between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students will reduce. Work scrutiny will show an improvement in comprehension within student books.
Gaps in student knowledge will be filled allowing increased attainment and progress scores	2024/25 KS4 outcomes demonstrate that disadvantaged pupils achieve:
	An average Progress 8 score of 0

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: £ *4063.02*

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Teacher training and CPD to focus on metacognition. (e.g. CPD toolkit: the Key)	https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/metacognition-and-self-regulation The impact of students understanding their learning and "how to learn" is potentially one of the most impactful interventions in terms of improving attainment. Evidence suggests that disadvantaged students are more likely to need these strategies teaching explicitly to them.	2, 6, 7
ABC strategy to be shared with all teaching staff and revisited regularly	Combination of all other strategies for attendance, behaviour and contribution to learning providing increased level of focus / awareness for staff	1, 2, 3,

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

Budgeted cost: £ *1770.34*

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Bespoke reading programme developed by CVHS	https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/reading-comprehension-strategies Reading interventions have a significant impact on students' ability to access the curriculum and can potentially impact the equivalent of 6 months within a year	5
Tutoring including the NTP and school led tutoring to focus on students who have shown gaps in knowledge. Although not exclusively for	Tuition targeted at specific needs and knowledge gaps can be an effective method to support low attaining pupils or those falling behind, both one-to-one: One to one tuition	EEF (educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk) And in small groups: Small group tuition	Toolkit Strand	Education Endowment Foundation	EEF	6, 7

disadvantaged students, they will be a primary focus.		

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

Budgeted cost: £ 216,697.64

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Recruit and employ additional staff into the PD team with an attendance focus	https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/school-attendance/framework-for-securing-full-attendance-actions-for-schools-and-local-authorities Key aspects of the guidance around improving attendance require staff to intervene "supporting students to overcome barriers".	1
Behaviour interventions provided through PD team and wider support staff (Aspire). Emotion coaching to be implemented to support this.	https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/behaviour-interventions EEF reviews show that although the impact of may be down to other interventions as well, behaviour interventions reduce learning time lost in classrooms	2, 3
Mental Health First Aid training to undertaken by staff and used effectively with students displaying need	https://www.eif.org.uk/report/adolescent-mental-health-a-systematic-review-on-the-effectiveness-of-school-based-interventions Universal social and emotional learning (SEL) interventions have good evidence of enhancing young people's social and emotional skills and reducing symptoms of depression and anxiety in the short term.	4
Contingency fund for issues related to lack of funding	A relatively small proportion of the budget will be spent on immediate actions which are "unknown" for budgeting purposes, for example, providing emergency uniform for students, contributing to costs of school events in time of hardship, providing ingredients etc for cooking lessons and providing transport where needed.	1 – 7

Total budgeted cost: £ 222,531

Part B: Review of outcomes in the previous academic year

Pupil premium strategy outcomes

This details the impact that our pupil premium activity had on pupils in the 2020 to 2021 academic year.

Our internal assessments during 2020/21 suggested that the performance of disadvantaged pupils has continued to improve year on year in key areas of the curriculum however the gap between PP and non-PP in school has slightly widened as non-PP students have improved at a faster rate.

Despite the improvement in attainment by pupil premium students and our target for Higher Ability PP students to achieve inline with their peers nationally being met, the outcomes we aimed to achieve in our previous strategy by the end of 2020/21 were not fully realised.

Our assessment of the reasons for these outcomes points primarily to Covid-19 impact, which disrupted all of our subject areas to varying degrees. As evidenced in schools across the country, partial closure was most detrimental to our disadvantaged pupils, and they were not able to benefit from our pupil premium funded improvements to teaching and targeted interventions to the degree that we intended. This was further compounded during reopening when our disadvantaged students were disproportionally represented in the group of students who struggled to maintain high levels of attendance due to poor working practices that had been developed during school site closures. The impact was however mitigated to some extent by our resolution to maintain a high quality curriculum, including during periods of partial closure, which was aided by use of virtual lessons and communication with home. However disadvantaged students were less likely to take a full and active part in their learning during this time meaning that some of the students were further behind when they returned to face to face education.

Although overall attendance in 2020/21 was lower than previous years, it was higher than the national average. At times when all pupils were expected to attend school, absence among disadvantaged pupils was 6.6% higher than their peers and persistent absence 18.6% higher. These gaps are larger than in previous years, which is why attendance continues to be a focus in our current plan. One of our foci in the previous plan was to improve the literacy levels of students who had started secondary school below national expectations. This intervention was having some good impact as evidenced during our mid-point review. However the Covid-19 school closures and the restructuring of the school to avoid pupil mixing led to some of this support being pared back meaning the impact of this support was reduced to fewer students making the gains they needed. Therefore this will continue to be a focus in our strategy.

Our data demonstrated that pupil behaviour, wellbeing and mental health were significantly impacted last year, primarily due to COVID-19-related issues. The impact was particularly acute for disadvantaged pupils. We used pupil premium funding to extend our wellbeing support for all pupils, and targeted interventions where required. We are building on that approach in our new plan.

Externally provided programmes

Please include the names of any non-DfE programmes that you purchased in the previous academic year. This will help the Department for Education identify which ones are popular in England

Programme	Provider

Service pupil premium funding (optional)

For schools that receive this funding, you may wish to provide the following information:

Measure	Details
How did you spend your service pupil premium allocation last academic year?	
What was the impact of that spending on service pupil premium eligible pupils?	

Further information (optional)

Use this space to provide any further information about your pupil premium strategy. For example, about your strategy planning, or other activity that you are implementing to support disadvantaged pupils, that is not dependent on pupil premium or recovery premium funding.