

Cedar Mount Academy Pupil Premium Review: September 2015

<p>Process</p>	<p>The Pupil Premium Review was undertaken by Carolyn Robson, an NLE, from the LeTS Alliance, the Teaching Academy led by Rushey Mead Academy in Leicester. The review consisted of scrutiny of key documentation, and a day long visit to the academy, which included discussions with key staff, learning walks to classrooms, talking to students and further scrutiny of documentation.</p> <p>Prior to the academy visit, the following documentation was scrutinised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ofsted Inspection Report April 2015 2. RAISE online Summary Reports 2013 and 2014 3. Pupil Premium Impact Summary 4. Link Governor Report 4th February 2015 5. Minutes of Governor meetings 26th September 2013, 27th November 2013, 19th December 2013, 22nd January 2014, 3rd April 2014, 3rd July 2014, 25th September 2014, 4th December 2014, and 26th March 2015. 6. Pupil Premium Impact Report for SEND 2014/15 7. Targeted Year 7 Reading Intervention Plan 8. Extra-curricular Programme included Disadvantaged Students 9. Pupil Premium Impact Report for LAC 2014/15 10. Pupil Premium Impact Report for Rewards and Behaviour Interventions 2014/15 11. Development and Post-Ofsted Action Plan 12. Pupil Premium website information 13. Pupil Premium Impact Report for EAL 2014/15 <p>The Review visit consisted of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meeting with the Principal, Pat Rice, and Vice-Principal, Chris Heyes, to outline the academy's initial responses to the inspection report and to provide some context about the academy. 2. A learning walk and short observation of Pupil Premium students in a year 11 Maths class. 3. Discussions with Ashley Burkitt and Chris Wyatt, the year 11 team. 4. Meeting with the heads of Maths, Sarah Mears, and English, Christine Reid. 5. Talks with Academy Improvement Board Chair, Jenny Andrews. 6. Dialogues with Karen Walsh, Co-Principal – Progress and Rebecca Walhurst, Co-Principal – Teaching and Learning. 7. A learning walk and short observation of Pupil Premium students in a year 11 English class. 8. Reflection time to formulate initial feedback. 9. Short review of the visit and feedback meeting with Pat Rice and Chris Heyes.
<p>Key Statements from Ofsted relating to performance of disadvantaged students</p>	<p>Section 5 Ofsted April 2015</p> <p><i>“An external review of the academy's use of pupil premium should be undertaken in order to assess how these aspects of leadership and management may be improved. “</i></p> <p><i>“Students’ achievement is inadequate and progress is highly variable across the academy. Students’ attainment and progress have not met government expectations since the Academy opened. Some students left in Year 11 in 2014 without any GCSE qualifications. “</i></p>

“Poor skills in reading, writing and mathematics are not tackled systematically across the academy including in different subjects.”

“In 2014, disadvantaged students underachieved and made much less progress than non- disadvantaged students both in academy and nationally. Gaps in attainment widened in English and narrowed slightly in Mathematics in comparison to non- disadvantaged students nationally. Disadvantaged students, at the end of Year 11 in 2014, were almost two GCSE grades behind non- disadvantaged students nationally in both English and mathematics. In GCSE mathematics, their standards were equally low when compared to non- disadvantaged students in the academy. In English, disadvantage students were half a GCSE grade behind non- disadvantaged students in the academy and attainment was low.”

“Expectations from teachers of what students are capable of achieving are too low. The quality of work accepted from students is often not good enough and results in students making slow progress and underachieving. This is not encouraging students to strive to attain higher standards and improve their progress”

“Leaders are not effective in checking on the impact of the academy’s work with disadvantaged students. As a result these students underachieve.”

“Over time, the use of additional government funding has not been effective. Disadvantaged students underachieved in 2014 in their external examinations. Leaders have subsequently introduced a new mentoring system alongside other support available for disadvantaged students. The academy’s assessment information shows that currently students are doing well in English, although not in Mathematics. Disadvantaged students are on track to achieve better outcomes by the end of Year 11 in 2015 than their peers in the 2014 cohort”

“Governors and sponsor have too readily accepted academy leaders’ overly positive assessments of students’ progress. This has prevented them holding the academy to account for students’ achievement and the quality of teaching”

“The Trust has too readily accepted leaders’ evaluation of the work of the academy. This has led to underachievement being left unchallenged. Since September 2014 Trust members have taken decisive action to assist the academy to improve. However these actions have not resulted in rapid improvement in achievement for all students as the quality of teaching and students’ behaviour is highly variable.”

The Ofsted inspection report identified a number of **strengths**, such as procedures for the protection of vulnerable students and the appointment of a new Principal who is taking decisive action to improve the effectiveness of the Academy.

Ofsted set a series of action areas relating to Pupil Premium in order to bring about rapid improvement:

Ensuring that:

- Work set matches the needs and abilities of all groups of Students and is adjusted appropriately if they are not making good progress
- There are consistently high expectations of what students can achieve

Improving students’ behaviour and safety by developing effective practices to:

- Urgently reduce the number of students absent from the academy, including those regularly absent, so their safety is assured and overall attendance across the academy is at least average.
- Ensuring that the impact of actions to help disadvantaged students is checked thoroughly to ensure these students are making good progress in all subjects and attend well.

	Ofsted acknowledge that the new principal is taking decisive action in an attempt to approve the effectiveness of the academy. He took up post on the 1 st September 2014. Ofsted also acknowledge that the sponsor trust has taken significant action to support the academy since September 2014.
Pupil Premium Context September 2015	
Total Number of students in academy	597 (NB academy built with potential PAN of 900)
Number of PP-eligible students	367 (61.47%)
Amount of PPG per pupil	£935.00 (2014-15)
Total PP budget	£343,145
Context	<p>Cedar Mount Academy, opened in 2012, sponsored by the Bright Futures Educational Trust. It is a mixed 11-16 comprehensive academy based in the Gorton Educational Village, which splits its site between two academies, Cedar Mount Academy and Melland High School.</p> <p>Cedar Mount Academy was inspected on the 29th-30th April –2015</p> <p>The academy is a small academy at 575 (national average 957), with high FSM, above the 80th percentile at 64.3 (national average 28.5), and high ethnic minority population at 60.7% (national average 25.6). The academy has high percentage of persistent absentees at 10.6 (national average 5.8), with FSM persistent absentees at 12.1 (national average 11.5). There are high fixed term exclusions at 27.67 (national average 6.87) with exclusions of FSM students at 28.83 (against national average for FSM of 16.34).</p> <p>The academy has a high degree of student turbulence with a high percentage of disadvantaged students. Both the teaching staff and leadership team have also witnessed a high staffing turnover; 17 members of staff left in July 2015 and approximately 16 new members of staff started in September 2015. The Principal, Pat Rice, has been in post since September 2014.</p> <p>The SLT describe the academy and its community has having low aspirations, lack of ambition and high levels of deprivation. This would appear to be a long term issue, which now needs urgently addressing.</p> <p>Literacy at the academy had not been addressed for years and there had been no school library, or assessment of reading ages. This summer these have been addressed with a full school reading ages testing programme implemented and the creation of a new library space.</p>
Pupil Premium Attainment and Achievement	
<p>Summary of academy's performance data</p> <p>Does the academy's performance data indicate that attainment and progress for disadvantaged</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RAISEonline shows that in terms of Prior Attainment the academy is significantly below national averages in every year group. Again, in each year group prior attainment bands are skewed towards low ability by a significant degree. For example 48.1% of Year 10 this academic year are in the low ability band against NA of 14.6%. Similarly, the % of high ability students in the same year group is 2.5% against NA of 30.8%. This presents huge challenges to the academy and demonstrates the need for KS3 and transition interventions and high progress targets in order to give all students the support and challenge to achieve. <p>Cedar Mount Academy: Summary of Year 11 Attainment Data 2014-2015</p> <p>2014</p>

students are improving, and that gaps are closing, both within the academy and compared to the national average?

	All Academy	NA	Academy PP	NA PP	Academy Non PP	National Non PP
5 A*-C (incl. En & Ma)	34%	55%	29%	36%	44%	62%
5 A*-C	40%	64%	35%	45%	50%	72%
5 A*-G	78%	92%	76%	86%	83%	95%
EBACC	13%	24%	8%	11%	23%	28%
BASICS	36%	58%	32%	39%	44%	64%
English A*-C	43%	67%	39%	51%	52%	73%
English 3+ levels progress	53%	70%	47%	58%	64%	75%
English 4+ levels progress		32%		35%		35%
Maths A*-C	48%	67%	48%	49%	50%	74%
Maths 3+ levels progress	48%	65%	46%	48%	53%	71%
Maths 4+ levels progress	20%	29%		15%		35%
VA Score	957.6					
VA FSM	939.3					
VA NFSM	1000.6					
2015 (Predictions in brackets)						
	All Academy	NA	Academy PP	NA PP	Academy Non PP	National Non PP
5 A*-C (incl. En & Ma)	25% (42%)		21% (37%)		32% (45%)	
5 A*-C	31%		25%		42%	
5 A*-G	85% (91%)		87%		82%	
EBACC	11%		11%		11%	
BASICS	29%		25%		37%	
English A*-C	36% (58%)		34%		39%	
English 3+ levels progress	48% (69%)		46%		54%	
English 4+ levels progress	19% (26%)		15%		31%	
Maths A*-C	44% (53%)		37%		58%	
Maths 3+ levels progress	54% (60%)		48%		70%	
Maths 4+ levels progress	26% (26%)		22%		33%	

KS4 APS Attainment - Pupil Premium							
Pupil Premium	Average Grade per Qual	APS per Qual	Average No. of Qual	Students	% Students	Best 8 TPS	Uncapped TPS
N	D	34.8	8.2	37	32%	252.6	287.0
Y	D-	31.7	8.1	77	68%	234.8	257.3

Additional data provided post review

Threshold Attainment - Pupil Premium							
	Students	% Students	SACEM	SAC	SAG	English Baccalaureate	Basics Rate
N	37	32%	38%	49%	84%	8%	41%
Y	77	68%	23%	26%	87%	10%	27%

Expected Progress - Pupil Premium						
	Students	% Students	English 3+ Progress Levels	English 4+ Progress Levels	Maths 3+ Progress Levels	Maths 4+ Progress Levels
N	37	32%	45%	29%	63%	34%
Y	77	68%	54%	20%	48%	25%

- In 2015 the academy achieved 25% 5+A*-C including English and Maths, which is significantly below the national average.
- Interestingly Progress 8 scores for disadvantaged students is -0.2 and others is -0.5, but these are both negative scores.
- Predictions for 2015 were very inaccurate through the assessment points last year, particularly in English.
- In order to establish a more robust approach to assessment the academy has increased the number of data collections and now has six Assessment points throughout the year.
- The academy has recently purchased a new data package EVA (Educational Visual Analysis), which will provide a comprehensive range of analyses of data, the introduction of which, staff say, will make a significant impact on their ability to track the attainment and progress of groups of students. This is too newly implemented to comment on impact.
- In KS3, the academy has now launched assessment without levels system using a new matrix to track mastery.

Academy's PP statement

Does the academy's published pupil premium statement clearly describe how the academy is planning to allocate funding to raise attainment and progress for all or

The academy's website has a dedicated pupil premium section which, does in part, outline the information about attainment and progress gaps. This currently is misleading in that whilst the chart below does share the actual measures, it emphasises data patterns against national gaps in pupil premium, seeming to show significant improvements in reducing gaps. The facts that the actual gaps between national averages and the academy's results have been considerable and that that there is downward trend in results is less obvious in this published analysis.

HISTORICAL INDICATORS OF ACHIEVEMENT IMPACT AT KS4		2013				2014				
		All	PP	NPP	Gap	All	PP	NPP	Gap	Trend
5A*-C EM	Academy	37	32	49	-17	33	28	44	-16	+1
	National	60	41	68	-27	55	36	62	-26	+1

disadvantaged students,
and close gaps?

					+10				+10	
Capped Best 8 Point Score	Academy	278	264	312	-48	237	225	261	-36	+12
	National	338	305	350	-45	307	259	324	-65	-20
					-3				+29	
APS English (40=C)	Academy	34	33	36	-3	31	30	33	-3	0
	National	39	33	41	-8	39	N/A	40	N/A	N/A
					+5					
APS Maths (40=C)	Academy	30	29	35	-6	29	29	30	-1	-5
	National	39	33	41	-8	38	N/A	40	N/A	N/A
					+2					
3LP English	Academy	68	62	86	-24	53	47	64	-17	+7
	National	69	56	74	-18	70	58	74	-16	+2
					-6				-1	
3LP Maths	Academy	48	44	57	-13	48	46	53	-7	+6
	National	72	54	77	-23	65	48	71	-23	0
					+10				+16	
EBACC	Academy	9	4	21	-17	13	8	23	-15	+2
	National	22	10	27	-17	24	11	28	-17	0
					0				+2	
HISTORICAL INDICATORS OF ATTENDANCE IMPACT AT KS4	2013					2014				
	All	PP	NPP	Gap		All	PP	NPP	Gap	Trend
% Sessions Absence	Academy	8.9	9.8	6.5	3.3	5.9	6.3	4.9	1.4	1.9
	National	5.9	8.3	4.9	3.4	5.1	7.3	4.1	3.2	+0.2
					+0.1				+1.8	
% PA Students	Academy	15.5	19	7.2	11.8	10.6	12.1	8.3	3.8	+8
	National	6.6	12.8	4	8.8	5.8	11.5	3.4	8.1	+0.7
					-3.0				+4.3	

The academy's statement does explain what Pupil Premium funding is for but there is no information about targets or success criteria, or the academy's overall strategy to reduce the attainment gap for Pupil Premium students, increase the rate of progress for Pupil Premium students, and ensure good attendance and low rates of exclusion. The impact summary included below is also misleading.

“In 2014, the in-academy gap between disadvantaged students and non-disadvantaged achieving 5A-C including E+M students was 10% smaller than the national gap. In 2014, the overall gap between disadvantaged vs all students nationally fell by 1%. In terms of capped best score, the in-academy gap is smaller than the National figure. The capped best score gap between disadvantaged students and other is better than the National picture by 29 points. Disadvantaged students in English narrowed the gap by 5% when looking at the in-academy performance. Disadvantaged students in Maths closed the gap by 9% from the previous year when compared to national for all students. The performance of disadvantaged students studying for the EBACC was 2% better than the gap nationally. In 2014, the gap in attendance between disadvantaged and non –disadvantaged students was smaller than the National gap by 1.8%. In 2014, the gap between PA disadvantaged and non –disadvantaged students was smaller than the National gap by 4.3%.”*

The PP statement also consists of factual information about PP numbers and income, and a list of expenditure which covers:

- Creation of a library to support Literacy across the curriculum.
- Increase in capacity for mentors and counsellors to support students with their needs.
- Appointment of Pastoral Lead to increase pastoral care within the academy.
- Appointment of Assistant Pastoral Lead to further increase pastoral care within the academy.
- Increased capacity of Teaching Assistants within subjects areas to support students’ intervention.
- Contributions to academy trips and enrichment activities locally and nationally to support learning and enhance social interaction.
- Appointment of an Assistant Vice Principal with responsibility for student progress.
- Appointment of a Literacy Lead teacher to further support the development of literacy skills across Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4.
- Purchase of a Reading Recovery programme.
- Appointment of an additional Teaching Assistant for reading recovery to ensure specific targeted intervention for those in most need.
- Appointment of an additional Associate Assistant Vice Principal to support English as an additional language.
- Appointment of an additional support teacher of English as an additional language.
- Provision of One to One and small group booster sessions in English and Maths for identified students in Year 11.
- Enhanced capacity for the attendance team to ensure all students are attending every day.

This list of activities and resources, have no reference to research evidence, such as the EEF/ Sutton Trust toolkit that would back up the choice of spend or to the intended impact of that spending.

Summary of academy’s existing areas of focus and strategies

Cedar Mount Academy is currently in Special Measures following an Ofsted inspection in April 2015. It has a number of significant areas requiring rapid improvement, but is clear that this will not be a quick turnaround. The community low aspirations, lack of ambition, and high levels of deprivation need careful but urgent consideration. Better parent relationships need building as a priority and the staff and students need to review the current motto “Growing Success and Achievement” to check that it adequately sums up the academy’s current and future thinking. The academy already uses Carol Dweck’s Growth Mindset, but this needs further development across all staff and indeed all students. Whilst some catchphrases may be meaningless the academy currently is lacking in a central, shared and well-understood hook, on which to build a campaign of raised aspirations. Staff also need to collectively model that positivity and belief in achievement for all students. The “can do” change of culture is key to sustainable change and a well-constructed and meaningful strapline, motto or mission statement, which quickly and easily sums up the new direction of travel, would be helpful.

There is very clearly a steep hill to climb to raise standards and levels of progress for all students, especially given national changes to curriculum and accountability measures. From the visit, the evidence suggests that this will need a very focused action plan, with some much higher expectations of all staff

and students and a building of belief that the job overall is do-able. This cannot be quickly fixed, but will need time to develop and embed. The Bright Futures Educational Trust will support the academy with governance, school improvement expertise and by brokering additional support. One particular East Midlands school, within the LeTS Alliance, with a similar context, an outstanding Ofsted category and an NLE Principal, would certainly be prepared to offer support and guidance, as well as practical methods to rapidly turn things round. If Cedar Mount would like the details these can be swiftly provided.

Its key improvement priorities from Ofsted are:

Improve the quality of teaching to at least good in order to raise achievement for students by ensuring that all teachers:

- Use the available information about students to plan and teach lessons that provide suitable challenge for all the students across the academy.
- **Frequently evaluate the rate of progress being made by individuals and groups of students during each lesson, so that students move on to more challenging work when they are ready or receive support if they need it.**
- Use questioning more effectively to problem, challenge, and deepen students' knowledge and understanding.
- Give clear direction to Teaching Assistants and other adults in the class to ensure they provide support to those students who need it the most.
- Consistently give student written feedback that clearly shows them what they need to do to reach higher levels and corrects errors in understanding, spelling, punctuation, and grammar.
- Give students opportunities to reflect on and respond to comments about their work and check that the improvements have been made.

Improve leadership, management and governance at all levels by:

- Ensuring the checks made on teaching, focus on the quality of learning and student's progress, and that leaders are suitable trained to support teachers to improve their practice.
- Providing opportunities for teachers to see and learn from the best teaching, in order that they can improve their own practise.
- **Ensuring that the assessment information to support teaching and learning is easily accessible, clear and well used to plan activities which promote good progress for all students.**
- Check on the implementation and impact of whole academy policies, especially the quality of marking and lesson planning.
- **Ensuring that the Pupil Premium funding is used effectively to close the gaps between disadvantaged students and others.**
- Ensuring that the governors hold leaders fully to account for the rates of improvement in teaching and student's achievement.

The academy action plan is being redrafted and the most recent version needs considerable further work. It was not clear how the entire plan is addressing Pupil Premium and disadvantage, as that sits currently as a separate section. Unambitious or vague targets are not addressing the need for more students to make four levels of progress, particularly in maths. Specific areas on PP lack detail and focus.

The academy's key focus aims are:

- 1 **Improve the quality of teaching to at least good in order to raise achievement for all students**
 - Objective: To provide a comprehensive CPD programme based on best practice
 - Objective: To ensure a consistent approach to effective lesson planning and best classroom practice
 - Objective: To ensure all staff are able to meet Ofsted Teaching and Learning areas for development
- 2 **Raise attainment and accelerate rates of progress for all groups of students, including KS4 English and Maths (OFSTED 2 and 4 Outcomes)**
 - Objective: To ensure there is a robust system of internal moderation to facilitate accurate assessment.

- Objective: Improve the data system that tracks student progress ensuring an effective data tracking system is in place and used to inform challenging targets.
 - Objective: To provide timely and effective interventions.
 - 3 Improve Behaviour, Safety and Attendance of Students across the Academy (OFSTED 3 Personal Development, Behaviour and Welfare)**
 - Objective: Ensure that behaviour management systems are used by staff
 - Objective: Improve the quality of behaviour and student engagement in lessons
 - Objective: Further reduce the number of exclusions
 - Objective: Continue to raise student attendance
 - 4 Improve leadership and management at all levels, including governance**
 - Objective: Ensure that the checks made on teaching, including, focus on the quality of learning and students' progress over time and that leaders are suitably trained to support teachers to improve their practice
 - Objective: Provide opportunities for teachers to see and learn from the best teaching in order that they can improve their own practice
 - Objective: Ensure that the assessment information to support teaching and learning is easily accessible, clear and consistently used
 - Objective: Check on the implementation and impact of whole school policies, especially the consistency of marking and lesson planning
 - Objective: Ensure that Governors hold leaders fully to account for the rates of improvement in teaching and students' achievement
 - Objective: Ensure the curriculum meets the needs of all pupils at KS3, KS4
 - Objective: Ensure there are effective programmes for the development of students' spiritual, moral, social and cultural understanding and British Values that impact well on the behaviour and attitudes of all students.
 - Objective: Ensure that pupil premium funding is used effectively to close gaps between disadvantaged pupils and other students
 - Objective: Ensure continuity in staffing
- Some comments on effectiveness of current plan:**
- Suggest on page 1 that you put, after the date, revised September 2015 and that you add something about the 2015 results in your opening paragraph.
 - Impact measures are generally weak, so for example to say that a map of good/best practice in place is achieved is insufficient as it is not impact merely completion of an action. The impact measure would be that teaching %s were 60% good or better by December 2015, and 75% in June 2016.
 - Objective 1.1 is full of actions but most of those could be bullet points in one row, rather than each having a separate row when the impact measures should be similar.
 - One impact measure talks about support for inadequate teaching and that needs to be tighter.
 - It would help if every aim was referenced again Pupil Premium outcomes in particular.
 - The Teaching and Learning section is very generalised.
 - In objective 1.3 if you are commissioning Teaching School support, how much when? For whom? And to do what? How will you measure impact rather than just a completed task?
 - What sort of evidence of progress tasks are you looking for? Be precise.
 - Key Aim 1 appears to have no impact measures at all.
 - In section 2 on attainment and progress, what do you mean by 'continue to improve assessment and tracking system'? If you are not precise how will you know if you have achieved it? Again, how will you measure impact rather than completion of tasks?
 - When you talk about progress of students having a positive trend, by how much and by when? How will you know if you are reaching milestones along the way?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Section 2 should have far more emphasis on Pupil Premium and precisely what you are going to do to reduce gaps. ○ Key aim 3 on behaviour shows the same issues with lack of precise SMART impact measures. What sort of reduction in behaviour incidents are you aiming for? What reduction in percentage of FTE are you intending to achieve and how will Mancunian Way be held accountable for their work? ○ In the section on raising student’s attendance the actions are generalised and there are no milestones or impact measures included at all. ○ The section on leadership and management is much more detailed and measureable and this should be evident throughout the plan. However, there is a lack of evidence in that section of reference to Pupil Premium. ○ The final section of the plan looks specifically at pupil premium and this is fine, but there should be linkage throughout the overall plan. <p>Some comments on effectiveness of revised plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Concern that you have few if any milestones include as measures along the way of what you have achieved. I also feel that the majority of your impact measures are not actually outcomes but are actions to complete. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● on p 4 Deployment of teaching assistants is an action but what is the outcome? ● on p 5 coaches completing their training is a completed action but what is the impact? ● On p 5 consistent measurable improvement in attendance and punctuality – by how much by when? ● on p7 there are no measures for behaviour improvements so how will you know whether you are making progress? How significant due you want the % changes to be? <p>Not commented on each item, rather on the general way the report is set out. Many of the original comments still apply.</p>	
<p>Summary of how effectively academy uses evidence to identify effective strategies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● What is clear is that there is no explicit PP strategy in the academy due to the extent and complexity of the challenges relating to staffing and the turbulence in senior leadership. It simply has not been a single priority. There is therefore no evidence that the Education Endowment Foundation’s evidence has yet informed any planning on PP because there has been no dedicated planning, with the exception of the draft part of the action plan, although certain features are being implemented this academic year. ● Some time ago, however, the academy had a group of staff engaged in the national Challenge the Gap project in a triad with Altrincham Girls Grammar School and a local primary. One of the key staff involved in the project was the current Head of Maths. This programme examined EEF research evidence and worked on building student resilience and academic literacy. Whilst the knowledge of this exists in pockets, it has not yet had a measurable impact across the school, largely due to staffing changes. ● From the research evidence available, feedback had been recognised last year to be a significant area for development and this is being systematically addressed through the academy. All staff had training at the beginning of this academic year (i.e. a week ago) in life after levels, which clearly linked educational activities to impact measures, such as feedback and meta cognition giving high impact of + 8 months, whereas setting giving low impact. Other areas are too newly introduced to note impact. New middle leaders, such as the new SL for English, will also need support to ensure that they fully understand what strategies will be most effective. ● Given the importance of community and parental “buy-in” the academy needs to consider further ways to involve parents in their children’s learning. Traditional subject based parents’ evenings, which are added to with progress meetings for year 7 and 11, do not draw in sufficient parents and therefore the timing, nature and structure of these need re-thinking. In addition other types of parental involvement opportunities need considering. 	
<p>Area of PP Review</p>	<p>Strengths</p>	<p>Areas for Development</p>
<p>Pupil Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>What is the overall number and proportion of PP eligible students</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The overall percentage of PP students is well above the National Average in every year group, generally being about 65% against NA of 28.5% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The academy should sharpen, even further, its explicit emphasis on PP attainment and progress in all its accountability measures including line management and monitoring meetings.

<p><i>within the whole academy population?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What is the two/three year pattern in eligibility for PP?</i> • <i>How well does the academy know the eligibility data and patterns?</i> • <i>What does the current data tell?</i> 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The academy should sharpen its focus on supporting its Low Ability students to make greater progress, as many of these are also PP. • Attendance of PP students is significantly worse than the academy's own non-PP students. Persistent absentees are also significantly more from PP backgrounds, although national patterns also reflect these differences. Nevertheless, attendance is an area for specific action in order that all students can attend school and achieve better progress and results. • Similarly fixed term exclusions overall are high, for PP and non PP students, and way above the NA. Reducing these is a priority.
<p>Achievement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>How well does the academy make use of evidence including the Education Endowment Foundation's toolkit?</i> • <i>Do evidence-based systems for evaluation of impact exist?</i> • <i>What is the progress of disadvantaged students relative to their starting points?</i> • <i>How quickly are attainment gaps for disadvantaged students closing compared to the national average?</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The nature of the academy means that there are high levels of deprivation, beyond those students who are eligible for PP. The PP cohort is therefore not a group, which is particularly distinct from other students. • Whilst some key members of staff are better informed, the academy has only just introduced staff to aspects of the EEF toolkit, around the issues and barriers facing disadvantaged students • Again this year there has been a strong emphasis placed on the impact of Teacher Feedback, but only one week into the new academy year it is difficult to measure any impact. • Work is being undertaken to establish a more consistent approach across the academy, both to the recording of assessment data and also to providing useful feedback to students on how to improve. • The Academy has recognised the need to focus on Key Stage 3 and have appointed a senior member of staff to create, and lead on, a clear strategy at Key Stage 3. This post holder also has the overall academy focus on Pupil Premium. • This newly appointed AVP is well versed in Sutton Trust/ EEF evidence on impact of various strategies on disadvantaged students. He will provide strong challenge. It is clear that he will provide strong challenge, and follow up, after each Assessment Day and it is highly likely that this will lead to improved attainment and achievement of PP students. • The Academy has joined PIXL to support strategies for incremental improvement in standards. • 2015 showed increased expected progress levels in Maths • The academy has developed a dedicated team, consisting of Progress Leaders (teachers) and Assistant Progress Leaders (non-teachers) to extend support to students and act as academic mentors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is fair to say that reducing the PP gap has not been enough of a priority across the academy, but this is largely because standards themselves are too low across the board. • As already mentioned the attainment gap between the academy and national attainment remains substantial and is now a real priority for the academy. • RAISEonline indicates that in 2014 the academy was well below the national average for Best 8 Value Added at 957.6 but FSM students were well below the National Average on 939.3 [NA of 1000] whereas non PP students were at 1000.6. • There needs to be a sharp focus, at all levels, particularly with class teachers, on the attainment and progress of all students, but especially PP. The new life after levels matrix, being implemented by the academy this term, tracking students' progress from emerging to mastery, will be another tool to raise aspirations', as long as it is widely and consistently applied. • The academy needs to accelerate its emerging focus on attainment and progress lower down the academy, particularly with PP students, and ensure that relevant leaders are involved in implementing, and monitoring, key actions follow evaluation of the data at Assessment Days • Senior Leaders might want to look at ways of strengthening the visual representation of student progress so that it is even clearer, to teachers, middle leaders and students, who is meeting, exceeding and not meeting targets. • The academy needs to maintain, and build on, consciousness-raising amongst classroom staff about the significance of disadvantage, including research evidence on typical outcomes for disadvantaged young people. There needs to be a clearer, and more explicit, understanding of the barriers PP students face in their learning.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the Progress Tutor's focuses is to hold intervention sessions for GCSE students; although as this began during the last term of the last academic year it would have been too quick to have an impact. The Progress Tutor's intervention sessions hold mainly hold a Maths and Science focus. • Part of the Assistant Progress Mentor's job role is to provide homework clubs before, during and after academy. • This year Cedar Mount will associate each of the students with a mentor, consulting the students to determine the preferences of mentors. • The academy have rebranded and redirected 'tutor time', with tutors and students now utilising the tutor period as 'progress time', thus utilising this period for learning. • Progress tutors for Year 10 and 11 students are allocated a Math or English teacher as their tutor. • The tutor time scheduled for the afternoon period enables the academy to extend English and Maths lessons for year 11 students, providing them with an hour and a half intensive lesson of English or Maths. This is effective as long as there are dedicated subject teachers available and not supply staff. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be useful to continue development of the most effective feedback systems. • Use of flight paths in books would help students track their own progress • The academy is currently producing extensive amounts of data and trying to tackle attainment and progress on several fronts. This is complex, time and energy consuming and not always easy to manage and ensure impact • The academy might want to invest some further thinking time in finding ways of working 'smarter not harder.' • A significant number of students are currently educated offsite in Alternative Provision placements and many of these students historically achieve no GCSE qualifications. The academy needs to address this as a matter of urgency. • The academy should also give mere consideration to setting policies in core subjects. In English, in particular, research suggests that better learning might be achieved through broadly mixed ability groups.
<p>Leadership and Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>How well does the academy make use of evidence including the EEF toolkit?</i> • <i>Do evidence-based systems for evaluation of impact exist?</i> • <i>How effectively does the academy identify priorities for PP funding?</i> • <i>How well matched are the academy's strategies with the perceived barriers to learning for disadvantaged students?</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The original governing body for Cedar Mount Academy has been disbanded, following the academy's SM Ofsted categorisation. Bright Futures Educational Trust appointed an Academy Improvement Board, made up of two Trust Co-Principals and an ex-Local Authority director The SIB provides dedicated, flexible support to the EH and the Leadership Team and helps to promote and embed sustainable academy-led improvement throughout the academy. The SIB will do this by ensuring that the academy's action plan is fit for purpose, reassurance systems are effectively implemented, and will actively participate in academy operations. • The SIB have an expected lifespan of twelve months, after which they intend to re-establish a governing body made up of the right people with the right skills. Jenny Andrews, Chair of the SIB, believes that failure of the historic governing body to be in part caused from sporadic attendance of membership and failure to examine subcommittee issues. • The Senior Leadership Team is determined to accelerate the academy's efforts to improve overall attainment and progress, and to intensify the drive to close the PP gap. To this end they have just implemented a new QA monitoring schedule with individualised student tracking, attention to action, follow up and impact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SEF and Academy Action Plan are currently in draft form. The Action plan is currently far too vague and needs tighter impact measures and more thought about the timing and monitoring of tasks. Appraisal targets the need to fit with the academy's overall objectives especially around student progress. • Given the level of funding provided by the PP Grant, and the extent of the PP gap, this now needs to be a higher priority. All agendas and monitoring meetings need to include discussion of PP students. • The SIB needs to ensure that there is an agreed protocol for monitoring the use and impact of the PP Grant as an item on every agenda • The SLT and SIB need to agree a series of monitoring questions to be answered after each Assessment capture e.g. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 How does the attainment of PP students compare to non – PP students in each year group [where appropriate] 2 How does the progress of PP students compare to non-PP students in each group? 3 Do we have any underperforming PP students and how are we using the PP Grant to support them? 4 Are PP students doing relatively better in some subjects than others? 5 Where the greatest PP gaps and what are are we doing to close them? 6 How does PP attendance compare with non-PP attendance?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>How ambitious are the targets for disadvantaged students?</i> • <i>How does the academy divide its use of funding between activities which have a clear and direct impact on student progress and those which focused on providing wider opportunities or meeting social/emotional needs?</i> • <i>How effective are the strategies used and how does the academy evaluate them?</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senior leaders have a high level of professional honesty and are not flinching from tackling underperformance where it exists, however this does take time and they need to find ways of accelerating action where they can. • Whilst the academy only has an emerging policy of using EEF evidence this is having an impact and is likely to lead to improvement to the Progress Gap and possibly to the Attainment Gap for 2016. • Whilst Maths showed better levels of progress than English in the 2015 exams, there is still a major area of challenge for the academy, given the gap with national averages. The Head of Faculty has just returned from a significant illness and whilst she is extremely focused, knowledgeable and able, she has serious issues of understaffing to contend with. • There are currently only 3 dedicated maths expert teachers and a number of long-term supply teachers. Re-advertisements are planned but there is severe shortage of maths expertise locally. • The Principal has introduced a regular QA meeting cycle, which considers individual students' performance and achievement data. The meeting, which is made up of the Principal, co-principal, deputy-principal – Pupil Premium lead, heads of departments, progress leaders, and assistant progress leaders, occurs fortnightly. Student referrals for Mancunian Way are also decided upon at this meeting. • Both Maths/English leaders shared the reasons for the achievement data and gap between PP students in their departments. The English SL is only just in post and cited syllabus changes and entry policies, and lack of consistency as some of the key issues last year. • There are plans to support PP students in both core subjects with the purchase of resources such as revision guides, exam papers and literature texts, and in Maths physical resources to support mastery. • There is a plan to more actively engage with PP parents to inform them of all the help and resources which is available for their children and find out the barriers to their learning. • There is a big push on improving whole academy literacy. The lack of a school library has been addressed over the summer. • Cedar Mount Academy is introducing this year a student leadership team. Consisting of approximately 10 students, they will help give ownership, and help drive standards throughout the academy and student body. 	<p>7 How does PP exclusions compare with non-PP exclusions?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently the academy has very few strategies, which are targeted specifically at PP students. Several interventions are funding by the PP Grant but these are used to support all students. Given the high percentage of PP students this may still adequately address support and accelerate the attainment and progress of PP students, but the academy must not forget to analyse that data accordingly to check. • It would be useful for the academy to collate all the strategies being used at departmental level and evaluate which are the most effective in having impact so that those can be consistently applied across the curriculum. • The PP statement on the website, shows that PP funding expenditure in 2013/2014 was not clearly linked to identified barriers and priorities. Going forward, there needs to be a clear plan for how PP resources will be allocated and must be linked to identified barriers. The chosen activities need to be based on evidence and research e.g. The Sutton Trust EEF Toolkit, PP Awards website, Ofsted documentation etc. There also needs to be a clear indication in how the impact of the chosen activities to overcome the barriers will be measured and what the successful outcomes will look like. The impact should be measured on a regular basis and if no impact is evident, then the nature of the activity should be modified. • There needs to be a more transparent and effective evaluation process which leads to action for further improvement where required. Having a detailed and focused PP plan would a good starting point. • The academy might want to scrutinise PP statements of academies which have a similar context, but which have been judged to be Good or Outstanding, in order to find good practice in relation to PP strategies. • As a longer term strategy the academy may wish to consider including aspects of PP attainment and progress as a specific Performance Management Objective for all staff, relevant to their status and role. This might include staff having named students in order to sharpen focus on accelerated progress for key identified students. • The academy should consider setting more ambitious targets for PP students in order to improve attainment and accelerate progress. Currently there is discussion at setting 4 levels of Progress for students, especially PP students in order to draw teachers' attention to the need to accelerate their progress. • The academy must ensure that the SEF and the academy improvement plan have a sharper focus on PP students.
---	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The academy should map the profile of the PP students for the next five years e.g. how many boys, girls, SEND, abilities, reading ages, CATs scores etc. and use this information to target resources and plan ahead. • Although work sampling to look at the quality of feedback has been planned by collecting in books, it would be recommended to do this in-situ with the student so that the impact of teaching on their learning and progress can be accurately evaluated. • The academy should increase the rigour of its accountability processes and ensure that subject leaders and teachers are being held more sharply to account and data is being used more effectively to establish dips and gaps across the PP cohort. E.g. Through regular SLT line management meetings to discuss achievement in each department and setting appraisal targets for PP students, which is based on four levels of progress. • There needs to be a clearer, and more explicit, understanding of the barriers PP students face in their learning. • Performance Management ought to be introduced for these key support staff who have responsibility for a significant number of students in a year group through their group intervention work. • There needs to be an even stronger emphasis on consistently good Quality First Teaching.
<p>Teaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>How well do class teachers plan for disadvantaged student within lessons and for targeted interventions?</i> • <i>How effective are teaching assistants in implementing strategies and raising attainment and progress of disadvantaged students?</i> • <i>Are parents/carers and multi-professionals involved in these discussions?</i> • <i>How well does the academy plan for, and</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning Walks to Year 11 Maths and English classrooms showed generally good learning taking place and good behaviour. Subject knowledge of contracted staff was good, but many maths lessons were being delivered through supply teachers. • A new MINT classroom planning system has just been put into place, which will allow for a more sophisticated way of refining seating plans using key data. • Staff interviewed are clear that there is a much calmer start to the year and a sense of optimism around improving teaching and learning and that much work is being done at all levels to increase consistency across the academy. There is a yearning for greater stability, and for clear leadership, which is consistent and sustained. • There is improving evidence of systems for formative feedback to students, communication of targets, tracking progress across the Assessment points. Feedback consistency is being achieved through simple green written feedback from staff and red feedback responses for students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several staff interviewed identified the academy's main obstacles to further improvement as a previous lack of consistency and current recruitment issues, especially in maths. • The academy should therefore intensify all its efforts on achieving greater consistency across all curriculum areas and with all staff. It might be helpful to identify a more explicit finite list of 'non-negotiables' or golden rules for classrooms that constitute the Cedar Mount way of teaching which are based on research evidence of effectiveness and impact. The academy is already exploring this including using a 4 part lesson plan. • The academy needs to ensure that class teachers are actively engaging with, and acting upon, the data the academy provides on individual students, particularly PP students. Currently there is no sense that this is being monitored at classroom level. • The academy needs to continue to increase its efforts to ensure consistency of approach in relation to feedback and communication of targets.

<p><i>achieve, Quality First Teaching for disadvantaged students?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Where out-of-lesson interventions take place, how does the academy evaluate impact?</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is clear that staff are working hard to improve practice including their use of questioning, their feedback to students, their challenging to students to be more active learners • There is evidence of staff planning for differentiation within their lessons to ensure that PP students are making good progress along with all students but there is not a specific emphasis on PP students through the academy. • It is clear that most staff are determined to get the best outcomes for their students and understand the sense of urgency, but they may not all be fully committed to achievement for all and may use the schools context as an excuse for low performance. They all need to focus on picking up the pace. • There is significant use of other adults outside, and within the classroom to lead specific intervention programmes for students who are underachieving but there is not a specific PP focus. • Good examples of feedback and response to marking were seen in some lessons, where students had understood the feedback and spent time correcting their work and as a result progress in learning had moved along. However, the quality of feedback in class books varied and the response to this was not always evident. As a result, it held back the progress of some students, as they were not entirely sure exactly what they had to do improve as the feedback was too generic. In contrast, where it was of high quality, the students were acting on feedback, the teacher was using it to provide further follow up work to help master concepts and as a result the students were able to articulate their understanding and demonstrate good progress. Verbal feedback when requested by the student was identified as being helpful as it allowed the student to move on their learning when they hadn't understood a concept in class. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As stated above this needs to be addressed. For example it would not be difficult to do a Work Scrutiny, which focused entirely on PP students of all abilities. • The academy could consider improving progress across various groups, including PP, by identifying a cohort of students with overlapping characteristics and consider how best to teach and accelerate the progress of those students e.g. White British, FSM boys with Low or Middle Ability For example the academy could look at the very considerable research evidence on what works for accelerating boys' achievement and consider introducing some effective strategies for improving boys' progress into its Teaching and Learning practice in order to have an indirect impact on PP achievement.
<p>Behaviour and Safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>How well is the academy using the PP Grant to support students to develop positive attitudes to learning and a thirst for knowledge across all learning contexts?</i> • <i>Where support is focused on wider issues</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ofsted recognised this as being also inadequate, with poor attendance and highly variable attitudes to learning. On learning walks to Year 11 classes behaviour was good but low numbers of students present in some classes suggest attendance is still an issue. Attitudes to learning, even when with supply teachers were at least satisfactory. • There is a very strong commitment from the academy to supporting students and to removing barriers to learning. • Pastoral staff have a very comprehensive system for recording interventions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The academy needs to consider how well it uses PP funding to support students in developing positive attitudes to learning as it is not clear how this is happening at the moment although there are undoubtedly positive attitudes in many students. • Despite many positives in relation to Behaviour and Safety it is hard to gauge how well the academy is using the PP Grant to support students in developing positive attitudes to learning because there is no clear data or monitoring of this area of work. There is no system for monitoring the impact of the various support strategies the academy uses.

<p><i>in students' and their families' lives, and/or to widen opportunity, is there evidence that this support is improving engagement and contributing to closing performance gaps?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress Leaders are now expected to monitor and support students' academic progress as well as social and emotional aspects of their academy life. • Throughout the review references to behaviour demonstrated that a strategic approach to dealing with behaviour had been communicated to staff and that staff are beginning to have a standardised approach to dealing with behaviour. • The academy have enlisted the help of external organisation <u>Mancunian Way</u>, who are supporting the academy with individual students, to challenge poor behaviour and support students to achieve and grow. • BFET have provided the academy access to a TASS team, who include an Educational Psychologist and Speech and Language Therapist to help support and deal with the high number of EAL students and behavioural issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The academy should consider how they can monitor the impact of support strategies so that the SIB and the Academy Trust can be confident that PP funding is being well spent. • The PP statement indicates that a proportion of the salaries of key members of staff is paid for out of the PP Grant. There needs to be greater transparency around how much of these posts are funded through the PP Grant, and what impact this has on the behaviour and attendance of PP students. • The academy should amend the PP Statement so that there is greater clarity about spending on staffing, linked to research and impact measures. • The academy should review the roles of those staff funded through PP Grant to ensure that there is specific and measurable impact on the attainment and progress of PP students. • The academy needs to have a clearer system of monitoring the quality and impact of the work of the progress Mentors and other support staff. • The academy should revise its use of exclusion and review the support it provides students at risk of exclusion with, particularly PP students at risk of exclusion. • The academy needs to review staff arrangements in order to be confident that the balance is right between activities and strategies which have a clear and direct impact on pupil progress and those which focus on providing wider opportunities to meet social and/or emotional needs.
<p>Evaluation of impact of PPG</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>How well is PP funding used to:</i> • <i>Ensure Quality First Teaching and above expected progress?</i> • <i>Support effective interventions?</i> • <i>Widen opportunity?</i> • <i>What support can the reviewer offer for action planning and on-going monitoring of the plan?</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The academy, with new leadership, governance arrangements and staffing is now in a better position to move forward to improve the attainment and progress of PP students. • The Co-Principals and new AVP post holder for PP and KS3 are fully aware of Sutton Trust EEF research and impact measures and realise that much more needs to be done to link planned actions and deployment of resources to those areas which research suggests will have the maximum impact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is very little current evidence that the PP grant is being particularly directed at PP students, but given that 2/3 of all students are in this broad category, all deployments of resources will inevitably affect the majority of PP students. • The rigorous deployment and evaluation of the PP grant has not yet been a priority for the academy, given its recent issues. The newly appointed AVP will however lead on this far more rigorously. • The new SIB needs to have a much sharper focus on this significant area of expenditure and its impact. • There needs to be clear lines of responsibility in relation to Pupil Premium students, their outcomes and the deployment of the PP Grant to ensure they are making good or better progress than Non-PP students. This could be helped by ensuring the new VP has control of the full PP budget. • There needs to be a greater focus on PP students making greater than expected progress.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There needs to be a review of the balance between Quality First Teaching and Intervention Strategies as there appears to be an imbalance in PP expenditure in favour of Intervention possibly at the expense of developing and support Quality First Teaching.

Date of Review:Wednesday 9th September 2015**Reviewer:**Carolyn Robson CBE
Executive Principal and NLE
Rushey Mead School