**Pupil premium strategy statement: Aspire Pupil Referral Unit**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Summary information**
 |
| **School** | **Aspire Pupil Referral Unit** |
| **Financial Year** | 2020-21 | **Total PP budget****April 20 – March 21****Not inc LAC** (£19010) | £83,205 | **Date of most recent external PP Review** |  |
| **Total number of pupils** | 120(March 21) | **Number of pupils eligible for PP** | 72 | **Date for next internal review of this strategy** | March 2022 |
| 1. . Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP, including high ability)
 |
| The vast majority of our PP children enter our provision at various stages of their school life with attainment levels that are significantly below their peers nationally. Many of our students have had significant gaps in education due to issues with attendance and exclusion. Most of our students have not coped within a mainstream setting due to behaviour being the presenting need. Some of our parents feel let down by mainstream education and some students have historically been on reduced timetables. Families are encouraged to develop a better understanding of the importance of good attendance and the impact on academic and social achievement. Most of our students have issues with communication, independence, confidence, self-esteem, resilience and problem solving. These life skills are needed to enable our learners access to their environment and community, raising aspirations about what they can achieve in life. Some pupils within our setting have a full EHC plan and are commissioned by Rotherham Local Authority and therefore all pupils are placed in the academies in line with SEN and Fair Access protocols. Through the partnership arrangement, places can be commissioned directly by schools. Learning behaviours are underdeveloped. |
| 1. **Desired outcomes**
 |
| Our Pupil Premium learners develop socially and emotionally and consistently achieve good progress from their starting points. • Interventions continue to play a fundamental role in ensuring learning is personalised and meets the individual needs of all our PP learners. Thus, ensuring all pupils have an opportunity the reach their potential. • We are investing in interventions to enhance the curriculum, GTA, ACE, Rother Valley and Paleo Fitness will support the development of communication, interaction, cooperation, confidence and build resilience. • The development of our outreach tutors and increase in Mentors will continue to play a pivotal role in the engagement of our lowest attendees to increase attainment. • We will continue to track the impact of all of the interventions both academic and pastoral to monitor children individually within our student Support plan. |

| **Planned expenditure**  |
| --- |
| **Financial year** | **2020-2021** |
| The priorities below enable schools to demonstrate how they are using the pupil premium to improve classroom pedagogy, provide targeted support and support whole school strategies.  |
| **Action** | **Objective** | **Amount allocated** |  |
| 1x additional teacher 3 days a week to engage students through 1.1 sessions. | To increase attendance and offer specific intervention around engagement. | £11,200 |  |
| 3x additional Teaching Assistants to work across the school | To deliver specific intervention to Pupil Premium children in Read, Write Inc and Maths. | £25,000 |  |
| Access to alternative curriculum provision including; Rother Valley, GTA, Paleo Fitness | To provide PPG children with the opportunity to have access to therapeutic activity to support engagement in curriculum | £17,600 |  |
| Support with curriculum visits, trips and events as required | Ensure no child misses out on additional opportunities | £1,000 |  |
| Access to ACE programme to develop interpersonal skills. | To make sure that pupil premium groups have access to SEMH support from external agencies | £17,500 |  |
| To buy in the professional services of educational psychologist and learning advisors to develop learning programs for specific children | All children will be able to access bespoke learning and access all areas of the curriculum at school | £10.400 |  |
| Staff Training for all so that all children are taught by teachers and TAs with up-to-date knowledge | All children will be in classrooms with highly trained and skilled practioners. | £500 |  |
| Contingency |  |  |  |
| Total |  | £83,200 |  |

| 1. **Tracking, monitoring and Governors questions answered** (From Governors Toolkit 2017) **Data accurate: March 2021**
 |
| --- |
| 1 | Do Governors know how much money is allocated to the school for the Pupil Premium?1. What percentage of Pupil Premium eligible pupils have you in your school? How does this compare with national data?
2. Do governors know the breakdown between FSM, Looked

After Children and Service Children?1. Do you know the breakdown of each group by academic year/?
2. Do you know how many of each cohort appears in other vulnerable groups i.e. SEN(D), BAME (Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic), Gender?
 | Yes1. 60%, 120 children of which 72 are currently being given PP v National Average of 20.8% of all schools and a National Average of 53.1% in PRU’s
2. 7 x LAC, no Service Children
3. No of children: Yr1-0, Yr2-1, Yr3-4, Yr4-4, Yr5-4, Yr6-5

 Yr7-4 Yr8-4, Yr9-6, Yr10-17, Yr11-231. 50% of PP children have an EHCP for SEMH

80% Male 20% Female |
| 2 | Is the Pupil Premium money identified in the school’s budget planning?1. How much does the Pupil Premium money represent in percentage terms of the total income of the school?
2. Is the Pupil Premium money likely to alter significantly over time?
3. How is the delegated authority to make decisions over Pupil Premium spend decided and documented?
4. Is income and expenditure reported explicitly for Pupil Premium?
 | Yes1. 2.6% of total budget
2. It is expected to increase slightly over time
3. Delegated to HT who reports Management Committee
4. Yes
 |
|  | Do Governors have a clear understanding of where gaps exist, both within the school and against national performance data?1. Do the school’s systems enable governors to have a clear picture of the progress and attainment of pupils who are eligible for the Pupil Premium **in all year groups across the school and for all subjects** and how this compares to non-Pupil Premium pupils?
2. What is the trend of progress and attainment for each group over a 3-year period i.e. has the gap closed for each group?
3. How does this compare to National data?
 | 1. All Management Committee meetings have a section on outcomes, attainment, and progress of PP students where these are discussed.
2. Gaps have varied from year to year due to a large number of in year admissions and a high percentage of children PP children with SEN. Attainment of students who achieve a Grade 1 or better in GCSE English and maths has improved significantly (81% in 2019 compared to 63% in 2018). Comparisons since 2019 have been affected by the Covid-19 pandemic. In 2020 we used CAGs and 2021 used TAGs to award GCSE grades. Achievement in Voc Ed subjects is in line with all pupils at Aspire.
3. No comparative data available for PP and SEN children nationally
 |
| 4 | Do Governors discuss in detail, including intended outcomes/impact, how Pupil Premium funding is used?1. Does the school have a standalone Pupil Premium strategy to raise attainment and close the gap in all year groups?
2. Is the Pupil Premium strategy linked to the SIDP and other school policies?
3. Have the governors considered external research and reports about what works to inform their decisions about how to spend the Pupil Premium? E.g. The Sutton Trust / Education Endowment Fund, Ofsted updates and previous Pupil Premium award winners.
4. Are this year’s Pupil Premium interventions tailored to this year’s Pupil Premium eligible pupils to meet their individual and group needs?
5. Have the governors challenged the interventions and their predicted impact and is this documented?
6. Will interventions close the gap against predicted end of year attainment and progress?
7. Is there a correlation between the intervention on other outcomes i.e. attendance, behaviour, punctuality?
 | 1. No but because the majority of our intake are PP, all strategies consider PP students
2. Yes
3. Yes. Sutton Trust and EEF information are used across the school to influence strategies to increase rates of progress.
4. Yes
5. No
6. Yes
7. Attendance is continuing to rise across the school as is the standard of behaviour. Higher expectations, levels of challenge, rigorous monitoring and greater use of data to inform teaching are all having a positive impact. Data analysis of the ½ termly data of groups is invaluable and proving to be very beneficial when focused on in the PPM meetings. Covid -19 had an obvious negative impact on student attendance.
 |
| 5 | Do Governors regularly monitor the outcomes of Pupil Premium and know gaps are being reduced/removed?1. How often are Pupil Premium reports monitored by the governors?
2. Is there a Pupil Premium governor and have they undertaken training?
3. Is Pupil Premium a standing agenda item at committee or full GB?
4. Are Pupil Premium monitoring visits scheduled and completed on a regular basis?
5. Is Pupil Premium part of the Headteacher’s report and informs governors about intervention impact across all year groups in comparison with non-Pupil Premium?
6. Do the governing board use the Ofsted Pupil Premium and challenge toolkit?
7. Do **all governors** have a broad understanding of Pupil Premium funding and its use within the school?
 | 1. Every Management Committee meeting (3 x per year)
2. No.
3. No
4. No
5. Yes
6. Yes
7. Yes, Information regarding criteria and funding has been shared via Management Committee
 |
| 6 | Is value for money (in terms of impact on pupil outcomes) regularly discussed and challenged by governors (e.g. is Pupil Premium having the impact we anticipated?).1. Is the income and expenditure related to Pupil Premium being monitored and how often?
2. If money is held in reserve as a contingency, is this being monitored?
3. Is the expenditure on the intervention proving value for money in comparison to other interventions and the impact on attainment and progression or predicted outcomes?
4. Are the school’s interventions providing value for money when compared externally e.g. evidence of the Sutton Trust.
 | 1. Yes. Through data collection cycle.
2. Nothing left in contingency this year.
3. Yes. See recent progress data
4. Yes, See recent progress data and data analysis by DH and SENDCo.
 |
| 7 | Does the school’s website provide parents with a clear understanding of the amount of funding, how it is spent and what difference it makes to pupil outcomes?1. Does the website show the amount of the school’s allocation from the Pupil Premium grant in respect of the current academic year?
2. Does the website show details of how it is intended that the allocation will be spent for this academic year including individual interventions, their costs and the predicted impact including the target groups (each academic year if appropriate)?
3. Does the website show the details of how the previous academic year’s allocation was spent by intervention and target audience (each academic year if appropriate)?
4. Does the website show the impact of the previous year’s Pupil Premium expenditure on raising attainment and closing the gap when compared with non-Pupil Premium pupils?
 | 1. Yes
2. Yes
3. No
4. No
 |
| 8 | Is the above work documented to show a true audit trail of the governing board’s work in relation to Pupil Premium? | Yes |