

The Courtyard (St Mary Magdalene Academy)
Pupil Premium Review follow up visit
22 September 2016
Reviewer: Kate Roskell

School's Pupil Premium Profile	2016.17	2015.16	2014.15
Total number of pupils in the school	36	36	26
Number of PP-eligible pupils:	9 + 4 tbc	9	7
Amount per pupil:	£935	£935	£935
Total pupil premium budget:	tbc	£8500	£6545

Area (including sources of evidence)		Areas for development- April 2016	Progress- Sept 2016
Achievement	<p>The school's current data for English and maths show that disadvantaged students are making as good or better progress than other students; this was reflected in the students books seen during the review. The systems for assessing and tracking progress introduced since the OFSTED inspection mean that the school is now in a position to evaluate the progress of groups and individual students much more accurately.</p> <p>The school has begun to evaluate the impact of its interventions for disadvantaged students; sharper articulation of the success criteria will support more effective evaluation in the future.</p>	<p>Define and articulate success criteria precisely in order to monitor impact more effectively.</p> <p>Utilise external evidence of effective strategies.</p>	<p>Evaluation of the impact of 2015.16 funding against more precise success criteria indicates progress has been made. The headteacher has made use of external evidence.</p>

Area (including sources of evidence)		Areas for development- April 2016	Progress- Sept 2016
<p>Leadership & Management</p>	<p>The school identifies barriers to learning for all students, including disadvantaged, individually through its “All about” meetings which take place every 3 weeks and consider 3 or 4 students each time. Intervention strategies appear well matched to perceived needs, although it is less clear for all interventions that they are specifically matched to the needs of disadvantaged students.</p> <p>Flight paths are used to set challenging targets for English and maths; social, emotional and skills targets are also specified for each student.</p> <p>The school divides its funding appropriately between activities designed to have a direct impact on academic progress and those aimed at widening opportunity and developing social and emotional skills.</p> <p>Strategies are evaluated through the “All about” meetings. The headteacher also meets regularly with the staff members delivering interventions. Subject progress data is now collected and evaluated 4 times per year. Senior leaders use all this information in the summer term to make spending decisions for the following year.</p> <p>The pupil premium statement provides some evidence of impact; the headteacher describes examples of the impact of some strategies on individual students.</p> <p>Since September 2015 PP progress is a standing item at governing board meetings. The headteacher’s December 2015 and March 2016 reports clearly show PP students’ progress in comparison to that of other students.</p> <p>The school’s SEF comments on PP students’ progress in the L&M section; the commentary is not completely consistent through other sections.</p>	<p>Define and articulate success criteria precisely in order to monitor impact more effectively.</p> <p>Ensure that the governing board continues to improve its monitoring and challenge in relation to the progress of disadvantaged students and the spending of specific funding. A named governor (not staff) and governor training should be considered.</p> <p>Ensure that the SEF sections triangulate.</p>	<p>The Headteacher has evaluated the impact of 2015.16 funding using a format which clearly defines and articulates success criteria. This has informed decision making for 2016.17 strategies, which are detailed in the 2016.17 plan with costings.</p> <p>The governing board took part in a training session featuring PP this week. It has yet to name a non-staff PP governor (the Headteacher has someone in mind).</p> <p>The newly appointed deputy headteacher now has responsibility for PP.</p>

Area (including sources of evidence)		Areas for development- April 2016	Progress- Sept 2016
<p>Teaching</p>	<p>The headteacher's monitoring indicates that 2/3 of teachers plan well to meet the needs of disadvantaged students. She is confident that new teachers from September will take this to 100%. One of these new teachers will also be the deputy headteacher responsible for teaching and learning, including the brief of PP co-ordination.</p> <p>Students books seen show disadvantaged students making progress equal to that of other students. The most effective teacher feedback gives very clear information on how students can improve their work.</p> <p>The headteacher intends that disadvantaged students' progress will be a focus for progress and accountability (appraisal) meetings 3 times per year from September 2016.</p> <p>Pupil passports are in place for all students and an effective strategy for disadvantaged students.</p> <p>Staff members who deliver interventions can describe the purpose of their particular activity. They say that the interventions make a difference. Students can describe the purpose of the interventions and, in broad terms, the impact they are having. They say the interventions are enjoyable.</p>	<p>Ensure that expectations of the new deputy headteacher in relation to PP co-ordination are clearly agreed and understood, including working with governors.</p> <p>Ensure consistency between teachers in planning and feedback.</p> <p>Share the precise success criteria with all the intervention teachers; support and challenge them to take ownership of the criteria (hold to account, offer training, encourage to look for external examples of good practice and resources).</p>	<p>Expectations are agreed and understood. The DHT and governor(s) will need to agree the practicalities of working together.</p> <p>To be followed up at next visit.</p> <p>This will be done through staff meetings and incorporated into performance appraisal for relevant staff.</p>
<p>Behaviour & safety</p>	<p>The school provides evidence in the PP statement that the interventions designed to improve social and emotional aspects of learning are having a positive impact.</p> <p>This is supported by what the students said during the review.</p>	<p>Capture routinely students' own evaluation of the impact of interventions.</p>	<p>This is captured through the annual review process. The DHT should monitor to ensure that the PP success criteria and the statement/EHCP objectives match.</p>

Area (including sources of evidence)		Areas for development- April 2016	Progress- Sept 2016
<p>Next steps and further support</p>	<p>The school should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • incorporate the areas for development into its School Development Plan and routine systems and procedures <p>The reviewer can offer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a follow up visit in the first half of the autumn term • governor training • subsequent support through LDBS core visits 		<p>A reference in the SDP to the PP plan will suffice.</p>