Pupil premium strategy statement – Lord Lawson of Beamish Academy

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 (secondary stage)	1151
Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils	30.84%
Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers **(3 year plans are recommended – you must still publish an updated statement each academic year)**	2022/2023 to 2024/2025
Date this statement was published	December 2022
Date of most recent review	December 2023
Date on which it will next be reviewed	December 2024
Statement authorised by	Andrew Fowler, Principal
Pupil premium lead	Joe Dicocco, Deputy Principal
Governor / Trustee lead	Guy Currey

Funding overview

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year	£367,425
Recovery premium funding allocation this academic year	£99,636
Pupil premium (and recovery premium) funding carried forward from previous years *(enter £0 if not applicable)*	£22,331
Total budget for this academic year	£489,392

Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

Statement of intent

Our intention is that all pupils, irrespective of their background or the challenges they face, make good progress and achieve high attainment across the curriculum. The focus of our pupil premium strategy is to support all disadvantaged pupils to achieve that goal.

We will consider the challenges faced by vulnerable pupils, such as those who have a social worker and young carers. The activity we have outlined in this statement is also intended to support their needs, regardless of whether they are disadvantaged or not.

High-quality teaching is at the heart of our approach, with a focus on areas in which disadvantaged pupils require the most support. This is proven to have the greatest impact on closing the disadvantage attainment gap and at the same time will benefit the non-disadvantaged pupils in our school. Implicit in the intended outcomes detailed below, is the intention that non-disadvantaged pupils' attainment will be sustained and improved alongside progress for their disadvantaged peers.

Our approach will be responsive to common challenges and individual needs, rooted in robust diagnostic assessment, not assumptions about the impact of disadvantage. The approaches we have adopted complement each other to help pupils excel. To ensure they are effective we will:

- ensure disadvantaged pupils are supported and challenged in the work that they complete
- act early to intervene at the point need is identified
- adopt a whole school approach in which all staff take responsibility for disadvantaged pupils' outcomes and raise expectations of what they can achieve

Challenges

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

Challenge number	Detail of challenge
1	The attainment and progress of disadvantaged students at key stage 4 is lower than that of non-disadvantaged students.
2	The attainment and progress of disadvantaged students in English is significantly lower than that of non-disadvantaged students.
3	The attainment and progress of disadvantaged students in vocational subjects is significantly lower than that of non-disadvantaged students.
4	Reading age test data indicates that disadvantaged students generally have lower levels of reading comprehension than that of non-disadvantaged students. This impacts their progress in all subjects.
5	Our attendance data over the last 5 years indicates that attendance among disadvantaged students has been between 1.6% and 10.2% lower than that of non-disadvantaged students. It is the impact of the pandemic that has led to this drastic change from 2018/2019 to 2021/2022. This gap has narrowed in 2022/2023.

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 attainment and progress among disadvantaged students across the curriculum at the end of KS4, particularly in Open subjects and with a focus on English.	2024/25 KS4 outcomes demonstrate that **disadvantaged students** achieve: • An average attainment 8 score of at least 45.00 • An average progress 8 score of at least 0.00 • An average open attainment 8 grade of at least 4.50 • An average open progress 8 score of at least 0.00 • An average English attainment 8 grade of at least 4.50 • An average English progress 8 score of at least 0.00

	In the 2021/2022 academic year the corresponding figures were: • Average attainment 8 score 37.17 • Average progress 8 score -0.84 • Average open attainment 8 grade 3.69 • Average open progress 8 score -1.06 • Average English attainment 8 grade 3.89 • Average English progress 8 score -1.11 In the 2022/2023 academic year the corresponding figures were: • Average attainment 8 score 36.23 • Average progress 8 score -0.74 • Average open attainment 8 grade 3.75 • Average open progress 8 score -0.65 • Average English attainment 8 grade 3.90 • Average English progress 8 score -0.83 We will use these figures as baselines and checkpoints when assessing our progress towards the success criteria set above. Additional note: We are primarily concerned with the achievement of the progress 8 success criteria. We have however kept the attainment 8 criteria as we are aware this plan covers years where progress figures will be unavailable due to the impact of the pandemic upon KS2 SATs.
Improved reading comprehension among disadvantaged students across years 7 - 9	Original success criteria below: Sustained reduction in the percentage of disadvantaged students not functionally literate by 2024/2025 demonstrated by:

	• All disadvantaged students to be classed as functionally literate by the end of KS3. At the start of 2022/2023 the percentage of disadvantaged students, in year 7, classed as not being functionally literate was 52%. At the end of 2022/2023 the percentage of disadvantaged students, in year 7, classed as not being functionally literate was 27%. At the start of 2022/2023 the percentage of disadvantaged students, in year 8, classed as not being functionally literate was 29%. At the end of 2022/2023 the percentage of disadvantaged students, in year 8, classed as not being functionally literate was 15%. At the start of 2022/2023 the percentage of disadvantaged students, in year 9, classed as not being functionally literate was 23%. At the end of 2022/2023 the percentage of disadvantaged students, in year 9, classed as not being functionally literate was 12%. Amended success criteria to be carried forward: Sustained improvement in literacy levels of disadvantaged students by 2024/2025 demonstrated by: • The average improvement in reading age for students in receipt of literacy interventions to exceed 18 months per academic year. • The gap in average reading ages between disadvantaged students

	and their non-disadvantaged peers being reduced by 1 year.
To achieve and sustain improved attendance for all students, particularly our disadvantaged students	Sustained high attendance by 2024/2025 demonstrated by: • The overall attendance rate for all students being more than 95%, and the attendance gap between disadvantaged students and their non-disadvantaged peers being reduced by 2.5% In the 2021/2022 academic year the corresponding figures were: • Overall attendance 86.3% • Attendance gap 10.2% In the 2022/2023 academic year the corresponding figures were: • Overall attendance 89.1% • Attendance gap 8.8% We will use these figures as baselines and checkpoints when assessing our progress towards the success criteria set above.

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: £271,000

Transforming Teaching programme: £23,300

Additional CPD budget: £3,500

Staffing related to CPD, recruitment and retention: £244,200

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Developing high quality teaching, assessment, and a curriculum which responds to the needs of students	Evidence indicates that high quality teaching is the most important lever schools have to improve student attainment, including for disadvantaged students. Schools should focus on building teacher knowledge and pedagogical expertise, curriculum development, and the purposeful use of assessment. Evidence summaries include EEF guidance reports, The EEF Toolkit, Evidence Based Education's Great Teaching Toolkit, and the EEF Cognitive Science Approaches in the Classroom.	1, 2, 3
Professional development on evidence-based approaches focusing on adaptive teaching, embedding a teaching and learning framework, and the Lines in the Sand	Supporting continuous and sustained professional development on evidence-based approaches is important to develop the practice of teachers in their own settings. The content of professional development should be based on the best available evidence. Evidence summaries include EEF guidance reports, and The EEF Toolkit.	1, 2, 3

Building a culture of continuous quality assurance and teacher feedback	A common form of support for teacher professional development is feedback. We do this through departmental quality assurance and peer lesson visits through professional learning groups. Evidence for this approach includes The EEF guidance on Effective mechanisms of PD.	1, 2, 3
Recruitment and retention of teaching staff	Managing workload and supporting the delivery of effective professional development are key to retaining great teachers. Investing in additional recruitment strategies, or boosting retention via high quality professional development, are practical approaches to ensure a high-quality teaching staff. Evidence includes The EEF's Effective Professional Development guidance report and the DfE's Reducing School Workload Collection.	1, 2, 3
Improving literacy in all subject areas in line with the recommendations in the Education Endowment Fund's Improving Literacy in Secondary Schools guidance.	Acquiring disciplinary literacy is key for students as they learn new, more complex concepts in each subject. Evidence includes the EEF's Improving Literacy in Secondary Schools guidance. Reading comprehension, vocabulary and other literacy skills are heavily linked with attainment in maths and English. Evidence includes the Oxford Language Report.	4

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

Budgeted cost: £97,000

Additionality in staffing related to literacy interventions: £64,000

Tutor intervention: £18,000

Exam support: £15,000

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Reading intervention including; reading plus, LRC lessons, small group interventions with the teacher of reading, 6th form mentor reading support, Lexia, and phonics interventions	Students may require targeted academic support to assist literacy. Interventions should be carefully matched to specific need, whilst not inhibiting students' access to the curriculum. Evidence includes The EEF's Selecting Interventions tool, the EEF guide to literacy, and the EEF toolkit strand on peer tutoring.	4
After-school and lunch revision sessions for Key stage 4 and 5 students. A significant proportion of the students who receive this support will be disadvantaged.	Intensive small group work can support student learning. This is most likely to be impactful if provided in addition to and explicitly linked with normal lessons. Evidence includes the EEF toolkit strand on small group tuition.	1, 2, 3
In-school day structured revision for year 11 students in tutorial time	Intensive small group work can support student learning. This is most likely to be impactful if provided in addition to and explicitly linked with normal lessons. Evidence includes the EEF toolkit strand on small group tuition.	1, 2, 3

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

Budgeted cost: £121,200

Attendance programmes: £3,200

Additionality in attendance related staffing: £37,000

Additionality in behaviour related staffing: £81,000

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Supporting attendance by enhanced staffing and leadership of attendance strategies and implementation of strategy using A* Attendance program	Increased parental communication and targeted parental engagement interventions show promise in supporting student attendance. Evidence includes the EEF guidance report on Working with Parents to Support Children's Learning	5
Improve student engagement & attentiveness through STAR and Silence is Golden	Approaches to developing a positive school ethos or improving discipline across the whole school which also aim to support greater engagement in learning are understood to have a moderate positive impact for low cost. Evidence includes the EEF guidance on Behaviour interventions and the EEF guidance report on Improving Behaviour in Schools.	1, 2, 3
Improve student punctuality to lessons through improving corridor culture	Approaches to developing a positive school ethos and improving discipline across the whole school which also aim to support greater engagement in learning are understood to have a moderate positive impact for low cost. Evidence includes the EEF guidance on Behaviour interventions and the EEF guidance report on Improving Behaviour in Schools.	1, 2, 3, 5

Total budgeted cost: £489,200

Part B: Review of the previous academic year

Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils

We have analysed the performance of our school's disadvantaged students during the 2022/23 academic year using key stage 4 performance data.

General review of outcomes

As a general review of outcomes in the previous year we have used the Progress 8 score (which is a measure of how much progress students at this school made across 8 qualifications between the end of key stage 2 and the end of key stage 4, compared to other students nationally) and the Attainment 8 score (which is a measure of GCSE attainment across 8 subjects) as our data for analysis. See the Department of Education guidance for more information about key stage 4 performance measures.

The table below shows the performance of our disadvantaged students and non-disadvantaged students, in the years 2018/2019, 2021/2022, and 2022/2023 with comparative national average figures:

Measure	Cohort	School/National average	2018/2019	2021/2022	2022/2023
Attainment 8	Disadvantaged students	Lord Lawson of Beamish Academy	35.0	37.2	36.2
	Non-disadvantaged students		48.2	53.3	52.6
	Disadvantaged students	National average	36.7	37.6	34.9
	Non-disadvantaged students		50.3	52.8	50.2
Progress 8	Disadvantaged students	Lord Lawson of Beamish Academy	-0.98	-0.84	-0.74
	Non-disadvantaged students		-0.33	0.11	0.18
	Disadvantaged students	National average	-0.45	-0.55	-0.57
	Non-disadvantaged students		0.13	0.15	0.17

The Department for Education strongly discouraged comparison of a school's 2022 performance data with results in previous years. The impact of COVID-19 makes it difficult to interpret why the results are as they are. In addition, changes were made to GCSE and A level exams in 2022, with adaptations such as advance information for pupils and grading that reflected a midway point between grading in 2021 and 2019.

Examinations returned to (near) normal in 2023, with the most valid comparison year being 2019.

We have also compared our results to national figures to help gauge the performance of our disadvantaged pupils.

Comparison to national averages

These comparisons shows that our disadvantaged students achieved 1.3 more A8 points than the national average for disadvantaged students in terms of Attainment 8 in 2022/2023. This is the first time that Attainment 8 for our disadvantaged students has been above the national average in this tracking period. Attainment 8 for our disadvantaged students only fell by 1.0 points compared to the national average fall of 2.7 points. Our Attainment 8 for disadvantaged students is up 1.2 points on 2018/2019, whereas the attainment 8 nationally is down 1.8 points.

All these attainment 8 comparisons are favourable over time and context and suggest that the attainment levels of our disadvantaged students are rising over time, against a national picture of decline, and are now above the national average. This is a very positive outcome at this stage of review of the pupil premium strategy plan.

In terms of Progress 8, our disadvantaged students achieved 0.17 points less than the national average for disadvantaged students in 2022/2023. This gap to national average progress 8 for disadvantaged students has narrowed from 0.29 in 2021/2022 and 0.53 in 2018/2019. Progress 8 for disadvantaged students has fallen nationally from -0.45 in 2018-2019 to -0.57 in 2022-2023, a fall of 0.12 points. Progress 8 for our disadvantaged students in the same time period has risen from -0.98 to -0.74, a rise of 0.24 points.

Nearly all these progress 8 comparisons are favourable over time and context. Our progress 8 for disadvantaged students is still below the national average for disadvantaged students, by 0.17 points. However, our progress 8 figure is trending upwards across a time period when nationally it is trending downwards. This represents very positive steps in the right direction at this stage of review of the pupil premium strategy plan.

Comparison of in-school gaps

The gap between the Progress 8 and Attainment 8 scores of our disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils has grown since the start of the pandemic but remained virtually static in comparisons to 2021/2022.

The gap in 2022/2023 in terms of Attainment 8 was 16.4 points and the gap in terms of Progress 8 was 0.92 points. In 2019 these gaps were 13.2 and 0.65 respectively. In 2021/2022 the gaps were 16.1 and 0.95 respectively. These gaps have increased by 3.2 in terms of attainment and 0.27 in terms of progress, between 2018/2019 and 2022/2023. Nationally, these gaps increased by 1.7 for attainment and 0.16 for progress.

These comparisons of the in-school gaps are not very favourable at present. Improvements made to the quality of education provided since 2018/2019 have increased our in-school gaps. So, whilst the attainment of our disadvantaged students is above the national average, and their progress is moving towards the national average, our non-disadvantaged students have made greater strides in attainment and progress than their disadvantaged peers. Amendments and additions to our pupil premium strategy moving forward aim to address this trend. These additions focus around improving student culture in the academy and are included in the second

and third rows of the Wider strategies section seen earlier. These are new strategies for 2023/2024 aimed at narrowing our in-school progress gap.

In addition to the general overview review, below is our review of the specific intended outcomes specified in this pupil premium strategy plan.

Detailed review of specific intended outcomes

Intended outcome 1: Improved attainment and progress among disadvantaged students across the curriculum at the end of KS4, particularly in Open subjects and with a focus on English.

Intended Outcome	Success Criteria	21/22 Final	22/23 Final	Milestone 1 22/23 Success Criteria	On track for improvement?	Met Milestone?	Milestone 2 23/24 Success Criteria	24/25 Success Criteria	On track for 24/25 Success criteria?
Improved attainment (and progress) among disadvantaged students across the curriculum at the end of KS4, particularly in Open subjects and with a focus on English	Average A8 score	37.17	**36.23**	39.78	N	N	42.39	45.00	N
	Average P8 score	-0.85	**-0.74**	-0.56	Y	N	-0.28	0.00	N
	Average Open A8 grade	3.69	**3.75**	3.96	Y	N	4.23	4.50	N
	Average Open P8 score	-1.08	**-0.65**	-0.71	Y	Y	-0.35	0.00	Y
	Average English A8 grade	3.89	**3.90**	4.09	Y	N	4.30	4.50	N
	Average English P8 score	-1.12	**-0.83**	-0.74	Y	N	-0.37	0.00	N

We have set outcomes targets for attainment 8 that are probably too high; they represent an exceptional level of challenge and we recommend downward revision for future plans. Also, the decline in attainment 8 from 2021/2022 is in part due to outcomes for 2021/2022 being part of a transition year back to 2018/2019 baselines, which was completed in 2022/2023.

Despite the above, we have encouraging evidence of improvement in attainment 8 and progress 8 in open subjects and English, as well as the improvement in overall progress 8 reviewed earlier. We are on track for the final target set for open progress 8 as we met the milestone for 2022/2023. The review at this point is favourable given the improvements seen so far, but the improvements are not yet large enough to hit our progress targets overall and for English.

As mentioned earlier, we are keeping the attainment 8 targets so we can track against these for years when progress figures will not be published due to the impact of the pandemic upon KS2 SATS.

Intended outcome 2: Improved reading comprehension among disadvantaged students across years 7 – 9

When we set out the original plan we intended to track and measure against two criteria. We intend to refine our criteria for measurement for the remaining two years of this strategy. The

amended criteria have been detailed in the Intended Outcomes section earlier. This change is to refine and sharpen the strategy and the ease of measuring against desired outcomes. For this year, we have tracked aga-+inst original criteria as follows:

Intended Outcome	Success Criteria	21/22 Final	22/23 Beginning of term 1	22/23 Final	Milestone 1 22/23 Success Criteria	On track for improvement?	Met Milestone?
Improved reading comprehension among disadvantaged students across years 7-9	Decrease the % of DA students in year 7 who are not functionally literate to 0	29%	52%	27%	25%	Y	N
	Decrease the % of DA students in year 8 who are not functionally literate to 0	13%	29%	15%	13%	N	N
	Decrease the % of DA students in year 9 who are not functionally literate to 0	15%	23%	12%	0%	Y	N

We have not included success criteria for future years as we plan to change these. In this review we can see clear reductions in the percentage of disadvantaged students who are not functionally literate from their starting points at the start of the academic year. We can also see improvements in two out of three year end points. However, the milestones were not met in any year group.

We know, from underlying data, that students in receipt of literacy interventions are making more than 12 months progress in their reading ages on average. It is this improvement in reading age that we will track in future years, to assess the impact of these strategies to improve literacy. As such, for this review point, the evidence is inconclusive. However, individual student gains in literacy levels are being made, which we intend to measure against in remaining years of this strategy.

Intended outcome 3: To achieve and sustain improved attendance for all students, particularly our disadvantaged students

Intended Outcome	Success Criteria	21/22 Final	22/23 Final	Milestone 1 22/23 Success Criteria	On track for improvement?	Met Milestone?	Milestone 2 23/24 Success Criteria	24/25 Success Criteria	On track for 24/25 Success criteria?
To achieve and sustain improved attendance for all students, particularly our disadvantaged students	Overall attendance rate for all students	86.30%	89.05%	89.20%	Y	N	92.10%	95.00%	N
	Attendance gap between DA students and non-DA students	10.16%	8.77%	9.33%	Y	Y	8.49%	7.66%	Y

At this review point, we see improvements against both success criteria. Overall attendance improved by 2.75% year on year. This is promising but 0.15% below our 2022/2023 milestone, which was not met. The attendance gap decreased by 1.39% This criterion met the milestone and is better than the 2023/2024 criteria. If the decrease in the gap continues at this rate, we will meet the final target next year. We will be keeping the success criteria the same.

Conclusions

In the academic year 2022/2023 we can see clear signs that our pupil premium strategy is having a positive impact. Virtually all indicators are showing clear positive impact on outcomes for disadvantaged students.

We have reviewed our strategy plan and made slight changes to how we intend to use some of our budget for the two remaining academic years of this plan, as set out in the Activity in This Academic Year section above. The further information section below provides more details about our planning, implementation, and evaluation processes.

Further information

We make the pupil premium strategy central to our whole school improvement plan. We understand and fully support the single recommendation of our Ofsted report in November 2022 which stated that "there has not been a sufficiently strategic approach to ensuring that pupils from a disadvantaged background have the support they need. As a result, some pupils do not achieve well enough. Leaders and governors must ensure that all pupils, including those who are disadvantaged, receive the support they need to get the most from their education."

Following this, we met with two schools to find out more about their pupil premium strategies. We engaged with the known research bases around the pupil premium strategy, and completely rewrote ours for the 3 years from 2022/2023.

We now have internal trackers to monitor our progress against the 3 intended outcomes we have specified. We review progress toward these intended outcomes on a termly basis. This allows us to evaluate the impact of our pupil premium strategy and make amendments as required on a yearly basis. We report regularly on the reviews of the pupil premium strategy to governors so they are fully aware of the strategy and the progress toward the intended outcomes.

Externally provided programmes

Please include the names of any non-DfE programmes that you used your pupil premium (or recovery premium) to fund in the previous academic year.

Programme	Provider
N/A	N/A