

Pupil Premium Strategy Statement

This statement uses the Department for Education's recommended template to show Thomas Tallis School's use of Pupil Premium funding to help improve the attainment of our disadvantaged pupils. It also includes the 'Recovery Premium' for the 2021 to 2022 academic year.

It outlines our pupil premium strategy, how we intend to spend the funding in this academic year and the effect of last year's spending.

School overview

Detail	Data	
School name	Thomas Tallis School	
Number of pupils in school	2167 (1353 y7-11)	
Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils	32%	
Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers	2021-24	
Date this statement was published	October 2022	
Date on which it will be reviewed	October 2023	
Statement authorised by	Carolyn Roberts	
Pupil premium lead	Stephanie Shaldas	
Governor / Trustee lead	Gavin Williamson	

Funding overview

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year £ 430 445	
Recovery premium funding allocation this academic year (The Recovery Premium is a short-term post-Covid grant on top of PP, allocated using the same deprivation indicators)	£ 70 268
Pupil premium funding carried forward from previous years (enter £0 if not applicable)	
Total budget for this academic year	£ 500 713

Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

Statement of intent

Our school aim is to provide education to understand the world and change it for the better. Our three-year school plan is under five headings:

- 1. A powerful curriculum
- 2. The best teachers
- 3. Great learning and progress
- 4. Excellent personal development
- 5. A model for a better world

Challenges

This details the key challenges to achievement that we have identified among our disadvantaged pupils. They are carried forward from 2021-22. The level to which we met them is in red below.

Challenge number	Detail of challenge	
1	Low attendance of PP students	
	Attendance staffing and intervention is proactive, but the effect of Covid is still very evident in some households.	
	In 2021-22 Persistent Absence (90% or lower) among PP students was 12% higher than for other students	
2	Low progress in maths and English of PP students	
	Both English and maths results improved in 2022, supported by the additional groups and smaller class sizes. This model has been continued into 2022/2023	
	However, at GCSE, progress for PP students was about -0.74 below that of other students (about three-quarters of a GCSE grade). In English it was about a third of a grade lower and in maths about half a grade lower. While this is a good improvement since 2019, these areas need to improve further.	
3	Low progress of high attaining PP students	
	GCSE results for high prior attainment students across Tallis improved in 2022. However, higher tier PP students are also about three-quarters of a grade below national expectations. This remains a challenge.	
4	Poor independent learning environment	
	We worked hard to ensure that PP students had the equipment they need and issued laptops to those who didn't have them. 54% of all PP students were issued a laptop since Sept 21 (71% of PP students in year 11). However, the 90%+ homework completion rate has not been met.	
5	Limited parent engagement	

	We make sure that every household is known to us and we have contact with all parents and carers. However, the average parents and carers' attendance at parents' evenings is 30% lower for PP students than for all other students, so this remains a challenge.	
6	Disproportionate negative: positive behaviour points ratio We were successful in our aim to encourage PP students. In 2021-22 we aimed for students to get 7 positive points for every negative point (1:7). PP students got 1:5, better than all others at 1:3	
7	Disproportionately high number of suspensions We aimed for PP student suspensions to be at the same level as suspensions of non-PP students. This was not achieved: 7% PP students were suspended v 3.5% non-PP students – twice as many.	

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
1	Improved attendance of PP students	PP to attend in line with non-PP: 96% attendance 2.5% lateness PA to below national average of 13%
2	Improved progress in maths and English (2019 English All PP = -0.85 2022 English All PP = -0.35 2019 Maths All PP = -0.84 2022 Maths All PP = -0.66)	Continue progress towards P8 0
3	Improved progress of high attaining students (2019 Higher All PP = -1.43 2022 Higher All PP = -0.75)	Continue the progress towards P8 O+
4	Improved completion of independent learning, including access to technology and study areas	100% PP students have own laptops 90%+ PP independent learning completion
5	Parents' evening attendance	90%+ PP parents and carers
6	Negative: positive points	1:7 whole school aim achieved for PP
7	Suspension of PP students	Suspensions = suspensions of non-PP students

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: £ 141 064

(£ 57387 En teacher (M6), £ 57387 Ma teacher (M6), £ 26290 AHT T&L uplift)

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Added capacity in English and Maths	Adding an extra class in Year 11 for English and Maths allows more individualised instruction to take place. This improves learning because reduced numbers allow teachers to teach differently, having higher quality interactions with pupils and minimising disruption: https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/educationevidence/teaching-learning-toolkit Both English and maths results improved in 2022, supported by the additional groups and smaller class sizes This model has been continued into 2022/2023	2
Uplift for reinstated post of AHT Teaching and Learning	Supporting high quality teaching is pivotal in improving children's outcomes. Research shows high quality teaching narrows the disadvantage gap. Following EEF guidance Putting Evidence to Work - A School's Guide to Implementation, we now have capacity to identify and cultivate leaders of implementation and build capacity through implementation teams: https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/educationevidence/guidance-reports/implementation	2,3,4

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

Budgeted cost: £ 205 314

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Director of KS4 and Transition (leadership of mentoring, progress and independent learning	The core function of the RSL is to ensure the best possible outcomes and progress for students in every year group. PiXL advocate a single line of accountability from the Head, through the RSL, for achievement and	2,3,4,5

provision KS4) to improve our achievement at KS4 and transition for all students, especially PP.	standards. This consistent approach still works as part of our distributed leadership models: the RSL's responsibility is related specifically to outcomes. https://www.pixl.org.uk/	
Director of Inclusion (teaching quality for SEN + SENK) to improve the teaching offered to children with any kind of SEND, especially PP.	Guidance in the EEF Evidence Review for Special Educational Needs in Mainstream Schools cites evidence on effective school leadership of SEND where there is a 'visionary' leader who can 'model positive attitudes and beliefs about inclusion and equity; communicate clear expectations about inclusive teaching practices and a supportive, collaborative working environment. 'Our SEN numbers are so high that one person cannot complete the role on top of statutory processes. Director of Inclusion will lead the staff team to understand why and how to deliver inclusive education, create a shared vision of inclusion and offer constructive feedback and mentoring: https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/evidence-reviews/special-educational-needs-and-disabilities-send	2,3,4,6
SENK Coordinator (not the SENDCo) to improve the attendance and progress of children whose needs are identified as SENK, especially PP	OFSTED 2021 observed that gaps in understanding pupils' needs and starting points resulted in worse experiences and poorer learning during lockdown. For us, this seemed more likely to be the case for children without EHC plans. According to the Early Career Framework, adapting teaching in a responsive way, including providing targeted support to struggling pupils, is likely to increase pupil success. Five high-quality, impactful teaching strategies are identified in the EEF's guidance for special educational needs in mainstream schools: https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/guidance-reports/send	2,3,4,6
Contribution to MAL Coordinator post to ensure the good progress of the most	Many of our PP students are also More Able Learners (DfE Higher Tier on prior attainment). In June 2013, Ofsted published 'The most able students: are they doing as well as they should	2,3

able students,	in our non-selective secondary schools?' The	
especially PP	report made it clear that	
	many more able learners in non-selective	
	schools fail to achieve their potential	
	compared with students who attend selective	
	and independent schools. In particular, the	
	report singled out the difference in outcomes	
	between disadvantaged most able students	
	and their better-off peers. We have a	
	designated Lead Teacher for More Able	
	Learners who champions the needs of	
	disadvantaged most able students and devises	
	whole school strategy to raise achievement,	
	embedding an ethos in which academic	
	excellence is championed and providing	
	training for teachers so that their teaching	
	routinely challenges the most able students:	
	https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/gover	
	nment/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_	
	data/file/408909/The_most_able_students_an	
	<u>update_on_progress_since_June_2013.pdf</u>	

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

Budgeted cost: £154 335 (£27 677 Behaviour for Learning, £35 406 Attendance Officer, £23 133 Family Liaison Officer (pt), £41 712 PWT Lead, £26 407 PWT Admin.)

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Behaviour for Learning staffing, extra Pastoral Welfare Team lead post and p-t administrative post. To ensure that behaviour strategies work fairly and productively for	DfE 2021 reports that students from disadvantaged backgrounds are more likely to receive a permanent or fixed period exclusion. The most common reason is persistent disruptive behaviour. Two approaches that will address this are teachers' universal classroom management approaches and, where necessary, more specialist support in self-regulation and social and emotional skills. https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/behaviour-interventions Consistency and coherence at a whole-school level are paramount, led by our Director of Behaviour for Learning and supported by the Pastoral Welfare Team who lead daily behaviour interventions, fulfilling the roles of menotrs to	2,6,7

all students, especially PP.	children whose behaviour makes them vulnerable to school failure. https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/guidance-reports/behaviour	
Attendance Officer to ensure all students make the most of educational opportunities, especially PP	In state-funded secondary schools, COVID-related absence was 3.2% on 30 September 21. The proportion of students attending was 89.5%. down from 91.9% on 16 Sept 21. If a student achieves 96-100% attendance (57% of the year group) the • Average predicted grade: 5.76 • +0.6 of a GCSE grade above target in each subject, on average • 81% of these students are on or above target 90-95% attendance (24% of the year group) • Average predicted grade: 4.83 • +0.1 of a GCSE grade above target in each subject, on average • 74% of these students are on or above target Below 90% attendance (19% of the year group) • Average predicted grade: 3.74 • -0.8 of a GCSE grade below target in each subject, on average • 49% of these students are on or above target Poor school attendance is a significant problem in the UK. Research has found that poor attendance is linked to poor academic attainment across all stages as well as anti-social characteristics, delinquent activity and negative behavioural outcomes. Evidence suggests simple improvements in attendance have significant impact on these students. https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/educationevidence/evidence-reviews/attendance-interventions-rapid-evidence-assessment	1,5
Family Liaison Officer to help students who find school attendance most difficult, especially PP	In normal times 1 in 10 children living in the most deprived areas miss one day a week at school or more. 61% of persistently absent pupils were on free school meals, in contact with social services or had special educational needs. (Social Finance 2021). Encouraging attendance needs a discrete, personal approach. (This postholder is also the Deputy Safeguarding Lead)	1,4,5

Total budgeted cost: £ 500 713

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.

1. Improved progress at GCSE in maths and English

Based on Teacher-assessed grades, our estimated Progress 8 score is -0.09, better than the last 4 years, and our overall VA score is 0 against projected National Average grades. English estimated P8 is +0.16 and maths is -0.36, an improvement of +0.2 from the previous year.

2. Attendance of Pupil Premium Students

Hard to assess because of Covid-19. Total 93% attendance, PP 90%

3. Progress of higher tier students

Higher tier progress has improved to 0 in 2020 and 2021 (-0.7 in 2019)

4. Progress of students with SEND and at TOFFS (Tallis Offers a Fresh Start (Sutcliffe Park)) SEN K progress in 2021 was -0.4, an improvement of +0.6 from 2020

5. Completion of Independent Learning

The average independent learning grade for the whole school was 1.8 ('Good'). It was 2.1 (not quite 'good') for PP students. In 2020 the equivalent score was 2.0 for all students, and 2.2 for PP students.

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
NTP	My Tutor
Core subjects online revision	Tassomai
All GCSE online revision	GCSE Pod
University aspiration	Uniconnect

We did not receive Service Pupil Premium funding.

Carolyn Roberts Gavin Williamson

Headteacher Pupil Premium Governor

19.10.21