

## Disadvantaged Funding Strategy Statement (secondary) 2018-19

1. Summary information					
School	Ridgewood School				
Academic Year	2018-19	Total PP budget	181,649	Date of most recent PP Review	n/a
Total number of pupils		Number of pupils eligible for PP	238	Date for next internal review of this strategy	July 2019

2. Current attainment		
	Pupils eligible for PP	Pupils not eligible for PP
Average Progress 8 score	-0.093	-0.362
Average Attainment 8 score	4.400	4.823
3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)		
<b>In-school barriers</b> ( <i>issues to be addressed in school, such as poor literacy skills</i> )		
A.	Students eligible for disadvantaged / PP funding progress less rapidly, and attain less highly than their peers nationally (including in English)	
B.	Less robust levels of literacy within the cohort of students eligible for disadvantaged funding	
C.	Lower aspirations for future careers and Post 16 pathways	
<b>External barriers</b> ( <i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i> )		
D.	Attendance rates amongst student eligible for disadvantaged funding remain below that of their peers. This reduces their school hours and causes them to fall behind.	
E.	Poor home learning environment and poor engagement from students, and their parents and carers, including limited attendance at parent consultation evenings and achievement events, and higher numbers of incidents of poor behaviour.	
4. Desired outcomes ( <i>desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i> )		Success criteria
A.	Students eligible for disadvantaged funding will make and sustain rapid progress in order to close the gaps and achieve in line with their peers.	Students eligible for disadvantaged funding will achieve in line with their peers (in school) by the end of the year. This will be evidenced through GCSE outcomes, national and in school data
B.	Students eligible for disadvantaged funding will develop robust literacy and oracy skills, allowing them to secure the highest grades at GCSE / Level 2 courses, and to compete with students nationally for post 16 and post 18 pathways.	Students eligible for disadvantaged funding will increase the number of A* and A grades as a result of the development of the robust and sophisticated

		literacy skills required to do so.
<b>C.</b>	<p>Increased enrolment at Ridgewood School Post 16 provision by students who are eligible for disadvantaged funding.</p> <p>Increased participation, by students who are eligible for disadvantaged funding, in Level 3 courses, both at Ridgewood Post 16 and other local providers.</p>	<p>Numbers of students eligible for disadvantaged funding applying for Ridgewoods Post 16 provision will increase.</p> <p>Numbers of students eligible for disadvantaged funding applying for Level 3 courses post 16 will increase.</p>
<b>D.</b>	Increased attendance rates for student eligible for disadvantaged / PP funding.	Reduce the number of persistent absentees (PA) among pupils eligible for disadvantaged funding to 3% or below. Overall attendance among students eligible for disadvantaged funding improves to a minimum of 97% in line with 'other' students.
<b>E.</b>	There is an improved engagement by students, parents and carers at aspiration and extra curricular events such as Opus 100, and D of E participation.	Students, parents and carers access the school more frequently, including key events during the year. This is measured through attendance at events, and participation levels.

5. Planned expenditure					
Academic year		2018-19			
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?
Students eligible for disadvantaged funding will develop robust literacy and oracy skills, allowing them to secure the highest grades at GCSE / Level 2 courses, and to compete with students nationally for post 16 and post 18 pathways.	Delivered through a new whole school literacy strategy	Question level analysis and grade boundary analysis shows that students lack the vocabulary, technical language and sophisticated language that allows them to routinely access the highest grades at GCSE/Level 2, and students lack the skills in scaffolding and extending writing in examination situations	High quality staff CPD High quality planning that is pitched high and extends literacy. A clear strategy with minimum expectations for daily classroom practice Rigorous QA processes embedded across all subjects and departments	Teaching and Learning Team	At each CF cycle, and in August 2019
<b>Total budgeted cost</b>					10,000
ii. 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?

Students eligible for disadvantaged funding will make and sustain rapid progress in order to close the gaps and achieve in line with their peers.	Dedicated Learning Mentors to provide high quality twilight intervention support sessions on a daily basis, in core subjects, alongside targeted in class support for those students who are eligible for disadvantaged funding and working below target.	Continuation of the successful Learning Mentor intervention programme from 2017-18, which impacted highly on progress and outcomes of students eligible for disadvantaged funding.	This is a strategy that has made a significant impact in supporting closing the gap in the cohort, and allows students to access a high quality learning environment after school, with appropriate materials, resources and expertise to promote high achievement and plug gaps in learning.	AHT –data and achievement	At each CF cycle throughout the year, and upon receipt of results in August 2019
<b>Total budgeted cost</b>					66,000
<b>iii. Other approaches.</b>					
<b>Desired outcome</b>	<b>Chosen action / approach</b>	<b>What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?</b>	<b>How will you ensure it is implemented well?</b>	<b>Staff lead</b>	<b>When will you review implementation?</b>
Increased attendance rates for student eligible for disadvantaged / PP funding	An attendance strategy developed across the school pyramid, establishing common themes and expectations for our families from Y1 upwards	Historical data shows that our students eligible for disadvantaged funding attend less well than their peers, and that there is a pattern of poor attendance amongst siblings / other family members across out primary pyramid, whereby these habits of poor attendance are ingrained before the student accesses secondary education.	Monitoring and evaluation from our primary headteachers, and attendance collaborative group.	AHT behaviour and attendance	Termly throughout 2018-19.
<b>Total budgeted cost</b>					12,000
<b>iv. Other approaches</b>					
<b>Other approaches</b>	<b>Chosen action / approach</b>	<b>What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?</b>	<b>How will you ensure it is implemented well?</b>	<b>Staff lead</b>	<b>When will you review implementation?</b>
Increased enrolment at	A high quality careers	Previous years have shown that many of	A whole school targeted approach.	AHT – careers	January 2019, April 2019, July

<p>Ridgewood School Post 16 provision by students who are eligible for disadvantaged funding.</p> <p>Increased participation, by students who are eligible for disadvantaged funding, in Level 3 courses, both at Ridgewood Post 16 and other local providers.</p>	<p>and recruitment programme targeting students eligible for disadvantaged funding, alongside those for whom data prediction indicates a Level 3 post 16 progression is appropriate.</p> <p>A review of courses and progression within the school's post 16 provision to ensure that students have suitable courses to progress onto that meet their aspirations and career needs.</p>	<p>our students eligible for disadvantaged funding apply for Post 16 places outside of Ridgewood's own provision, as they do not feel that they are a 'fit' for the academic profile of the sixth form. Many of these students opt to undertake Level 2 courses as a result of poor quality CIAG</p>	<p>Rigorous monitoring and QA routines</p> <p>Through the delivery of high quality CIAG</p>	<p>AHT – director of sixth form</p>	<p>2019</p>
<b>Total budgeted cost</b>					8,000
<b>v. Other approaches</b>					
<b>Desired outcome</b>	<b>Chosen action / approach</b>	<b>What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?</b>	<b>How will you ensure it is implemented well?</b>	<b>Staff lead</b>	<b>When will you review implementation?</b>
<p>There is an improved engagement by students, parents and carers at aspiration and extra curricular events such as Opus 100, and D of E participation.</p> <p>Students, parents and carers access the school more frequently, including key events</p>	<p>School wide opportunities for leadership and widening participation, including Duke of Edinburgh Awards Scheme, and Opus 11 music project (y6 upwards)</p>	<p>Opportunities for increase participation in wider curriculum opportunities for all students eligible for disadvantaged funding. Widening horizons and opportunities, broadening experiences and allowing our students to compete (for post 16 and university places) with other students nationally.</p>	<p>High quality delivery model</p> <p>Effective administration and risk assessment</p> <p>Monitoring and evaluation of participation levels and impact.</p>	<p>D of E lead</p> <p>Opus Lead</p> <p>Extra curricular Lead</p>	<p>Termly, and annually.</p>

during the year. This is measured through attendance at events, and participation levels.					
<b>Total budgeted cost</b>					<b>35,000</b>

<b>6. Review of expenditure</b>	
<b>Previous Academic Year</b>	<b>2017-18</b>
i. Quality of teaching for all	

<b>Desired outcome</b>	<b>Chosen action / approach</b>	<b>Estimated impact:</b> Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	<b>Lessons learned</b> (and whether you will continue with this approach)	<b>Cost</b>
Planning, marking and feedback for disadvantaged students is robust and has a common approach by all teachers and associate staff	Minimum expectations document and training within the 'excellence framework'	Lesson observations, book scrutiny, focussed enquiry walks, planning scrutiny and student shadowing indicated that the quality of marking and feedback has improved across the board, and not just for those students who are in receipt of disadvantaged funding. Progress for students in receipt of disadvantaged funding were in line with or above those of their peers not in receipt of this funding (P8 of -0.093 for those in receipt of the funding, in comparison to P8 of -0.362 for students not in receipt of the funding) The attainment gap for students in receipt of disadvantaged funding in comparison with those not in receipt of the funding was minimal (0.423)	This approach demonstrated impact for all students, and will continue within the schools marking and feedback routines.	£2000

### ii. Targeted support

<b>Desired outcome</b>	<b>Chosen action / approach</b>	<b>Estimated impact:</b> Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	<b>Lessons learned</b> (and whether you will continue with this approach)	<b>Cost</b>
To improve the resilience and preparedness for GCSE examinations of disadvantaged students	Dedicated Learning Mentors to provide high quality twilight intervention support sessions on a daily basis, in core subjects	This is a strategy that has made a significant impact in supporting closing the gap in the cohort, and allows students to access a high quality learning environment after school, with appropriate materials, resources and expertise to promote high achievement and plug gaps in learning.	This approach will continue as a formal support routine for students within KS4	£76,000

### iii. Other approaches

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

		appropriate.		
To improve the resilience and mental health of our most vulnerable disadvantaged learners	By establishing a 'wellbeing centre to offer individual and group support, counselling and specialist intervention.	This approach allowed a small group of students to remain in school with significant support and a modified timetable, thus enabling them to achieve outcomes that they would otherwise have failed to take due to medical and mental health conditions. The provision of a small and supported study base in school allowed students to continue to access their education whilst supported by visiting health and mental health professionals, thus preventing lost hours due to multiple appointments outside of school. Staff were able to support with absences by coordinating and supporting the completion of missed work and revision events.	This provision made a significant impact on a small number of students, resulting in it being an expensive provision of targetted at KS4 only. Rolling out this provision to provide earlier intervention and support from y6 transition onwards will enable a wider approach that impacts on more students in receipt of disadvantaged funding, and supports families in accessing Early Help routines through school support.	<b>£32,000</b>

