

Pupil premium strategy statement – Cantell School

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	1237 (at grant allocation)
Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils	37.8% (at grant allocation)
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)	2021-2024
Date this statement was published	Dec 2023
Date on which it will be reviewed	Dec 2024
Statement authorised by	Harry Kutty
Pupil premium lead	Kat Cox
Governor / Trustee lead	Peter Hilditch

Funding overview

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year	£484,380
Recovery premium funding allocation this academic year <i>Recovery premium received in academic year 2023/24 cannot be carried forward beyond August 31, 2024.</i>	£129,720
Pupil premium funding carried forward from previous years (<i>enter £0 if not applicable</i>)	£0
Total budget for this academic year <i>If your school is an academy in a trust that pools this funding, state the amount available to your school this academic year</i>	£614,100

Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

Statement of intent

Challenges

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

Challenge number	Detail of challenge
1	Lower average reading age on entry
2	Lower average prior attainment on entry
3	Lower average attendance
4	Difficulty engaging with parents for some students (for a range of reasons)
5	Lower aspirations held by many PP students

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 percentage gap between PP and Non PP students securing a positive progress 8 score	Reduce to 10%
Reduce the attainment 8 gap between PP and Non PP students	Reduce to 5 points
Reduce the 5+ English and Maths gap	Reduce to 7%
Improve attendance to national average	Attendance in line with national average
Reduce PP NEETs	Aim for zero NEETs

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: £291,286.53

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
<p>Development of the 'Creating Experts in...' approach. Which is the basis for all whole school CPD including the professional development cycle, teaching and learning bursts, teaching and learning briefings and training on INSET days.</p>	<p>Having three T&L priorities is no longer necessary as the four that we have cycled through have been developed to a high level consistently across the school. Our varied CPD for teachers and student-centred support staff is now based around fine tuning a set of ingredients for exceptional teaching and learning. Funding is used for the Lead Practitioner's time, an Assistant Headteacher's time and time for staff to be trained and then involved in the professional development cycle.</p>	<p>1 & 2</p>
<p>Investment in Initial Teacher Training and recruitment of the strongest resulting teachers.</p>	<p>"Evidence from across the English school system shows that using your pupil premium funding to improve teaching quality is the most effective way to improve outcomes for disadvantaged pupils." https://www.gov.uk/guidance/pupil-premium-effective-use-and-accountability#non-eligible-pupils With the national teacher recruitment crisis, we have found that being heavily involved in the initial training of our future teachers is one of the best ways to ensure high quality effective teachers are available to teach our disadvantaged students. Funding is used for the Lead Practitioner's time, an Assistant Headteacher's time and time for staff to be trained in and carry out mentoring.</p>	<p>1,2 & 5</p>

<p>Strengthening of CPSD curriculum</p>	<p>The vision of the CPSD curriculum is “In a safe place we empower Students to make informed decisions now and in the future. Our Curriculum fosters an understanding of how these discussions may impact their lives and their community. Through application and experience students are encouraged to take ownership over what they are learning, thus EMPOWERing them to lead happy and successful lives.”</p> <p>This curriculum is important for many of our PP students to as Nationally the cohort tend to have lower levels of wellbeing and metacognitive skills.</p> <p>Funding is used for some of the CPSD lead’s time.</p>	<p>2,3 & 5</p>
<p>Pupil Premium Lead</p>	<p>As over a third of our students are classified as disadvantaged, we need a coordinated approach ensure their needs are being met by the wider staff body, which involves extensive targeted quality assurance and regular communication with staff.</p>	<p>1-5</p>
<p>Non-teaching Year Leaders</p>	<p>This approach has been used successfully for a significant number of years at Cantell. By having non-teaching Year Leaders, it gives them sufficient time to provide the majority of the required pastoral support to our most vulnerable students, freeing up teacher time to focus on the highest quality teaching and learning, which is “the most effective way to improve outcomes for disadvantaged pupils”, EEF.</p>	<p>1-5</p>

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

Budgeted cost: £119,042.83

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
<p>Appointment of Intervention Lead</p>	<p>Self-evaluation highlighted that although we have been using lots of successful intervention strategies, we weren't always sharing the best practice across areas and sometimes students were receiving duplicated interventions. We have since appointed an Intervention Lead to coordinate and quality assure our interventions, which has already given us more evidence of which interventions seem to be most successful and allowed us to target them more effectively.</p>	<p>1-5</p>
<p>Reading interventions, which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading buddies • Reading ambassadors • Phonics interventions <p>Staffing includes the Reading Buddies lead, a phonics teacher and LSA and Southampton University provide the pay for a number of University and College students to read with our young people.</p>	<p>DfE Research evidence on reading for pleasure Education standards research team May 2012 – page 9 benefits of reading for pleasure. Success of the reading buddies project in 2021-22.</p> <p>Evidence from reading tests and SATs scores show that a large number of our year 7 PP students arrive to us behind age related expectations for reading, which affects their ability to access the curriculum.</p> <p>From the EEF teaching and learning toolkit. Reading comprehension strategies - Very high impact for very low cost based on extensive evidence</p>	<p>1,2 & 5</p>

<p>IAG Lead organises a range of interventions for potential NEETs, which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • College visits • Careers advice • Work experience support • Work with local employers 	<p>“The link between time spent NEET and poor health is partly due to an increased likelihood of unemployment, low wages, or low quality work later on in life. Being NEET can also have an impact on unhealthy behaviours and involvement in crime.” “Because the chances of becoming NEET follow a social gradient, reducing the proportion of people NEET could help to reduce health inequalities.” REF: Reducing the number of young people not in employment, education or training (NEET). This is a huge priority to ensure a good quality of life for our students in the future.</p>	<p>5</p>
--	--	----------

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

Budgeted cost: £203,770.63

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
<p>Welfare - Emotional and mental health support Students are prioritised by need but, where possible, PP students will be triaged first and allocated the appropriate support from one of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-teaching year leader support • Mentoring • Wellbeing hub support • Support hub support (for those with SEND) • Attendance support • Safeguarding team support 	<p>Strategies that have been used within Cantell successfully over a number of years – success measured by parent, student and teacher feedback. The wellbeing hub is new for 2023/24 and is already proving successful in improving the attendance of some previously persistent non-attenders.</p> <p>From the EEF teaching and learning toolkit. Mentoring - Low impact for moderate cost based on moderate evidence, but in our context results seem promising from as measured from ImpactEd surveys, so worth persevering and continuing to monitor.</p>	<p>3,4 & 5</p>
<p>Engagement with parents – ensuring parents are able to support their children at home, both academically and pastorally. Non-teaching year leaders (to enable frequent and swift contact home).</p>	<p>From the EEF teaching and learning toolkit. Parental engagement - Moderate impact for very low cost based on extensive evidence.</p> <p>Non-teaching year leaders have been used in our context over a number of years with a very high success – particularly with safeguarding our most disadvantaged students.</p>	<p>4</p>

<p>Dedication of Deputy Headteacher's time to whole school drive on attendance. Involves targeted approach for PP students with intervention ranging from lesson A conversations to 1:1 meetings depending on % attendance for the student and their circumstances.</p>	<p>Attendance is our biggest barrier to progress for our PP students as identified in the analysis of GCSE results for a number of years and therefore needs to be a high priority at all levels of Leadership.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Learning2Learn Provision. An alternative provision for students that struggle in mainstream lessons for a variety of reasons. There is a strong focus on supporting students to reintegrate into mainstream lessons when they are ready.</p>	<p>A number of studies report that a disproportionate number of PP students are excluded from schools Nationally and this can have a significant negative impact on their future life chances.</p> <p>School exclusion: a literature review on the continued disproportionate exclusion of certain children reports: "Many interesting themes emerged in the literature around alternative provision (AP), including a range of studies in which pupils reported positive experiences of AP" There were negative effects found where APs lacked enough quality of teaching or curriculum coverage. This is why we have invested heavily in our Learning2Learn provision and timetable our most experienced teachers to teach there with the support of specialist staff that work just with those students (the majority of which are PP). Success over past years also shows the positive impact on students in mainstream lessons while their peers are given the support needed to be able to reintegrate into mainstream lessons at a later date without negatively affecting learning for the rest of the class.</p>	<p>1-5</p>

<p>Trips and visits – to increase the cultural capital of our students, ensure the curriculum has real world meaning to them and give them further opportunities to develop their EMPOWER skills in an engaging way. We allocate funds to ensuring PP students can access a wide range of trips and ensuring our head of Student Experience has sufficient time to ensure all PP students are experiencing trips.</p>	<p>https://www.suttontrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/Subject-to-background1-1.pdf demonstrates the positive impact that trips and visits can have on our PP students, especially those that are HPPA (high potential or prior attaining).</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>Support Hub - We have invested in a Deputy Leader of SEND to recognise the large cross over between our PP cohort and our SEND cohort. Both groups tend to underachieve nationally and therefore we have increased capacity to ensure they can receive the specialist support necessary.</p>	<p>The extra capacity allows us as a school to act on the EEF's 5 recommendations to support special educational needs in mainstream schools. Particularly when it comes to offering advice to teachers to 'ensure all pupils have access to high quality teaching'.</p>	

Total budgeted cost: £580,428.00

Part B: Review of the previous academic year

Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils

Last year was the second year of a 3 year pupil premium strategy plan, below is the assessment of how successfully the intended outcomes of that plan were met at the end of year 2.

NB – As stated by the DfE “Performance measures based on qualification results from 2022/23 cannot be directly compared to measures from 2021/22. This is because a different grading approach was used in 2021/22, to take account of the impact of the pandemic.” 2019 is the most comparable year in terms of how assessments were carried out and graded, but students in that year had their education disrupted by the global pandemic.

Progress 8 – Intended outcome is to reduce the percentage gap between PP and Non PP students securing a positive progress 8 score, to 10%.

- 2019: PP 48%, Non-PP 73% GAP 25%
- 2020: PP 53%, Non-PP 65% GAP 12%
- 2021: Not available
- 2022: PP 55%, Non-PP 76% GAP 21%
- 2023: PP 36.9%, Non-PP 64.5% GAP 27.6%

The effect of the pandemic can be seen in this measure. This measure needs to be monitored closely throughout 2023-24 to get closer to our target. Nationally the KS4 disadvantage gap index has widened compared to 2021/22, from 3.84 to 3.95. It is now at its highest level since 2011.

If we consider just those students with attendance over 90%, we get the following figures for 2023:

- PP 51.4%, Non-PP 74.3% GAP 22.9%.

Whilst the gap is only slightly smaller, it does indicate that many disadvantaged students make good progress at Cantell if they attend their lessons and that attendance of disadvantaged students needs to be a high priority.

Attainment 8 - Intended outcome is to reduce the A8 gap between PP and Non PP students to 5 points

- 2019 - PP 40.6, Non-PP 51.6 GAP 11.0 points
- 2020 - PP 41.9, Non-PP 49.5 GAP 7.6 points
- 2021 - PP 36.9, Non-PP 49.1 GAP 12.2 points
- 2022 - PP 41.7, Non-PP 50.3 GAP 8.7 points
- 2023 – PP 34.34, Non-PP 50.22 GAP 15.88 points

The attainment 8 score for pupil premium nationally is 34.9 and non-PP is 50.2 (<https://explore-education-statistics.service.gov.uk/find-statistics/key-stage-4-performance-revised> accessed 03/12/2023) so students are in line with the National picture after the pandemic, but this is not acceptable to us. Whilst the decline in the

National picture can be explained, we are passionate that all young people should have the same success and opportunities regardless of their background. If we consider just those students with attendance over 90%, we get the following figures for 2023:

- PP 45.86, Non-PP 54.96 GAP 9.10 points.

This provides evidence that teachers and support staff are having a positive impact on PP students when they attend lessons, and again that attendance is currently one of the biggest barriers to closing the gap.

Grade 5+ in English and maths - Intended outcome is to reduce the 5+ English and Maths gap to 7%.

- 2019 - PP: 29.3%, Non-PP: 44.0%, GAP 14.7%
- 2020 - PP: 32.5%, Non-PP: 43.2%, GAP 10.7%
- 2021 - PP: 14.7%, Non-PP: 46.0%, GAP 31.3%
- 2022 – PP: 44.0%, Non-PP: 53.1%, GAP 9.1%
- 2023 – PP: 21.6%, Non-PP: 50.3%, GAP 28.7%

We can see the negative effect of the pandemic here and need to use the recovery premium to reduce the effects of the pandemic on future cohorts.

Attendance – Intended outcome is to improve PP student attendance to match national average

- 2020 attendance for FSM was 91.4%, 0.6% above national average for FSM.
- 2021 attendance for FSM to May was 87.6%, which had dropped below national average, but was being skewed by vulnerable students that didn't attend during the school closures. Our FSM attendance from Sept 21 to 10/12/2021 was 90.6%, which is in line with national and very pleasing.
- 2022 attendance for FSM was 86.6%, 1.5% above national average.
- 2023 attendance for FSM was 86.4%, 1.3% above national average.

Whilst being above national average is pleasing, attendance will continue to be our highest priority due to the impact it has on student outcomes.

NEETS – Intended outcome is to achieve zero PP NEETS

- 2020 leavers PP NEETS 7.1%, which was 6 individuals (11% according to <https://www.compare-school-performance.service.gov.uk/school/116469/cantell-school/secondary/results-by-pupil-characteristics?accordionstate=0> and ASP, but we have reconciled with SCC).
- 2021 leavers PP NEETS 11.8%, which was 8 individuals.(17% according to <https://www.compare-school-performance.service.gov.uk/school/116469/cantell-school/secondary/results-by-pupil-characteristics?accordionstate=0> and ASP and ASP, but we have reconciled with SCC).
- 2022 leavers PP NEETS TBC
- 2023 leavers PP NEETS TBC

There are many factors outside our control which contribute to individual cases, but that will not prevent us from striving to meet this intended outcome because the impact

on each individual can be significant. This is likely to continue to be a priority in our next three-year plan.

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
Free Music Lessons for PP students	Southampton Music Service
DofE places provided for PP students	DofE
Reading Buddies	University of Southampton

Further information (optional)

Engagement with 'No limits' used to support PP students, but no cost.