

## Pupil premium strategy statement

This statement details our school's use of pupil premium (and recovery premium for the 2021 to 2022 academic year) 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 effect that last year's spending of pupil premium had within our school.

### School overview

| Detail  | Data                            |
|---|---------------------------------|
| School name   | Great Sankey High School        |
| Number of pupils in school  | 1840                            |
| Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils   | 10%                             |
| Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers ( <b>3 year plans are recommended</b> ) | 2020/21<br>2021/22<br>2022/2023 |
| Date this statement was published   | 04/11/2021                      |
| Date on which it will be reviewed   | 05/09/2022                      |
| Statement authorised by   | John Shannon                    |
| Pupil premium lead  | Paul Deay                       |
| Governor / Trustee lead   | John Morris                     |

### Funding overview

| Detail  | Amount   |
|---|----------|
| Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year   | £168,080 |
| Recovery premium funding allocation this academic year  | £28,885  |
| Pupil premium funding carried forward from previous years (enter £0 if not applicable)  | £0       |
| <b>Total budget for this academic year</b><br>If your school is an academy in a trust that pools this funding, state the amount available to your school this academic year | £196,935 |

# Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

## Statement of intent

Great Sankey has become a research driven organisation and draws upon evidence to make decisions about school improvement. For our PP Strategy we align our actions and approaches to the Education Endowment Fund's guide to PP which aims to help schools maximise the impact of the grant. On this basis our Pupil Premium spend uses the EEF tiered approach to improving outcomes for disadvantaged students. These are 1- Teaching, 2- Targeted Academic Support and 3- Wider Strategies. The EEF stress that many strategies will overlap and that balance between categories will vary year on year. It is also important to draw attention to the following; that it is a myth that only eligible children can benefit from pupil premium spending (as improving teaching has the biggest impact on shifting disadvantaged outcomes- it just has a disproportionate affect compared to non PP); that measuring and comparing internal class or school gaps is less likely to provide useful information and it isn't required by the DFE or Ofsted; and that when it is most effective the Pupil Premium sits at the heart of a whole school effort. We want to ensure that any support required will be identified early and implemented seamlessly, by working collaboratively and in partnership with stakeholders to ensure every child has the opportunity to succeed and thrive at Great Sankey regardless of starting point, background or the challenges they may encounter (be they at home, school, physical, mental or academic). Personal Development will play an integral part of 'what we do' as a school community. We want our students to become proactive responsible citizens and be able to pursue careers they are passionate about and live healthy, secure, happy and fulfilled lives. Our mission is to ensure that all students are on TRACK and leave GSHS articulate, resilient, compassionate and culturally aware.

## Challenges

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

| Challenge number | Detail of challenge   |
|------------------|---|
| 1                | <i>A significant proportion of students enter secondary school below chronological reading age expectations.</i>  |
| 2                | <i>In a large school, we face the challenge of embedding policies and systems to maintain consistency across the school to ensure parity of provision for all pupils.</i> |
| 3                | <i>Tracking progress and subsequent interventions lacks rigour for key pupil groups.</i>  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| 4 | <i>A culture of low aspiration in the wider community</i>              |
| 5 | <i>Attendance and persistent absenteeism of disadvantaged students</i> |
| 6 | <i>A historic lack of community engagement in school life</i>          |

## 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  |
|--|---|
| <i>To close the attainment gap between disadvantaged pupils and their non-disadvantaged peers at Key Stage 3</i> | The percentage of LPA disadvantaged students who are secure in Ebacc subjects, matches that of other LPA students within the school   |
|  | The percentage of MPA disadvantaged students who are secure in Ebacc subjects matches that of other MPA students within the school  |
|  | The percentage of HPA disadvantaged students who are secure in Ebacc subjects, matches that of other HPA students within the school   |
|  | Disadvantaged students complete homework at a frequency in line with their peers  |
| <i>To close the attainment gap between disadvantaged pupils and their non-disadvantaged peers at Key Stage 4</i> | <b>Progress 8</b> to increase the proportion of PP students making positive progress  |
|  | <b>Progress 8</b> - English to increase the proportion of PP students making positive progress  |
|  | <b>Progress 8</b> - Maths to increase the proportion of PP students making positive progress  |
|  | <b>Progress 8</b> - Ebacc to increase the proportion of PP students making positive progress  |
|  | <b>Progress 8</b> – Open to increase the proportion of PP students making positive progress   |
|  | <b>Attainment 8</b> - score to continue to outperform national disadvantaged measures by an increasing amount   |
|  | <b>Percentage of Grade 5+ in English and maths</b> - to close the gap between the disadvantaged students and the national average for non-disadvantaged students by a decreasing amount |
| <i>To close the gap between disadvantaged students' reading and chronological age.</i>                           | The reading ages of our disadvantaged students will improve from their year 7 benchmark STAR test. The gap between reading age and chronological reading age will decrease.             |
|  | The reading ages of our disadvantaged students will improve from their year 8 benchmark STAR test. The  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | gap between reading age and chronological reading age will decrease.  |
| <i>To increase disadvantaged students engagement in school life</i> | The attendance of the majority of disadvantaged students, at least, matches that for other students nationally, or this gap is reducing |
|   | Disadvantaged students complete homework at a frequency in line with their peers  |
|   | All disadvantaged students achieve at least one scholars (extra-curricular) award   |

## 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: £ 99,000

| Activity   | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|--|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Design and Implement high quality CPD for teaching staff delivered by Ambition Institute                   | EEF Toolkit: Strategy 9 & 14         | 2                             |
| AHT to lead literacy across the school   | EEF Toolkit: Strategy 25             | 1 & 2                         |
| Train a series of coaches to support teaching across the school  | EEF Toolkit: Strategy 9 & 14         | 2                             |
| Employ additional staff so that key classes in core subjects to provide additional support for PP students | EEF Toolkit: Strategy 26 & 30        | 2 & 3                         |

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

Budgeted cost: £ 42,388

| Activity  | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Buy revision guides for PP students in KS4  | EEF Toolkit: Strategy 11             | 1&4                           |
| Run staffed homework clubs to support PP students with out of school learning                                       | EEF Toolkit: Strategy 8, 11          | 2, 3, 4 & 6                   |
| Dedicated careers advisor time for all PP students to support their transition into further education or employment | EEF Toolkit: Strategy 2              |                               |
| Thinking Reading embedded across the school with a particular focus on PP   | EEF Toolkit: Strategy 25             |                               |

|  |                                 |           |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------|
| PP students are monitored by department DATCAT analysis and prioritised for department and whole school intervention                                       | EEF Toolkit: Strategy 17, 30    | 2&3       |
| Provide additional after school, holiday and Saturday sessions to support students preparing for exams. Positively discriminate to prioritise PP students. | EEF Toolkit: Strategy 8         | 2&3       |
| To develop and embed class charts and provision mapping systematically across the school   | EEF Toolkit: Strategy 9, 14, 34 | 2, 3 & 5. |

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

Budgeted cost: £ 55,007

| Activity  | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Additional pastoral staff to track and support PP students                                  | EEF Toolkit: Strategy 2, 3           | 3                             |
| Embed accelerated reader and DEAR into year 7 and 8   | EEF Toolkit: Strategy 25             | 1                             |
| All KS3 students provided with a knowledge organiser  | EEF Toolkit: Strategy 11             | 1 & 3                         |
| Knowledge organiser quiz completion monitored and support/sanction implemented where needed | EEF Toolkit: Strategy 3, 11          | 3, 6                          |
| Provide breakfast every morning so students are ready to learn                              |                                      | 6                             |
| Subsidise Duke of Edinburgh award to reinforce our core values                              | EEF Toolkit: Strategy 2, 19, 32      | 4&6                           |
| Offer subsidies for general subject trips throughout the year                               | EEF Toolkit: Strategy 2, 19, 32      | 4&6                           |
| Subsidise uniform costs and equipment where needed  |                                      | 4, 5 & 6                      |

|  |                                 |               |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------|
| Laptop library to support PP students with remote learning   | EEF Toolkit: Strategy 6         | 2, 4          |
| Deliver high quality emotional/behavioural support for those most at need.                                     | EEF Toolkit: Strategy 2, 3      | 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 |
| Strategically deploy an attendance officer to target key disadvantaged students                                | EEF Toolkit: Strategy 2, 3      | 5             |
| Track and monitor attendance at extracurricular activities. Positively discriminate to prioritise PP students. | EEF Toolkit: Strategy 2, 19, 32 | 4 & 6         |
| Improve PP tracking and monitoring systems   | EEF Toolkit: Strategy 2, 19, 32 | 1-6           |

**Total budgeted cost: £ £196,935**

## 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.

| Key Metrics to measure success/impact - Year 7 |   | 2020/21  |     |     |      |     | 2                 |
|--|---|--|-----|-----|------|-----|-------------------|
|  |   | Eng  | Mat | Sci | Hums | MFL |                   |
| A  | The percentage of LPA disadvantaged students who are secure in <u>Ebacc</u> subjects, matches that of other LPA students within the school                                  |  |     |     |      |     |                   |
| B  | The percentage of MPA disadvantaged students who are secure in <u>Ebacc</u> subjects matches that of other MPA students within the school                                   |  |     |     |      |     |                   |
| C  | The percentage of HPA disadvantaged students who are secure in <u>Ebacc</u> subjects, matches that of other HPA students within the school                                  |  |     |     |      |     |                   |
| D  | The attendance of the majority of disadvantaged students, at least, matches that for other students nationally, or this gap is reducing                                     | Disadvantaged: 89.83% vs 94.98% (5.5% difference)<br>Disadvantaged more likely to miss morning mark. 3% vs 0.95% unauthorised absence.   |     |     |      |     |                   |
| E  | All disadvantaged students achieve at least one <u>scholars</u> award   | Delayed launch due to covid  |     |     |      |     | L                 |
| F  | The reading ages of our disadvantaged students will improve from their year 7 benchmark STAR test. The gap between reading age and chronological reading age will decrease. | Increase of 0.24, gap closed 0.01 difference   |     |     |      |     | S                 |
| G  | Disadvantaged <u>students</u> complete homework at a frequency in line with their peers   | Average data shows 95% of disadvantaged students completed their KO homework regularly compared to 92% of their non-disadvantaged peers. |     |     |      |     | F                 |
| H  | The ATL scores of disadvantaged students are in line with their peers   | Data shows three students outlying their peers in negative ATL records. No positive data shown.  |     |     |      |     | li<br>2<br>r<br>7 |



| Key Metrics to measure success/ <u>impact</u> - Year 8 |   | 2020/21  |        |        |        |        |
|--|---|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|  |   | Eng  | Mat    | Sci    | Hums   | MFL    |
| A  | The percentage of LPA disadvantaged students who are secure in <u>Ebacc</u> subjects, matches that of other LPA students within the school                                  | Yellow   | Yellow | Yellow | Yellow | Yellow |
| B  | The percentage of MPA disadvantaged students who are secure in <u>Ebacc</u> subjects matches that of other MPA students within the school                                   | Green  | Green  | Green  | Green  | Green  |
| C  | The percentage of HPA disadvantaged students who are secure in <u>Ebacc</u> subjects, matches that of other HPA students within the school                                  | Red  | Red    | Red    | Red    | Red    |
| D  | The attendance of the majority of disadvantaged students, at least, matches that for other students nationally, or this gap is reducing                                     | 85.27 vs 93.72 (8.45% gap)<br>More likely to miss morning mark.<br>4.65% vs 1.42% unauthorised absence     |        |        |        |        |
| E  | All disadvantaged students achieve at least one <u>scholars</u> award   | Delayed launch due to covid  |        |        |        |        |
| F  | The reading ages of our disadvantaged students will improve from their year 8 benchmark STAR test. The gap between reading age and chronological reading age will decrease. | Gap of 1.7 decreased to 1.5 from start to end of the year. 2 <u>month</u> increase in average reading age. |        |        |        |        |
| G  | Disadvantaged <u>students</u> complete homework at a frequency in line with their peers   | 65 % completion rate vs 77%  |        |        |        |        |
| H  | The ATL scores of disadvantaged students are in line with their peers   | Two students skew the overall comparison figures. ATL is in line with peers.                               |        |        |        |        |

Key Stage 3 Key: **Red: more than 10% difference,** **Yellow: less than 10% difference,** **Green: 2% difference, equal, or higher.**

| Key Metrics to measure success/impact - Year 9 |   | 2020/21   |                  |                  |                  |                  | 2 |
|--|---|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---|
|  |   | Eng   | Mat              | Sci              | Hums             | MFL              |   |
| A  | The percentage of LPA disadvantaged students who are secure in Ebacc subjects, matches that of other LPA students within the school     |   |                  |                  |                  |                  |   |
| B  | The percentage of MPA disadvantaged students who are secure in Ebacc subjects matches that of other MPA students within the school      | 22%<br>vs<br>43%  | 4%<br>vs<br>11%  | 4%<br>vs<br>11%  | 4%<br>vs<br>18%  | 33%<br>vs<br>62% |   |
| C  | The percentage of HPA disadvantaged students who are secure in Ebacc subjects, matches that of other HPA students within the school     | 59%<br>vs<br>76%  | 64%<br>vs<br>73% | 64%<br>vs<br>62% | 59%<br>vs<br>62% | 57%<br>vs<br>65% |   |
| D  | The attendance of the majority of disadvantaged students, at least, matches that for other students nationally, or this gap is reducing | 86.35% vs 94.41%<br>gap of 8.6%   |                  |                  |                  |                  |   |
| E  | All disadvantaged students achieve at least one <u>scholars</u> award   | Delayed launch due to covid   |                  |                  |                  |                  | L |
| F  | Disadvantaged <u>students</u> complete homework at a frequency in line with their peers   | 66% completion rate vs 80%  |                  |                  |                  |                  | S |
| G  | The ATL scores of disadvantaged students are in line with their peers   | Overall in line with peers, engagement in remote learning skews the figure. |                  |                  |                  |                  |   |

| Key Metrics to measure success/impact - Year 10 |   | 2020/21                               |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| A   | Progress 8 to increase the proportion of PP students making positive progress   | N/A*                                  |
| B   | Progress 8 - English to increase the proportion of PP students making positive progress   | N/A*                                  |
| C   | Progress 8 - Maths to increase the proportion of PP students making positive progress   | N/A*                                  |
| D   | Progress 8 - Ebacc to increase the proportion of PP students making positive progress   | N/A*                                  |
| E   | Progress 8 – Open to increase the proportion of PP students making positive progress  | N/A*                                  |
| F   | Attainment 8 - score to continue to outperform national disadvantaged measures by an increasing amount  | N/A*                                  |
| G   | Percentage of Grade 5+ in English and maths - o close the gap between the disadvantaged students and the national average for non-disadvantaged students by a decreasing amount | N/A*                                  |
| H   | The attendance of disadvantaged students, at least, matches that for other students nationally  | On average +2.3% higher than national |

\*Due to uncertainty surrounding the 2022 exam series OTF grades were not collected in the 2021 summer term

| Key Metrics to measure success/impact - Year 11 |  | 2020/21                                |
|---|--|--|
| A   | Progress 8 to increase the proportion of PP students making positive progress  | N/A*                                   |
| B   | Progress 8 - English to increase the proportion of PP students making positive progress  | N/A*                                   |
| C   | Progress 8 - Maths to increase the proportion of PP students making positive progress  | N/A*                                   |
| D   | Progress 8 - Ebacc to increase the proportion of PP students making positive progress  | N/A*                                   |
| E   | Progress 8 – Open to increase the proportion of PP students making positive progress   | N/A*                                   |
| F   | Attainment 8 - score to continue to outperform national disadvantaged measures by an increasing amount   | 37.4 (36.7 nationally in 2019)         |
| G   | Percentage of Grade 5+ in English and maths - to close the gap between the disadvantaged students and the national average for non-disadvantaged students by a decreasing amount | 26.5% (25% nationally in 2019)         |
| H   | The attendance of disadvantaged students, at least, matches that for other students nationally   | On average, 1.7% higher than national. |

| Teaching  |   |     |     |     |    |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |
|---|---|-----|-----|-----|----|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|----|---|
| <p><b>Impact</b></p> <p>Book scrutiny shows improved compliance with regards marking &amp; feedback, variable quality of DIRT</p> <p>Team of TEDS trained and deliberate practice clinics planned for 2021</p> <p>Impact on T&amp;L is difficult to quantify as learning walks and lesson observations have been paused due to covid and prioritising marking and moderation of TAGS</p>  | <p><b>Lessons Learned</b></p> <p>Learning walks/observations need to be a priority in the Autumn Term so that we can evaluate the impact of T&amp;L CPD and curriculum changes</p> <p>The use of formative and summative assessment to inform planning needs to be an area of focus for staff/department development</p>  |     |     |     |    |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |
| Targeted Academic Support   |   |     |     |     |    |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |
| <p><b>Impact</b></p> <p>Students in year 11 and 13 invited to additional sessions afterschool and in school.</p> <p>Yr 11 improvement of Average attainment 8 of 8.82 points from December mock data, 14.7 % increase in students achieving %9-7 in English &amp; maths. 44% increase in the percentage of disadvantaged students achieving grades 9-4 in English &amp; maths</p>   | <p><b>Lessons Learned</b></p> <p>Intervention needs to be early and targeted</p> <p>Clear communication with students &amp; parents increases uptake</p> <p>For hard to engage students in school intervention is more effective</p> <p>Intervention needs to support the building of relationships between staff and students</p> <p>Keep on Track intervention is more effective than catch up intervention</p> |     |     |     |    |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |
| Wider Strategies  |   |     |     |     |    |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |
| <p><b>Impact</b></p> <p>Knowledge organisers used across KS3 and has led to increased homework uptake. The laptop library supported engagement with online learning, with much increased engagement with online learning during spring 2021 when the system was active</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>ALL</th> <th>PP</th> <th>SEN</th> <th>M</th> <th>F</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>81</td> <td>77</td> <td>77</td> <td>77</td> <td>84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>67</td> <td>57</td> <td>75</td> <td>67</td> <td>68</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9</td> <td>73</td> <td>58</td> <td>65</td> <td>73</td> <td>75</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Our PP students are showing lower levels of engagement, but the provision of laptops and WIFI dongles from our laptop library helped to reduce this gap. In addition, our year 11 PP students who are at risk of not meeting a standard pass in both English and Maths received additional remote tutoring.</p> <p>Some strategies were not implemented due to covid restrictions.</p> | Year  | ALL | PP  | SEN | M  | F | 7 | 81 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 84 | 8 | 67 | 57 | 75 | 67 | 68 | 9 | 73 | 58 | 65 | 73 | 75 | <p><b>Lessons Learned</b></p> <p>Engagement in homework/online learning was far higher when this information was regularly reported to parents and associated with sanctions if not completed</p> <p>Knowledge organisers continue to be a useful tool to support learning within and outside of school – these will be rolled into year 10</p> |
| Year  | ALL   | PP  | SEN | M   | F  |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |
| 7   | 81  | 77  | 77  | 77  | 84 |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |
| 8   | 67  | 57  | 75  | 67  | 68 |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |
| 9   | 73  | 58  | 65  | 73  | 75 |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |

## 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           |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Transforming Teaching | Ambition Institute |
|                       |                    |

## Further information (optional)

### Appendix 1\*\*

The Sutton Trust-EEF Teaching & Learning Toolkit is an accessible summary of educational research which provides guidance to teachers and schools on how to use their resources to improve the attainment of disadvantaged pupils.

The Toolkit currently covers 35 topics, each summarised in terms of their average impact on attainment, the strength of evidence supporting them and their cost. Each number in the plan above corresponds to a strategy identified in the toolkit linked below.

| Approach                      | Cost Estimate | Evidence Estimate | Average Impact | Summary   |
|-------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------|---|
| 1 Arts participation          | £ £ £ £ £     | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★         | + 2 Months     | Low impact for low cost, based on moderate evidence.                      |
| 2 Aspiration interventions    | £ £ £ £ £     | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★         | 0 Months       | Very low or no impact for moderate cost, based on very limited evidence.  |
| 3 Behaviour interventions     | £ £ £ £ £     | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★         | + 3 Months     | Moderate impact for moderate cost, based on extensive evidence.           |
| 4 Block scheduling            | £ £ £ £ £     | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★         | 0 Months       | Very low or negative impact for very low cost, based on limited evidence. |
| 5 Collaborative learning      | £ £ £ £ £     | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★         | + 5 Months     | High impact for very low cost, based on extensive evidence.               |
| 6 Digital technology          | £ £ £ £ £     | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★         | + 4 Months     | Moderate impact for moderate cost, based on extensive evidence.           |
| 7 Early years intervention    | £ £ £ £ £     | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★         | + 5 Months     | High impact for very high cost, based on extensive evidence.              |
| 8 Extended school time        | £ £ £ £ £     | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★         | + 2 Months     | Low impact for moderate cost, based on moderate evidence.                 |
| 9 Feedback                    | £ £ £ £ £     | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★         | + 8 Months     | Very high impact for very low cost, based on moderate evidence.           |
| 10 Homework (Primary)         | £ £ £ £ £     | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★         | + 2 Month      | Low impact for very low cost, based on limited evidence.                  |
| 11 Homework (Secondary)       | £ £ £ £ £     | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★         | + 5 Months     | High impact for very low cost, based on limited evidence.                 |
| 12 Individualised instruction | £ £ £ £ £     | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★         | + 3 Months     | Moderate impact for very low cost, based on moderate evidence.            |
| 13 Learning styles            | £ £ £ £ £     | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★         | + 2 Months     | Low impact for very low cost, based on limited evidence.                  |

| Approach                              | Cost Estimate | Evidence Estimate | Average Impact | Summary   |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------|---|
| 14 Mastery learning                   | £ £ £ £ £     | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★         | + 5 Months     | High impact for very low cost, based on moderate evidence.            |
| 15 Mentoring                          | £ £ £ £ £     | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★         | 0 Month        | Very low or no impact for moderate cost, based on extensive evidence. |
| 16 Meta-cognition and self-regulation | £ £ £ £ £     | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★         | + 7 Months     | High impact for very low cost, based on extensive evidence.           |

|    |                                  |           |           |            |  |
|----|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|--|
| 17 | One to one tuition               | £ £ £ £ £ | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ | + 5 Months | High impact for high cost, based on extensive evidence.                  |
| 18 | Oral language interventions      | £ £ £ £ £ | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ | + 5 Months | High impact for very low cost, based on extensive evidence.              |
| 19 | Outdoor adventure learning       | £ £ £ £ £ | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ | + 4 Months | Moderate impact for moderate cost, based on moderate evidence.           |
| 20 | Parental involvement             | £ £ £ £ £ | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ | + 3 Months | Moderate impact for moderate cost, based on moderate evidence.           |
| 21 | Peer tutoring                    | £ £ £ £ £ | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ | + 5 Months | High impact for very low cost, based on extensive evidence.              |
| 22 | Performance pay                  | £ £ £ £ £ | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ | + 1 Months | Low impact for low cost, based on limited evidence.                      |
| 23 | Phonics                          | £ £ £ £ £ | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ | + 4 Months | Moderate impact for very low cost, based on very extensive evidence.     |
| 24 | Physical environment             | £ £ £ £ £ | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ | 0 Months   | Very low or no impact for low cost based on very limited evidence.       |
| 25 | Reading comprehension            | £ £ £ £ £ | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ | + 6 Months | High impact for very low cost, based on extensive evidence.              |
| 26 | Reducing class size              | £ £ £ £ £ | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ | + 3 Months | Moderate impact for very high cost, based on moderate evidence.          |
| 27 | Repeating a year                 | £ £ £ £ £ | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ | - 4 Months | Negative impact for very high cost based on moderate evidence.           |
| 28 | School uniform                   | £ £ £ £ £ | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ | 0 Months   | Very low or no impact for very low cost, based on very limited evidence. |
| 29 | Setting or streaming             | £ £ £ £ £ | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ | - 1 Months | Negative impact for very low cost, based on limited evidence.            |
| 30 | Small group tuition              | £ £ £ £ £ | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ | + 4 Months | Moderate impact for moderate cost, based on limited evidence.            |
| 31 | Social and emotional learning    | £ £ £ £ £ | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ | + 4 Months | Moderate impact for moderate cost, based on extensive evidence.          |
| 32 | Sports participation             | £ £ £ £ £ | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ | + 2 Months | Low impact for moderate cost based on limited evidence.                  |
| 33 | Summer schools                   | £ £ £ £ £ | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ | + 2 Months | Low impact for moderate cost based on extensive evidence.                |
| 34 | Teaching assistants              | £ £ £ £ £ | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ | +1 Months  | Low impact for high cost, based on limited evidence.                     |
| 35 | Within-class attainment grouping | £ £ £ £ £ | ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ | +3 Months  | Moderate impact for low cost, based on limited evidence.                 |