

Frederick Gent School 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	Frederick Gent School
Number of pupils in school	798
Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils	31.3% (250 pupils)
Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers (3 year plans are recommended)	2021 - 2024
Date this statement was published	September 2021
Date on which it will be reviewed	June 2022
Statement authorised by	Christopher Woollard
Pupil premium lead	Amanda Comins
Governor / Trustee lead	Sally Bridges

Funding overview

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year	£226,804.29
Recovery premium funding allocation this academic year	£5260.71
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	£232,065.00



Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

Statement of intent

You may want to include information on:

- What are your ultimate objectives for your disadvantaged pupils?
- How does your current pupil premium strategy plan work towards achieving those objectives?
- What are the key principles of your strategy plan?

Challenges

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

Challenge number	Detail of challenge
1	Ensuring enthusiastic engagement of disadvantage pupils with a knowledge rich curriculum
2	Overcoming material/physical barriers to learning. - Effective use of 'bid pot' spending
3	Attendance of PP students including extra-curricular activities
4	Literacy reading ages of PP students
5	Engagement with independent learning outside of the classroom/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
Reduce the progress 8 gap between PP and non PP students	Progress 8 measure to be reduced by 50% (around -0.4/-0.3)
Attendance to be line with national expectations	Aiming for an attendance figure of 97% for PP students
Quality first teaching by all staff	Staff are implementing high value curriculum plans which are knowledge rich. Evidence of FFF strategies and FREDS framework being used during lessons
Literacy intervention	PP pupils make greater reading age gains than Non-PP peers
Monitoring of extra-curricular offer	PP attendance and completion of extra-curricular activities/work is closely monitored.



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: £58,016.25

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Staffing structure	RADY – Impact of QFT teaching	1,4,5
In-house and externally sourced training to inform best practice	Individual research on specific technique or organisation.	1-5
Curriculum offer	In-house data analysis of grades and pupil voice	1, 4, 5
Retention & recruitment of staff through high quality CPD and professional development opportunities	Staff surveys on CPD opportunities to analyse effectiveness	1 & 2
BIDS pot	Historic in-house evaluation shows improvements in engagement of pupils	2, 3 & 5

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

Budgeted cost: £88,184.70

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
HLTA's (1 x literacy, 1 x numeracy)	In-house evaluation on pupil progress	1, 2 & 4
Learning mentors	In-house evaluation on pupil progress	1, 2 & 4
Staffing structure	RADY – Impact of QFT teaching	3
Alternative provision	Internal review of provision impact	3
KS3 project group	Tailored curriculum which meets the needs of the pupils as shown through data analysis	1, 2 & 4
Revision resources	BIDS pot evaluations	1,2 & 5
MyMaths subscription	72% of teachers who use MyMaths said that it allows them to provide more specific 1-1 intervention	1, 2 & 5
Accelerated reader programme	This programme has shown to improve reading ages of pupils and accelerates the improvement of PP pupils. 73% of users are on track to meet reading age goals.	2 & 5
Times Table Rock Star subscription (TTRS)	Improves the confidence and speed at which students can complete times tables which impacts many mathematical principles	2 & 5
National tutoring programme	Government recommended programme to identify and close attainment gaps.	1 & 3
Academic mentoring	Government recommended programme	1 & 3
School led tuition	UK's leading provider of in school tuition on core subjects	1 & 3
My Tutor	(<i>Budget depending</i>) MyTutor pupils make 1 whole grade of progress, on average, after 10 sessions, double that of peers	1 & 5



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

Budgeted cost: £85,864.05

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
PHASE curriculum	In-house evaluation of impact	2 & 3
Pastoral staffing structure	In-house evaluation of impact	3
CEAIG events and support	Gatsby benchmarks	5
Year group ALSA's	Improving PP attendance to be in line with non PP peers	3
Breakfast club staffing	Removing barriers for pupils coming to school without breakfast	2 & 3
Scholars programme	Participation in the Brilliant Club programme shows an improvement in critical thinking and written communication skills by around 15%	5
Debate Mate	Improves students transferrable skills, 94% of pupils state they learnt skills that will help them succeed in further studies	4 & 5
External trips (eg Theatre trips, museums, universities)	In house evaluation of destination impact	2 & 3

Total budgeted cost: £232,065.00

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.

Due to COVID-19, performance measures have not been published for 2020 to 2021, and 2020 to 2021 results will not be used to hold schools to account. Given this, please point to any other pupil evaluations undertaken during the 2020 to 2021 academic year, for example, standardised teacher administered tests or diagnostic assessments such as rubrics or scales.

In-house data both for the 2021 award and for the current Year 11 suggest the school is making progress on diminishing the difference between DAP and Non-DAP pupils. This is as a result of progress being greater for DAP rather than as a result of any 'drop-back' in Non-DAP outcomes.



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
Scholars programme	Brilliant Club
Accelerated Reader	Accelerated Reader

