

Pupil premium strategy statement (secondary)

1. Summary information					
School	The City of Leicester College, Downing Drive, Leicester LE				
Academic Year	2017/18	Total PP budget	£374,935	Date of most recent PP Review	Oct. 2017
Total number of pupils Years 7-11 (+ Post-16)	1255(+361)	Number of pupils eligible for support through the Pupil Premium Grant	401 (32%)	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Sept. 2018

2. High-level strategic objectives for disadvantaged students (“Disadvantaged First”):

The objective of the “Disadvantaged First” Strategy is to dramatically diminish the attainment and attendance gaps between our disadvantaged students and students without disadvantage both locally (in-school) and nationally. There are three high-level strategic objectives:

- **Continue to improve the quality of teaching and learning across the college in order to raise attainment and accelerate the progress of 400+ disadvantaged students in order to ‘diminish the difference’ when compared with students nationally and locally who do not face disadvantage.**
- **Improve the attendance of disadvantaged students and reduce the current gap when compared to their non-disadvantaged peers.**
- **Raise the aspirations and expectations of our disadvantaged students (and their parents/carers where necessary), and ensure that any specific barriers to achievement are identified and overcome through targeted support.**

“Disadvantaged First”: Teaching staff will identify every disadvantaged student in each of their classes and will make interactions with these students a priority every lesson, to ensure their individual needs are being met and expectations are high. The absolute focus will be on **quality first teaching** with targeted intervention where appropriate. Contact with parents/guardians for this group of students will be made regularly and frequently by designated student ‘advocates’ who will have a clear oversight of any specific barriers to learning.

Students deemed to be disadvantaged will also benefit from additional support, including financial, to ensure that they are:

- able to travel to and from College safely and efficiently,
- provided with resources including revision guides and stationary which directly support positive study habits,
- are able to access enrichment activities and experiences such as theatre trips, residential experiences,
- do not go hungry throughout the College day.

4. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)	
In-school barriers (<i>issues to be addressed in school, such as poor literacy skills</i>)	
A.	Low literacy and language skills on entry to the school, particularly language comprehension, are lower for disadvantaged students (including those with EAL) than for others which prevents them from making rapid progress in KS3 (Y7&8) and therefore having to 'catch-up' in KS4.
B.	Numeracy skills are lower for disadvantaged students entering Year 7 and across KS3 compared to others. Consequently, disadvantaged students (including lower, middle and higher attaining students) are making less progress in maths than other high-attainers across KS3 and 4. This prevents sustained high achievement at the end of KS4.
C.	There is too much inconsistency in the quality of teaching across the curriculum and across KS3 and 4 (Ofsted May 2017). Leaders in the school recognise that disadvantaged students are not consistently challenged in all lessons and expectations of teachers are not always high enough.
D.	MER: Leaders in the school, including governors, do not measure or monitor sufficiently the impact of the PPG on the attendance, attainment and progress of disadvantaged students (Ofsted 2017).
External barriers (<i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i>)	
D.	In 2016-17, the overall, end of year attendance of disadvantaged students across all year groups was low (90.10%) compared to (93.9% for all students) and there was a high proportion (around 20%) of disadvantaged students deemed to be PA; this reduces their learning time, and restricts both progress and attainment significantly.
E.	Student Conduct/ Engagement in Learning: During 2015-16 and 2016-17, disadvantaged students were disproportionately represented in exclusion statistics (44% and 32% respectively), and in internal behaviour monitoring systems.
F.	Social, emotional and mental health concerns: Across the school, there is a growing proportion of disadvantaged students with additional social, emotional and mental health needs. This impacts negatively on attendance, behaviour and general progress in lessons due to additional stress and distractions from learning.
5. Desired outcomes (<i>desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>)	Success criteria
A.	<p>Improved attainment and progress of disadvantaged students across the curriculum but specifically in English, maths and science.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disadvantaged students will meet National average in Basic measures at 4+ and 5+ by the end of Year 11 SISRA will show improved P8 scores for identified cohorts and a closing of the attainment gap between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students across all subjects and ability bands. High attaining disadvantaged students (based on end of KS2 assessments), make as much progress as 'other' high attaining students in the college, so that the vast majority are 'on track' to achieve at or above CTG/ CTG+1 by the end of

		KS4. Where they are not, curriculum leaders will implement appropriate interventions which will be monitored and evaluated by line managers/CLT.
B.	“Disadvantaged First”: Greater consistency in the quality of teaching across the curriculum with evidence of consistently high expectations and high challenge for all disadvantaged students, but particularly those who are higher attaining.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal monitoring provides evidence of an increasing proportion of teaching that is judged to be consistently good or better. • Internal monitoring, including lesson observations and work scrutiny, provides evidence of support being offered first, high challenge and high expectations of disadvantaged students. • Evidence from ‘student voice’ shows a high satisfaction rating amongst disadvantaged students; student questionnaire March 2018.
C.	Improved behaviour and attendance rates for disadvantaged students including a reduction in the proportion who fall below the PA threshold.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall attendance of disadvantaged students increases from the end of 2016/17 level of 90.1% towards a whole college aspirational target of 96% and is at least broadly in-line with ‘other’ students (93.4% in 2016/17). • The proportion of disadvantaged students who fall below the PA threshold reduces from around 20% (end of 2016/17) to around 10% or lower. • Internal tracking of behaviour shows an improving trend over time. Fewer behaviour incidents and exclusions recorded for disadvantaged students. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proportion of ‘Stage 3’ incidents recorded against disadvantaged students on SIMS is broadly in line with ‘others’. ○ The proportion of disadvantaged students who are represented in the college’s fixed-term exclusion figures, continues to reduce (44% during 2015-16; 32% during 2016-17).
D.	All staff across the college are better informed about the progress, attainment and attendance of disadvantaged students, and are more effectively held to account by leaders and governors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All disadvantaged students are allocated an ‘advocate’ who tracks progress and ensures effective communication between college and parents/carers. Internal tracking by HoY/AchCo shows that parents/carers of disadvantaged students receive regular (fortnightly) communications from advocates. • Lesson observations show that all teachers know who their disadvantaged students are and are aware of their individual needs.

6. Planned expenditure					
Academic year	2017-18				
The three headings below enable schools to demonstrate how they are using the Pupil Premium to improve classroom pedagogy, provide targeted support and support whole school strategies.					
i. Quality of teaching for all					
Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
Outcomes A and B	6 non-negotiables/ DTT approach embedded in all lessons. 'Prepared for Learning routines established.'	High quality teaching to drive progress and improve outcomes, and raise expectations of all students including the disadvantaged.	Lesson Observation; Appraisal target and Progress Weeks to ensure greater consistency.	HCF	Progress Weeks Oct 2017 and Feb 2018
Outcomes A and B	T&L focus (Conference, TMX etc)	Targeted CPD for all teaching staff based on known best practice involving external facilitators, peers and local subject networks.	PES will evaluate the effectiveness of the Conference. Changes in pedagogy will be monitored by T&Ls and through lesson observations.	PES	November 2017
Outcomes A and B	Reading Coordinator-whole school approach	High proportion of incoming Year 7 students with low reading ages and poor reading comprehension. Evidence-based programmes e.g. RML Fresh Start to close gaps and accelerate progress in reading. Whole-school reading culture-'Whatever it Takes'	HCF will line manage and appraise the Reading Coordinator (KP)	HCF	On-going
Outcome A	Senior TA in maths, and English	Additional support in mainstream lessons for disadvantaged students who fall behind expected levels of progress. Involvement in TAs and mentors in whole-staff CPD for improving the quality of T&L.	NC will monitor the impact of TA deployment on targeted groups especially low-attaining disadvantaged students, including SEND, in the core subjects.	NC/ WJM	
Outcomes A	Improved access to learning resources e.g. revision guides, basics, ingredients, ICT hardware for all disadvantaged students.	Some of our disadvantaged students cannot afford essential learning resources such as revision guides, scientific calculators and food ingredients. Some have identified poor access to IT at home as a barrier to learning including on-line revision and completing homework. Where this is identified by advocates as a barrier to learning, additional support will be provided.	Advocates will track the progress, attendance and behaviour of designated disadvantaged students every 2 weeks. This will be followed up with a communication with parents/carers.	Advocates	

Total budgeted cost £116,800.00

ii. Targeted support

Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
Outcomes A and D	War Board/ 1:1 academic mentoring	Evidence indicates that one to one tuition can be effective, on average accelerating learning by approximately five additional months' progress. Students are given intensive tuition for short, regular sessions (about 60 minutes each time).	Assistant HT will update the 'war-board' on a weekly basis in order to track marginal gains amongst identified disadvantaged students in Years 10 and 11. The focus will be on improving hard outcomes through targeted support and intervention	HH	
Outcomes A and C	White Boys achievement project (S Cook)	Target group of approx. 50 students are being worked with. Assertive mentoring includes student target setting, tracking, mentoring, intervention and checking. There is a high proportion of WB students in the group to ensure that we narrow the gap for this highly vulnerable group.		SC/ AMG	
Outcomes A and C	Targeted intervention for vulnerable groups e.g. 'Dadaal' Project for underachieving, disadvantaged Somali students (AT) and a Y11 Disadvantaged High-attaining girls group who are under-attaining in one or more subjects (A Khan)	Higher level of parental engagement and improved communications with the homes of Somali heritage students will lead to improved outcomes.	WJM will line manage the Somali Mentor (AT) and ensure that the needs of targeted disadvantaged students of Somali heritage are being met.	AT/ WJM AK/ AMG	

Outcome D	PP Advocacy Programme	Engagement of parents to lead to improved student engagement therefore improved attendance, behaviour and progress. No specific Sutton Trust research evidence base available.	Advocates will hold teaching staff to account at least fortnightly to ensure that the individual needs of disadvantaged students are being met and that expectations are high.	AMG	w/c 25/09/2017
Outcome A and C	Additional pastoral support for disengaged/ SEMH including Alternative Provision (The Base), mentoring and counselling.	The proportion of disadvantaged students that require additional pastoral support due to challenging circumstances at home or complex mental health issues is increasing at an alarming rate. The number of CP/ safeguarding concerns amongst disadvantaged students is rising similarly which is having a detrimental impact on their ability to learn effectively. In some cases, behaviour and attendance concerns become apparent so the college is strengthening the Inclusion Team in order to meet the growing demand for support.	Through appraisal and half-termly monitoring, There will be a much sharper focus on evaluating the impact of this additional support on measurable outcomes.	WJM	From 1st Sept 2017

Total budgeted cost

£158,135.00

iii. Other approaches

Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
Outcome C	Dedicated Attendance/Welfare Officer; PSPs to include graduated response to attendance and punctuality concerns	Disadvantaged students attend school less well than their non-disadvantaged peers. Last year, the overall attendance gap was unacceptably high (90.1% compared to 93.4%). The proportion of disadvantaged students who triggered the PA threshold during 2016-17 was of the order of 20% which is a huge concern. A full-time, dedicated Attendance officer and an enhanced rewards budget will be retained to help reduce these figures and reverse the trend.	3-weekly cycle of attendance and PA reporting to CLT. Standing Item on Governors' PDB&W Committee agenda. Fortnightly line-management meetings with AOs.	SL/YL	Major review at end of each HT. December 2017 review of HT1 and 2
Outcome C	Basic Needs support e.g. food, drink, transport to school etc	Maslow's Hierarchy of Need; students will not be able to perform if they are hungry, thirsty or unable to get to school on time. Where these factors are identified as a barrier to learning during discussions with Advocates, support will be provided as appropriate.	Advocates will identify any basic needs barriers and submit funding request to College Business Manager	WM/JS	Ongoing through advocacy discussions

Outcome C	Extra-curricular/ enrichment activities programme including DoE, sport, drama (RSC), subsidised music tuition, HE visits, work experience etc	Many disadvantaged students have lower aspirations to be successful compared to their non-disadvantaged peers. The proportion of disadvantaged students who aspire to go to university is much lower than those from more affluent backgrounds and disadvantaged students are less likely to avail themselves of opportunities that aim to challenge and inspire students to become self-motivating and resilient.	Advocates will monitor participation in extra-curricular activity and encourage students to take advantage using PP funding where necessary to subsidise cost to parents.	WM Advocates	On-going through advocacy meetings
Outcome C and A	Development of student leadership roles (PiXL Edge, Prefects etc)	Students respond well when given an opportunity to take responsibility for some aspect of college life. The aim is to increase the proportion of disadvantaged students who have positions of responsibility across the college in order to increase their self-confidence and self-worth.	DA students encouraged to take on additional student leadership responsibilities including PiXL Edge LORIC Leaders and similar eg. Prefect/ Head Student etc.	AHT KS3/ WM	Year 10 Prefects Jan 2018 LORIC Leaders from Oct 2017
Total budgeted cost					£100,000.00

7. Review of expenditure

Previous Academic Year

2016-17 (Total amount of grant received £388,960.00)

i. Quality of teaching for all

Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost
Improve the quality of teaching across the curriculum	Introduction of the 'six non-negotiables', marking, feedback and assessment policies and 'Progress Weeks'.	Moderate-high impact on quality of teaching and learning across the college as evidenced by Ofsted report in May 2017 and in-house MER. However, there remain pockets of inconsistency in QT&L which need to be further addressed. T&L training including regional T&L conference (hosted by TCOLC) positively evaluated.. Success criteria partially met.	Relatively low-cost (Senior and middle-leader time). Approach will continue with renewed focus and rigour. 'Progress Weeks' to continue throughout 2017-18.	£25,078

ii. Targeted support

Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost

Improve literacy at point of transition KS 2-3.	Summer school for students with below average literacy levels.	Low-moderate impact on literacy development. Summer school helped develop social and interaction skills but no measurable impact on reading/ comprehension levels.	Cost of Summer School, particularly staffing costs are too high for such low-moderate impact on literacy. Impact on transition for a small number of students with identified social/ emotional issues was probably of greater significance, but we are unlikely to continue this approach.	£7,539
Improve standard of reading.	Additional reading interventions (RML) and 1:1 support.	Significant impact on reading ages of targeted students (Hodder) including disadvantaged. Up to 12 month gain in some cases.	This approach has sharpened our ability to identify and support struggling readers. Approach to continue through dedicated HLTA	£9,293 £21,705
Raise attainment in maths	Additional 1:1 numeracy support for targeted disadvantaged students	Significant impact on attendance, confidence and engagement of targeted students. Impact on outcomes moderate.	Whilst successful, the high cost of this approach is not sustainable. Next year we will focus more on quality first teaching in maths with less reliance on intervention.	£39,498
	College Reading Champion	High impact on college reading culture and habits including some of most disadvantaged students.	This approach has been successful for several years and is likely to continue. Role of RC to be extended to include strategic leadership of all literacy-based interventions.	£21,705
Raise attainment in maths, Eng. and sci	Y11 Coaching scheme and 'period 6'	Moderate impact on outcomes; improved attendance, behaviour and engagement of targeted disadvantaged students.	Significant impact on engagement plus moderate impact on outcomes; approach to continue but with greater use of PP 'advocates'.	£7,139 £8,290
Improved outcomes for vulnerable groups	'Dadaal' project for Somali Boys and 'Yes you Can' BME project and more bespoke curriculum provision'.	Moderate-High impact on attendance and behaviour of targeted students.	High cost for moderate to high impact. Both BME projects to be extended next year with sharper focus on impact evaluation. Environment group to come 'in-house'.	£15,600 £39,578

iii. Other approaches

Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost
Improved attendance	Attendance officer/ Champion and reward schemes; Bus passes, FSM top-ups	Low-moderate impact on some of our most enduring attendance problems. High impact on some individual cases.	Approach to be refined but continued with increased focus on our most hard to reach cases. Food subsidy to continue where this is identified as a barrier.	£25,368 £4,005 £16,102
Improved behaviour and engagement	Additional mentoring, intervention and enrichment (music/ i-Pads etc)	High impact on exclusion statistics and behaviour. Disadvantaged students are still over-represented in fte figures.	Sharper focus on impact. Approach to be refined and extended with greater focus on hard outcomes as well as 'soft' data	£82,181
Enhanced support for SEMH	Additional mentoring and counselling vulnerable students with SEMH needs	Low-moderate impact on outcomes but significant impact on well-being and personal development needs.	Sharper focus on impact evaluation but approach to continue as need across the college continues to grow.	£38,420 £27,459

8. Additional detail

- In this section you can annex or refer to **additional** information which you have used to inform the statement above.

