

Wellfield Academy Pupil Premium Strategy Statement

This statement details our school's use of pupil premium (and recovery premium for the 2023 to 2024 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 | Wellfield Academy |
| Number of pupils in school | 525 |
| Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils | 36% (189) |
| Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers (3 year plans are recommended) | Sept 2024-August 2027 |
| Date this statement was published | Revised September 2024 |
| Date on which it will be reviewed | 1 st September 2025 |
| Statement authorised by | Mr Jamie Lewis |
| Pupil premium lead | Mr Jamie Lewis |
| Governor / Trustee lead | Mrs Helen Dicker |

Funding overview

| Detail | Amount |
|---|----------------|
| Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year | £ 191,175.99 |
| Recovery premium funding allocation this academic year | £ |
| Pupil premium funding carried forward from previous years (enter £0 if not applicable) | £0 |
| Total budget for this academic year If your school is an academy in a trust that pools this funding, state the amount available to your school this academic year | £ 4,321,720.17 |

Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

Statement of intent

Wellfield Academy aims to ensure that our disadvantaged students leave our school equipped with the skills, attitudes and qualifications to enable them to make the best choices and have all the opportunities to succeed in life. To contribute positively to society, go on to further and higher education, employment and training and to aspire to be their best.

For our Pupil Premium Strategy, we align our actions and approaches to the Education Endowment Fund's guide to Pupil Premium which aims to help schools maximise the impact of the grant. We also align our actions to the three strands of our School Development Plan (SDP). These are:

- Attend & Engage
- Assess & Progress
- Include & Support

On this basis, our Pupil Premium spend uses the EEF tiered approach to improving outcomes for disadvantaged students.

These are 1 – High Quality 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.

The key driver of our strategy is to ensure that high quality teaching is available to all and is central to many of our approaches.

Our approaches will:

- ensure that any support required will be identified early and implemented clearly, by working collaboratively and in partnership with stakeholders
- be based on diagnostic assessment of data and need, not assumption about the impact of disadvantage
- ensure every child has the opportunity to succeed and thrive at Wellfield Academy 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.

Challenges

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

| Challenge number | Detail of challenge |
|------------------|---------------------|
|------------------|---------------------|

| | |
|---|--|
| 1 | Disadvantaged students are disproportionately affected when the quality of teaching is not deemed to be good. Therefore, quality first teaching is the main focus to ensure accelerated progress for disadvantaged students. |
| 2 | A proportion of students enter secondary school below chronological reading age expectations and as such are unable to access parts of the curriculum without intervention and support. |
| 3 | Persistent absenteeism of disadvantaged students remains above that of non-disadvantaged students. |
| 4 | Student learning habits have been affected by the periods of remote learning and disadvantaged students have been disproportionately affected. |
| 5 | Disadvantaged students have sometimes had lower aspirations regarding going on to appropriate post 16 courses at further and higher education. |
| 6 | Parental engagement of disadvantaged students with school is sometimes lower than non-disadvantaged students |
| 7 | The availability of resources [and finance] available for supporting school, learning and enrichment experiences for disadvantaged students means that they can be disproportionately impacted when compared to their peers. |
| 8 | The proportion of disadvantaged students with SEMH concerns, including self-esteem and self-confidence, is larger than that of their non-disadvantaged peers. |

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 |
|---|--|
| To close the attainment gap between disadvantaged pupils and their non-disadvantaged peers at Key Stage 4 (SDP priority- Assess & Progress) | Diagnostic analysis of internal data shows that gaps in knowledge are closing and that disadvantaged attainment is moving towards that of their non-disadvantaged peers. GCSE data shows that the attainment gap is narrowing, and that all student's attainment is in line with that of their non-disadvantaged peers. |
| To address students with lower than chronological reading ages (SDP priority- Assess & Progress) | Following benchmarking, there will be evidence of improvement in reading ages through high quality interventions. |
| To increase attendance of disadvantaged students (SDP priority- Attend & Engage) | The attendance of disadvantaged students broadly matches the attendance of their non-disadvantaged peers, or the attendance |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>gap is measurably reducing. Data is in line with, or above, national averages.</p> |
| <p>To increase disadvantaged students' engagement in school life and aspirations <i>(SDP priority- Include & Support/Attend & Engage)</i></p> | <p>Increase the percentage of parents accessing support and engaging with school in regular constructive/supportive contact with school, including accessing ClassCharts and support systems, for example.</p> <p>Ensure that disadvantaged students are supported in accessing extra-curricular opportunities.</p> <p>Increase the percentage of disadvantaged students accessing aspirational and appropriate post 16 education.</p> <p>Curriculum content is reviewed to ensure it supports maximising the engagement of disadvantaged students.</p> <p>To expose disadvantaged students to a wider range of employment opportunities and employer encounters.</p> <p>Monitor homework and curriculum access to ensure disadvantaged students are completing tasks and are making appropriate progress from their starting points.</p> |

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: £ 28,070.39

| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|---|--|-------------------------------|
| Plan and implement high quality CPD for Teaching staff | <p>Wellfield teaching staff have participated in a range of whole school CPD opportunities. These have included: effective use of TAs, How to utilise AI in the classroom, How to be an adaptative teacher (SEND).</p> <p>To support the development of staff and to further improve pedagogy, Instructional Coaching was established as a CPD strategy. Every teaching staff member had a coach and identified areas of development through coaching meetings. The areas of development were then linked to a specific Walk Thru and staff were given the opportunity to rehearse these with their coach before they used them within their teaching.</p> <p>Wellfield Walk Thrus</p> | 1, 4 |
| Enhanced use of Bedrock Learning, Reading Plus, Fresh Start Phonics and reading across the curriculum | <p>Whole school CPD was delivered focusing on how to utilise reading strategies. Best practice was shared from a variety of subject areas</p> <p>Reading comprehension strategies focus on the learners' understanding of written text. Students learn a range of techniques which enable them to comprehend the meaning of what they read.</p> <p>Selected students worked with staff to develop reading ability and to be able to access the curriculum</p> | 2, 8 |
| Employ additional Teaching staff to enable a nurture group to provide additional support for disadvantaged students | <p>Employment of one HLTA to support with use of Fresh Start reading intervention.</p> <p>Employment of three additional TAs to support students with EHCPs to access the curriculum</p> <p>Acquiring disciplinary literacy is key for students as they learn new, more complex concepts in each subject:</p> <p>Improving Literacy in Secondary Schools</p> | 1, 2, 7 |

| | | |
|--|---|------|
| | Reading comprehension, vocabulary and other literacy skills are heavily linked with attainment in Maths and English | |
| Consistent approach for homework | Use of digital packages such as Educake, Seneca, SPARX Maths, Bedrock introduced across both Key Stages Homework which is set by individual teachers focuses on reading and recall in particular and is referenced in the next lesson. Merits and demerits are used on submission. Homework badges have been created on classcharts to encourage submission Homework club provision provided during lunch and after school hours. | 1, 4 |
| Purchase of standardised diagnostic assessments. Completion of NGRT/CAT4 diagnostic testing upon entry. Training will be provided for staff to ensure assessments are interpreted correctly. | Standardised tests can provide reliable insights into the specific strengths and weaknesses of each pupil to help ensure they receive the correct additional support through interventions or teacher instruction: EEF Assessment and Feedback | 1, 2 |

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

Budgeted cost: £40,944.90

| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|--|---|-------------------------------|
| Employment and training of a HLTA to provide a blend of tuition, mentoring and tutoring/intervention for students. A significant proportion of the pupils who receive tutoring/intervention will be disadvantaged, including those who are high attainers. | Tuition targeted at specific needs and knowledge gaps can be an effective method to support low attaining pupils or those falling behind, both one-to-one: One to one tuition EEF (educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk) And in small groups: Small group tuition Toolkit Strand Education Endowment Foundation EEF There will be an enhanced focus on reading: Reading within the curriculum, reading for pleasure, reading recovery/ intervention. | 1, 4 |

| | | |
|---|---|---------|
| High Quality CEIAG Programme embedded into the PSHCE Curriculum through the introduction of weekly PD lessons and TLR responsibility for a PD Curriculum & Aspirations Leader | Our school's CEIAG programme, underpinned by Career North – ensures all disadvantaged students have access to careers guidance, experience of the work place and visits to FE and Higher Education Establishments Aspiration Interventions EEF | 5, 7, 8 |
| Purchasing of all revision guides and resources for disadvantaged students | EEF Homework Use of digital packages and resources to support learning outside of the classroom that is linked to classroom work tends to be more effective. | 4 |
| Maths wizz intervention package | Tuition targeted at specific needs and knowledge gaps can be an effective method to support low attaining pupils or those falling behind, both one-to-one: One to one tuition EEF (educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk) And in small groups: Small group tuition Toolkit Strand Education Endowment Foundation EEF | 1, 2, 4 |
| Year 11 intervention-mastery mornings | Tuition targeted at specific needs and knowledge gaps can be an effective method to support low attaining pupils or those falling behind, both one-to-one: One to one tuition EEF (educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk) And in small groups: Small group tuition Toolkit Strand Education Endowment Foundation EEF | 1, 2, 4 |

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

Budgeted cost: £ 122, 160.70

| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| Additional pastoral staff, Attendance | Embedding principles of good practice set out in DfE's Improving School Attendance advice Improving School Attendance | 3, 7 |

| | | |
|--|---|---------------|
| Manager & Officer and Heads of Key Stage to track and support PP student's attendance at extra-curricular activities | | |
| Provide breakfast every morning so students are ready to learn | Ensure students are able to start each day with a suitable breakfast to aid in their engagement in learning. | 3, 4 |
| Implementation of the ClassCharts attendance module to enhance 'pattern spotting' of poor attenders | Rapid intervention in 'slipping' attendance leads to measurable improvements: | 3 |
| Offer subsidies for general subject trips throughout the year | Support students to access rich opportunities that enhance their curriculum experience and impact upon their levels of engagement and aspiration Providing for young people's needs can also help to build a positive relationship with families and communities, which can support better engagement with young people as well. YEF-Insights-Brief-1-Engaging-young-people-during-the-COVID-19-pandemic-FINAL.pdf (youthendowmentfund.org.uk) | 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 |
| Subsidise uniform costs and equipment where needed | Some households are less likely to be able to afford the cost of school uniforms thus affecting attendance/ increasing barriers to attending school. | 6, 7, 8 |
| Improve tracking and monitoring systems | Ensure that disadvantaged students are appropriately tracked to ensure that they receive rewards and demerits in line with disadvantaged students and their attainment and progress is in line with or better than prior attainment Improving Behaviour in Schools EEF | 1, 4 |
| Implementation of School Cloud meeting software followed by re-introduction of face to face parents' evenings | Provision of alternative means of communicating with parents such as online/video meetings. Providing opportunities for further positive dialogue with parents/carers is recommended by the EEF as a means to improve engagement. This also links to our professional standards model with increased explicit opportunities for celebration of student achievement. Working with Parents to Support Children's Learning EEF | 4, 5, 6 |

| | | |
|--|---|----------------|
| <p>Additional pastoral staff, Safeguarding & Wellbeing Manager and Counselling service to provide high quality pastoral care particularly for those with SEMH concerns</p> | <p>Safeguarding and Wellbeing Manager is now Mental Health First aid trained and uses these skills to provide support to students with SEMH issues.</p> | <p>3, 7, 8</p> |
|--|---|----------------|

Total budgeted cost: £ 191, 175.99

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 2023 to 2024 academic year.

Priority 1: To close the attainment gap between disadvantaged pupils and their non-disadvantaged peers at Key Stage 4

The table below shows the average end of year engagement and progress points for each year group and compares the overall average points awarded to all students to the average points awarded to PP students.

| Year Group | All engagement and progress (Non-PP) | PP engagement and progress | % difference between PP and Non-PP |
|------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 7 | 583 (618) | 532 | -14 |
| 8 | 501 (523) | 463 | -11 |
| 9 | 454 (503) | 377 | -25 |
| 10 | 441 (460) | 778 | +70 |
| 11 | 393 (453) | 359 | -21 |

In Year 10 the number of engagement points for disadvantaged students is significantly higher than that of the year group. The percentage difference between the engagement points of PP students compared to their Non-PP peers is greatest in years 9 and 11, the gap is much smaller in years 7 & 8. Disengagement is not widespread through the PP cohort but there is work to be done with most especially the Year 9 cohort.

GCSE Results Analysis

The table below shows the individual performance data of each PP student in the Summer 2024 GCSEs. Although the data highlights key areas for improvement, it should be noted that attendance of several students was of significant concern. There are 6 students who achieved well, 2 who were broadly in-line in terms of their expected progress, and 15 students who

underachieved. In comparison to the non-PP cohort the percentages for progress (P8) were 35% for PP v 43% for non-PP. When identifying positive elements, this data shows:

- 8 out of 23 students achieved a positive P8 in English and Maths
- 6 out of 23 students achieved a positive P8 in the Ebacc bucket

| Candidate | Attainment 8 Buckets | | | | Progress 8 Buckets | | | | | |
|-----------|----------------------|----|-------|-------|--------------------|--------|--------|--------|------|--------|
| | En | Ma | EBacc | Other | En | Ma | EBacc | Other | A8 | P8 |
| 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | -3.03 | -1.475 | -2.27 | -3.213 | 10 | -2.546 |
| 2 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 7 | -1.195 | -1.655 | -1.463 | -1.39 | 23 | -1.427 |
| 3 | 6 | 8 | 11 | 8 | -1.55 | -0.065 | -0.197 | -1.4 | 33 | -0.802 |
| 4 | 8 | 6 | 9 | 11 | -0.55 | -1.065 | -0.863 | -0.4 | 34 | -0.702 |
| 5 | 14 | 14 | 19 | 17 | 1.415 | 1.735 | 1.173 | 0.537 | 64 | 1.143 |
| 6 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 0.91 | -0.25 | 0.543 | 0.14 | 20 | 0.337 |
| 7 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 5 | -0.515 | 0.11 | -0.4 | -1.41 | 24 | -0.624 |
| 8 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | -3.55 | -2.065 | -3.197 | -4.067 | 8 | -3.302 |
| 9 | 10 | 8 | 11 | 13.5 | 0.265 | -0.26 | -0.41 | 0.25 | 42.5 | -0.047 |
| 10 | 10 | 8 | 12 | 10 | 0.805 | 0.345 | 0.537 | -0.39 | 40 | 0.273 |
| 11 | 10 | 6 | 12 | 8 | -0.14 | -1.725 | -0.58 | -1.993 | 36 | -1.145 |
| 12 | 12 | 10 | 15 | 14 | 1.265 | 0.74 | 0.923 | 0.417 | 51 | 0.803 |
| 13 | 10 | 8 | 12 | 13.5 | -0.14 | -0.725 | -0.58 | -0.16 | 43.5 | -0.395 |
| 14 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 4 | -1.515 | 0.11 | -1.067 | -1.743 | 19 | -1.124 |
| 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -3.865 | -3.28 | -3.097 | -3.397 | 0 | -3.378 |
| 16 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 5 | -0.09 | -0.25 | 0.543 | -0.193 | 17 | 0.037 |
| 17 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 3 | -1.515 | -0.89 | -0.4 | -2.077 | 18 | -1.224 |
| 18 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | -3.365 | -1.28 | -2.43 | -2.397 | 10 | -2.378 |
| 19 | 12 | 8 | 10 | 14 | 0.17 | -1.54 | -2.127 | -0.723 | 44 | -1.13 |
| 20 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 8 | -1.73 | -2.12 | -1.94 | -0.593 | 17 | -1.53 |
| 21 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | -2.17 | -1.41 | -2.35 | -2.407 | 5 | -2.142 |
| 22 | 10 | 8 | 12 | 13.5 | 0.45 | -0.065 | 0.137 | 0.433 | 43.5 | 0.248 |
| 23 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | -0.38 | -0.535 | -0.33 | -1.063 | 13 | -0.601 |

Priority 2: To address students with lower than chronological reading ages

The reading ages of our disadvantaged students will improve from their September benchmark tests. We have used the Bedrock learning as a digital literacy support package and have implemented a 'building a reading culture' whole school reading strategy. We adopted Bedrock Vocabulary to address the significant word gap that exists between different groups of pupils. A wide base of academic and DfE research has highlighted poor vocabulary development as a key factor in low literacy levels and attainment. Sources have found this to be a result of social factors, compounded by a lack of independent reading. By teaching Tier 2 vocabulary explicitly within the context of a wide range of fiction and nonfiction texts, Bedrock enables us to address this "word gap". This program makes it possible to ensure regular reading and manage language acquisition in a coherent and consistent way.

Using this inclusive strategy the gap between reading age and chronological reading age will decrease for all students.

Year 7 (Class of 2028) - Bedrock Vocabulary data analysis

Students across the last academic year were set Bedrock Vocabulary once per week for homework. Students were required to accrue at least 30 points across the week (curriculum and

homework) Students who engaged with the homework made more progress in their vocabulary acquisition and retention.

| | Number in Cohort | Average progress made % | % Range | % made progress |
|---------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | 116 | 26% | -50%-381% | 93% |
| Male | 61 | 30% | -14%-381% | 93% |
| Female | 55 | 21% | -50%- 60% | 92% |
| PP (Disadvantaged) | 41 | 35% | -50%-381% | 95% |
| PP Male | 23 | 47% | -11%-381% | 95% |
| Non PP Male | 38 | 20% | -14%- 94% | 92% |
| PP Female | 18 | 19% | -50%-57% | 94% |
| Non PP Female | 37 | 22% | -4%-60% | 91% |

Average improvement of learners who **are not** eligible for pupil premium funding 23%

Average improvement of learners who **are** eligible for pupil premium funding 38%

Bedrock Vocabulary's data shows that Pupil Premium students make higher average gains than their peers. This is evident from the PP Male students who have made more progress (47%) than their non-PP peers who made on average 22%

Year 8 (Class of 2027) - Bedrock Vocabulary data analysis

Over the last academic year, this cohort have completed Bedrock Vocabulary once per fortnight. This has been reduced from once per week. Engagement with homework was not consistent. Where students completed their homework weekly, they made more progress.

Each teacher has access to a teacher dashboard. This presents live data to the class teacher, subject leader, and designated senior leader. It offers a broad suite of reporting options, allowing staff to monitor effort, attainment and progress made in any given time period. Teachers who identified that students were not engaging with Bedrock consistently would put intervention in place at different stages from supportive encouragement and praise to class charts announcements, homework demerits and an invitation to faculty detention for 3 or more missed homework.

| | 2023-24 | | | | 2022-23 | | | |
|--------------------|------------------|-------------------------|------------|------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------|------------------------------|
| | Number in Cohort | Average progress made % | % Range | % students who made progress | Number in Cohort | Average progress made % | % Range | % students who made progress |
| | | 130 | 34% | -48%-669% | 90% | 128 | 24% | -74%-87% |
| Male | 70 | 41% | -17%-456% | 77% | 70 | 16% | -74%-87% | 84% |
| Female | 60 | 25% | -48%- 669% | 88% | 58 | 18% | -26%-55% | 94% |
| PP (Disadvantaged) | 46 | 19% | -48%-188% | 86% | 46 | 18% | -74%-55% | 93% |
| PP Male | 20 | 28% | -11%-188% | 90% | 20 | 16% | -74%-50% | 90% |
| Non PP Male | 50 | 46% | -17%- 456% | 92% | 50 | 17% | -14%-87% | 82% |
| PP Female | 26 | 12% | -48%-47% | 84% | 26 | 20% | -26%-55% | 96% |
| Non-PP Female | 34 | 35% | -4%-669% | 91% | 32 | 16% | -7%-42% | 93% |

Average improvement of learners who **are not** eligible for pupil premium funding 65%. Male students' attainment was on average better than female students with Males averaging a 46% increase their vocabulary knowledge compared to 35% from female students. The range for Male students is wider than that of the female students. More Non-PP Female students made progress than Non-PP Males, but this is only by 1%.

Average improvement of learners who **are** eligible for pupil premium funding 19%. Bedrock Vocabulary's data shows that Non-PP students made marginally higher average gains than their peers with increases of 5%. 86% of our PP students made 24% progress on average, over the year.

| | | | |
|-----|-----|-----------|-----|
| 128 | 24% | -74%-87% | 89% |
| 70 | 16% | -74%-87% | 84% |
| 58 | 18% | -26%- 55% | 94% |

| | | | |
|----|-----|-----------|-----|
| 46 | 18% | -74%-55% | 93% |
| 20 | 16% | -74%-50% | 90% |
| 50 | 17% | -14%- 87% | 82% |
| 26 | 20% | -26%-55% | 96% |
| 32 | 16% | -7%-42% | 93% |

The data from the previous year suggests that the cohort are making similar progress. In 2022 this year group had a Bedrock lesson each week and homework. Since the Bedrock lesson has been reduced (so as not to affect the curriculum content and delivery) a smaller percentage of student groups are making less progress apart from PP Male students where 90% of the cohort made progress across both Academic years. However, the average progress made across all groups has increased since the previous year apart from PP Females which have seen a decline. This data will be used to target this group in the next academic year.

NGRTS and Reading Interventions

All students completed NGRTs at the start and end of the academic year and were placed on the Bedrock programme to enhance their reading and vocabulary. Some Pupil Premium students were also identified for a more personalised reading intervention programme. This programme involved small group and individual interventions using the newly appointed HTLA (who commenced role February 2024). Below we compare reading progress across the year groups and then for those involved in the HTLA intervention programme:

| | Reading progress - Expected or Better than Expected | | |
|----|---|--------|------------|
| | PP | Non-PP | Difference |
| Y7 | 68% | 75% | -8% |
| Y8 | 87% | 83% | +4% |
| Y9 | 68% | 77% | -9% |

| | % Reading progress on HTLA intervention programme |
|------------------------------|---|
| Y7 (cohort of 8 PP students) | 50% |
| Y8 (cohort of 9 PP students) | 89% |

The HTLA intervention programme only ran for 4 months and focussed primarily on the year 8 cohort.

Priority 3: Increasing the attendance of disadvantaged students

2022-2023 Attendance Data

| FSM6 | | | All | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 |
|----------|-----|--------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| FSM6 | 106 | School | 79.7% | 82.7% | 77.1% | 80.7% | 79.8% | 77.3% |
| | | FFT National | 84.9% | 88.1% | 85.6% | 83.9% | 83.0% | 82.5% |
| | | Difference | -5.1% ● | -5.4% ● | -8.5% ● | -3.3% ● | -3.1% ● | -5.1% ● |
| Not FSM6 | | | All | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 |
| Not FSM6 | 222 | School | 87.8% | 90.7% | 85.6% | 91.9% | 87.3% | 83.4% |
| | | FFT National | 91.3% | 93.0% | 91.9% | 91.0% | 90.6% | 89.7% |
| | | Difference | -3.5% ● | -2.3% ● | -6.3% ● | +0.9% | -3.3% ● | -6.3% ● |

2023-2024 Attendance Data

| FSM6 | | | All | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 |
|----------|-----|--------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| FSM6 | 156 | School | 82.2% | 84.8% | 83.7% | 82.2% | 78.7% | 74.7% |
| | | FFT National | 85.4% | 89.0% | 86.2% | 84.5% | 83.3% | 82.8% |
| | | Difference | -3.2% ● | -4.2% ● | -2.5% ● | -2.4% ● | -4.6% ● | -8.1% ● |
| Not FSM6 | | | All | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 |
| Not FSM6 | 326 | School | 92.0% | 93.6% | 91.8% | 92.8% | 88.5% | 92.2% |
| | | FFT National | 92.8% | 94.6% | 93.3% | 92.4% | 92.1% | 91.3% |
| | | Difference | -0.8% | -1.0% ● | -1.5% ● | +0.4% | -3.6% ● | +0.9% |

The pandemic has had a significant impact upon attendance at Wellfield, as has been the case both locally and nationally. Despite our best efforts with following attendance procedures, the gap remains a concern for those identified as disadvantaged. As a result, we have recruited additional staffing into the attendance team which now consists of an Attendance Manager and an Attendance Officer.

The attendance of all years for both disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students for 2023-2024 was below National Average. In years 7-9 disadvantaged students had poorer attendance, however, in Years 10&11, the gap between school and FFT national was bigger. When making comparisons to the previous academic year, FSM attendance overall has improved from 79.7% to 82.2%. In each year group at Key Stage 3, the FSM attendance gap when compared to FFT national has reduced which is positive, although there are concerns with increased gaps in Year 10 and 11.

Year 11 contained a small, but significant proportion of persistent absentees who received targeted support from our attendance team. Ultimately however, their persistent absenteeism was reflective in their GCSE examination outcomes.

Disadvantaged attendance – Autumn Term comparison – 3 year trend

The table below shows the comparison of attendance of disadvantaged students v non-disadvantaged students for Autumn Term over the past three academic years.

| Disadvantaged students v <u>Non-disadvantaged</u> students attendance (using dates 2 nd September to 16 th December) | | |
|---|---------------|-------------------|
| | Disadvantaged | Non-disadvantaged |
| 2024/2025 | 86.22 | 93.20 |
| 2023/2024 | 84.92 | 92.38 |
| 2022/2023 | 83.45 | 92.39 |

This shows the ongoing impact of the whole school attendance strategy to improve the attendance of all students at Wellfield Academy. Disadvantaged students' attendance has improved at a great rate than non-disadvantaged, with the gap for the Autumn Term comparison closing from 8.94% in Autumn Term 2022 to 6.98% for Autumn 2025.

Attendance Gap (PP v NPP) 2023/2024

| Year | Pupil Premium Attendance | Non-Pupil Premium Attendance | Gap |
|--------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|-------|
| 7 | 84.72 | 93.79 | 9.02 |
| 8 | 85.25 | 91.75 | 6.2 |
| 9 | 83.17 | 93.19 | 10.02 |
| 10 | 79.07 | 88.77 | 9.7 |
| 11 | 72.46 | 86.10 | 13.64 |
| Whole School | 82.46 | 91.36 | 8.9 |

The Attendance Strategy at Wellfield Academy is underpinned by the approach of “attendance being everyone’s responsibility”. As a result, the attendance of individual students, groups and the whole academy is interrogated at all levels. The Attendance Team have specific focus on improving the attendance of students whose attendance is a cause for concern.

Priority 4: To increase disadvantaged students’ engagement in school life and aspirations

Student Data:

| Year | Total Students | Total PP | % | Total Non-PP | % |
|------|----------------|----------|-----|--------------|-----|
| 7 | 131 | 48 | 37% | 83 | 63% |
| 8 | 141 | 48 | 34% | 93 | 66% |



| | | | | | |
|----|----|----|-----|----|-----|
| 9 | 76 | 26 | 34% | 50 | 66% |
| 10 | 63 | 19 | 30% | 41 | 70% |

Extra-Curricular Programme:

This data has been extracted from ClassCharts to show attendance at Extra-Curricular Clubs & Activities:

| Year | PP% | PP (Total Merits Awarded) | PP (% Merits Awarded) | Non-PP (Total Merits Awarded) | Non-PP (% Merits Awarded) | Total |
|------|-----|---------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|
| 7 | 37% | 325 | 27% | 867 | 73% | 1192 |
| 8 | 34% | 337 | 30% | 776 | 70% | 1113 |
| 9 | 34% | 88 | 14% | 527 | 86% | 615 |
| 10 | 30% | 112 | 41% | 160 | 59% | 272 |

- Percentage of Disadvantaged in Year 10 shows excellent engagement in Extra-Curricular Clubs and Activities (+11%).
- PP participation in Year 8 falls slightly short of the percentage of Disadvantaged students in the year group.
- Data available for Years 9 and 10 is significantly lower overall in comparison to Years 7 and 8.

International Trips:**Barcelona Trip:**

| Year | Total Students | Total PP | % | Total Non-PP | % |
|------|----------------|----------|-----|--------------|------|
| 8 | 30 | 7 | 23% | 23 | 77% |
| 9 | 15 | 2 | 13% | 13 | 87% |
| 10 | 2 | 0 | 0% | 2 | 100% |

Ypres & Paris Trip:

| Year | Total Students | Total PP | % | Total Non-PP | % |
|------|----------------|----------|-----|--------------|-----|
| 8 | 22 | 6 | 27% | 16 | 73% |
| 9 | 5 | 2 | 40% | 3 | 60% |
| 10 | 19 | 2 | 11% | 17 | 89% |

Duke of Edinburgh Programme:

| Year | Total Students | Total PP | % | Total Non-PP | % |
|------|----------------|----------|-----|--------------|-----|
| 9 | 16 | 2 | 13% | 14 | 87% |
| 10 | 13 | 3 | 23% | 10 | 77% |

Parents' Evening:

The data in the table below shows that the % attendance of parents/carers of disadvantaged students at Parents' Evenings was broadly in line with the overall attendance figure for Year 8, but below that in other years.

| Year Group | Disadvantaged Cohort | % of disadvantaged students attendance at Parents' Evening | Overall % attendance |
|------------|----------------------|--|----------------------|
| 7 | 45/131 | 56 | 76 |
| 8 | 47/141 | 61 | 68 |
| 9 | 26/76 | 42 | 62 |
| 10 | 18/63 | 33 | 62 |
| 11 | 23/65 | 56 | 77 |

Post-16 Destination Data:

| | Levels Total | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------|-----------|------------|
| | Total | Total % | PP | PP% |
| NEET | 6 | 9 | 5 | 26 |
| Level 1 | 11 | 16 | 5 | 26 |
| Level 2 | 11 | 16 | 2 | 11 |
| Level 3 | 31 | 46 | 6 | 32 |
| Apprenticeship | 6 | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| Employment | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| Unknown | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| | 67 | 100 | 19 | 100 |

PP students were prioritised for one to one careers appointments with our provider, Career North and each had multiple appointments. Only 2 of the students are confirmed NEET, the others are assumed NEET as they have not answered any of our communication. These had either very poor attendance or did not end their education with us, 2 went to Shaftsbury High School. 74 % of PP students are in education, employment or training.

Priority 5: To ensure consistent, high quality Teaching and Learning for all students

A CPD programme designed by the Assistant Headteacher for Teaching and Learning, with support from staff from across all subject areas, was delivered to all teaching staff. The CPD offered was designed to ensure that all students receive high quality teaching and learning and with the aim to improve student work and independence, including students who may be disadvantaged. The CPD covered a variety of pedagogical practice including, How to best use AI within the classroom, Effective use of the TA, SEND adaptations, Slick routines to support attitude to Learning and how to use effective questioning to aid student knowledge.

All members of teaching staff have received throughout the year:

- 2 hours T&L CPD after-school per half term
- 15 minutes T&L CPD per week in briefing, incorporating bespoke T&L Walk Thru support through line management meetings
- 3 INSET days, with at least 1 hour in each of these focussed purely on T&L

This programme has ensured all members of staff are kept abreast of the latest pedagogical research and given the opportunity to put these into classroom practice. A programme of lesson drop-ins by Head of Subjects and SLT members and regular student voice quality assures the implementation.

Sparx

Number on roll

| YEAR | PP | FSM | EAL | N | K | E | NON | Males | Females | TOTAL |
|--------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| 7 | 45 | 42 | 1 | 12 | 15 | 5 | 52 | 66 | 57 | 123 |
| 8 | 48 | 42 | 7 | 10 | 12 | 5 | 61 | 74 | 62 | 136 |
| 9 | 27 | 25 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 3 | 39 | 37 | 37 | 74 |
| 10 | 18 | 18 | 7 | 10 | 6 | 2 | 22 | 25 | 37 | 62 |
| 11 | 22 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 37 | 26 | 39 | 65 |
| TOTAL | 160 | 146 | 17 | 36 | 48 | 15 | 211 | 228 | 232 | 460 |

% Average Score

| YEAR | PP | FSM | EAL | N | K | E | NON | Males | Females | TOTAL |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| 7 | 50.9% | 50.9% | 83.3% | 63.0% | 56.8% | 35.6% | 65.7% | 58.4% | 61.0% | 59.6% |
| 8 | 37.7% | 36.0% | 66.7% | 38.3% | 70.0% | 2.2% | 55.6% | 44.7% | 53.5% | 48.7% |
| 9 | 28.0% | 30.1% | - | 20.4% | 24.7% | 14.8% | 53.1% | 43.4% | 42.7% | 43.1% |
| 10 | 37.9% | 37.1% | 31.7% | 6.3% | 31.3% | 11.1% | 45.3% | 25.7% | 41.3% | 35.0% |
| 11 | 23.6% | 21.3% | 52.3% | - | 10.8% | - | 32.0% | 17.7% | 37.7% | 29.7% |
| TOTAL | 37.9% | 37.6% | 51.6% | 36.1% | 44.1% | 17.0% | 52.4% | 43.3% | 49.0% | 46.2% |