



Pupil premium strategy statement

1. Summary information					
School	Rushcliffe School				
Academic Year	2017/18	Total PP budget	£167,780	Date of most recent PP Review	n/a
Total number of pupils	1286	Number of pupils eligible for PP	184	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Jan 2019

2. Current attainment	
	<i>Pupils eligible for PP (your school)</i>
% achieving 9-4 in EM	64%
% achieving 9-5 in EM	38%
% achieving expected progress in English / Maths	46% / 50%
Progress 8 score average	-0.11
Attainment 8 score average	43.1

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP including high ability)	
<i>In-school barriers (issues to be addressed in school, such as poor literacy skills)</i>	
A.	Literacy skills entering Year 7 are lower for some pupils eligible for PP than for other non PP pupils, which prevents them from making good progress in Year 7 and beyond.
B.	Some pupils who are eligible for PP are making less progress than other pupils across KS3 and KS4.
C.	Behaviour and attitude to learning issues for a small group of PP pupils is having detrimental effect on their academic progress.
D.	Wider experiences/opportunities to develop personal and social skills and to build resilience could be limited.
<i>External barriers (issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)</i>	
E.	Attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP are 94% (below the target for all children of 96%. This reduces their school hours and causes them to fall behind on average.

F.	Emotional issues and low self-esteem impact on learning.
-----------	--

4. Outcomes		
	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>
A.	Higher levels of progress in literacy for targeted Year 7 and Year 8 pupils eligible for PP.	Targetted pupils eligible for PP in Year 7 and 8 make some progress in literacy ability by the end of the year they receive interevntion. This will be evidenced using accelerated reader assessments in December, March and June.
B.	Improved rates of progress across KS3 and KS4 for all pupils eligible for PP.	Pupils eligible for PP make as much progress as 'other' non PP students nationally, across Key Stage 3 and 4, so that PP students have a positive progress 8 or are on or above target in KS3. Where they are not appropriate interventions are put in place and monitored by heads of Faculty (HOF) and senior leadership team (SLT). All high ability students engaging with Ambition nottingham programme.
C.	Behavioural issues of targeted students improves.	Fewer behaviour incidents recorded for these pupils on the school system
D.	Increased social capital within PP cohort.	All PP students benefit from at least one additional cultural experience. Y9 and Y10 D of E groups running.
E.	Increased attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP.	Reduce the number of persistent absentees (PA) among pupils eligible for PP. Overall attendance among pupils eligible for PP improves from 94% to 96% in line with school target.
F.	Improved emotional and self-esteem across targeted PP students.	Reduce the number of persistent absentees (PA) among targeted pupils. Overall attendance among targeted pupils eligible for PP improves.

5. Planned expenditure

Academic year **2017/18**

The three headings below enable schools to demonstrate how they are using the Pupil Premium to improve classroom pedagogy, provide targeted support and support whole school strategies.

i. Quality of teaching for all

Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
A. Improved Year 7 and 8 literacy progress for targeted PP students.	<p>CPD on using Accelerated Reader effectively and time allowance given to deliver and administer use of AR.</p> <p>Learning links and some Spanish lessons used to further develop literacy skills of those PP with weakest literacy skills. Extra classes generated for these groups of students.</p>	<p>Accelerated Reader was shown to have a positive impact in an independent evaluation.</p> <p>Education Endowment Foundation toolkit cites evidence that suggests that improving literacy skills has a very high impact on achievement for a relative low cost.</p>	<p>KFN to oversee resources and scheme development with lead for learning links and Spanish to ensure that content is delivered with a focus on literacy.</p> <p>KFN to lead on AR and implementation.</p>	KFN	December, March and June 2018/19

Total budgeted cost £10,500

ii. Targeted support

Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
------------------------	-------------------------------	--	--	-------------------	---

A. Improved Year 7 and 8 literacy progress	Learning links and some Spanish lessons used to further develop literacy skills of those PP with weakest literacy skills. Extra classes generated for these groups of students.	Some of the students need targeted literacy support to catch up. This is a programme which has been independently evaluated and shown to be effective in other schools.	Organise timetable to ensure staff delivering provision have sufficient preparation and delivery time. Data tracking of these students to show impact of the programme. KFN to coordinate strategy and to liaise with parents.	KFN	Jun 19
B. Improved progress for PP pupils across KS3 and KS4	In class Support for targeted students and suitable small group interventions set up either during registration or during core PE time. KS3/4 mentors to run ambition Nottingham programme.	Education Endowment Foundation toolkit cites evidence that suggests that small group tuition and in-class support with highly qualified staff are known to be effective. We want to combine this additional provision with some 'aspiration' interventions such as mentoring from inspirational teachers to have a high impact on achievement.	Extra teaching time and preparation time paid for out of PP budget, not sought on a voluntary basis. Engage with parents and pupils before intervention begins to address any concerns. Track data in English and maths at AP1-3. HOFs to observe sessions and provide feedback / support.	Assistant Head	Jun 19
E. Increased attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP. F. Improved emotional and self-esteem across targeted PP students.	Highly qualified staff delivering core subjects (Science, English and Maths) to our most vulnerable students in our inclusion unit, the OC.	Again the Education Endowment Foundation toolkit cites evidence that suggests that small group tuition with highly qualified staff is known to be effective. We want to remain inclusive and educate our most vulnerable students here at Rushcliffe.	CPD for teachers to ensure that they are fully equipped for the challenge of working with these students. HBE/SLT to observe sessions and provide feedback / support. Student's data tracked at AP1-3.	Assistant Head and HBE.	Jun 19
Total budgeted cost					£85,000
iii. Other approaches					
Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
C. Problem behaviour of targeted students addressed E. Increased attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP.	Identify a targeted intervention for identified students.	The EEF Toolkit suggests that targeted interventions matched to specific students with particular needs or behavioural issues can be effective.	Ensure identification of pupils is fair, transparent and properly recorded. Monitor behaviour using achievement and behaviour points but also monitor whether improvements in behaviour translate into improved attainment and attendance.	Assistant Head	Jun 19

F. Improved emotional and self-esteem across targeted PP students.					
E. Increased attendance rates	Attendance Co-ordinator employed to monitor pupils and follow up quickly on truancies. First day response provision.	We can't improve attainment for children if they aren't actually attending school. NfER briefing for school leaders identifies addressing attendance as a key step.	AC, Assistant Head for PP, PP mentor and HOY will collaborate to ensure appropriate intervention are put into place such as same day calls, reduced timetable integration programme and or mentor assigned.	Assistant Head and AC	Jun 19
F. Improved emotional and self-esteem across targeted PP students.	PP students given access to school councillor and school careers advisor.	The EEF Toolkit suggests that aspirational interventions or other specific interventions matched to specific students with particular needs or behavioural issues can be effective.	Assistant Head teacher to ensure that whenever possible PP have priority access to support.		
D. Increased social capital within PP cohort.	PP students given free uniform, specialised equipment and free educational visits for most non-residential school trips.	The EEF Toolkit suggests that social and motivational interventions can have an impact on achievement.	Teaching staff made aware of school policy.		
Total budgeted cost					£75,500

6. Review of expenditure				
Previous Academic Year		2017-18		
i. Quality of teaching for all				
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost
A. Improved Year 7 literacy progress	Learning links and some Spanish lessons used to further develop literacy skills of those PP with weakest literacy skills. Extra classes generated for these groups of students.	<i>Mixed:</i> Most students made some progress and managed to close the gap with their non-PP peers. However not all students engaged with the process into year 8.	Tracking of literacy progress using AR was more robust than ever before but more needs to be done to ensure that the tracking is used to identify underperformance and that interventions are coordinated and put into place across these smaller groups to address any lack of progress. Continue with provision.	Cost for teacher to lead. Training on improving AR effectiveness and to buy licences for AR £10,500.
ii. Targeted support				
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost
A. Improved Year 7 and 8 literacy progress	Learning links and some Spanish lessons used to further develop literacy skills of those PP with weakest literacy skills. Extra classes generated for these groups of students.	<i>Mixed:</i> Most students made some progress and managed to close the gap with their non-PP peers. However not all students engaged with the process into year 8.	Tracking of literacy progress using AR was more robust than ever before but more needs to be done to ensure that the tracking is used to identify underperformance and that interventions are coordinated and put into place across these smaller groups to address any lack of progress. Continue with provision.	Cost for additional teaching staff to provide smaller literacy groups across Learning Links and Spanish £25,000.

B. Improved progress for PP pupils across KS3 and KS4	In class Support for targeted students and suitable small group interventions set up either during registration or during core PE time. KS3/4 mentors to run ambition Nottingham programme.	High. PP students in Year 11 achieved 64% 9-4 in E&M and a progress 8 score of -0.05 which is comparable with non-PP students nationally. There is now a four year trend of improvement in the percentage of PP students achieving a standard pass in both English and Maths and in the overall Progress 8 score for disadvantaged students. In KS3 all year groups have been predicted to achieve higher levels of progress in English and Mathematics than FFTD target data suggests.	We need to make sure that all targeted students attend these interventions. Extend interventions beyond core subjects. More QA to check that the quality of each provision. Continue with provision.	Cost for additional teaching staff to provide smaller group teaching or in class support with highly skilled teachers. £25,000.
E. Increased attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP. F. Improved emotional and self-esteem across targeted PP students.	Highly qualified staff delivering core subjects (Science, English and Maths) to our most vulnerable students in our inclusion unit, the OC.	High. PP students accessing this provision managed to stay in school and complete some exams. All Y11 PP students leaving school who had received OC intervention had an educational, employment or training place to attend.	We need to provide more CPD for teachers to ensure that they are fully equipped for the challenge of working with these students.	Cost for additional teaching staff to provide core subject teaching at OC and OC management £37,000.

iii. Other approaches

Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost
C. Problem behaviour of targeted students addressed E. Increased attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP. F. Improved emotional and self-esteem across targeted PP students.	Identify a targeted intervention for identified students.	Medium. Most students receiving mentoring either had an improvement in behaviour, attendance or achievement by the end of the intervention period.	We need to start using SIMs to record the vast variety of interventions used across the school for each PP student so that we can better judge the impact of each intervention and help decide which interventions are most appropriate for each student. Continue with provision.	Cost of two PP mentors in KS3 and KS4 and contribution to TA mentoring SEND PP students and OC mentors working with PP mentors. £59,000.
E. Increased attendance rates	Attendance Co-ordinator employed to monitor pupils and follow up quickly on trancies. First day response provision.	High. PP attendance rates at 94% compared to whole school target of 96%.	Continue with provision.	Contribution to cost of employing AO. £6,000

F. Improved emotional and self-esteem across targeted PP students.	PP students given access to school councillor and school careers advisor.	High. PP attendance rates at 94% compared to whole school target of 96%. All Y11 PP in Education, employment or training when leaving Rushcliffe.	Continue with provision.	Contribution to cost of employing councillor and careers advisor. £6,000.
D. Increased social capital within PP cohort.	PP students given free uniform, specialised equipment and free educational visits for most non-residential school trips.	High. PP attendance rates at 94% compared to whole school target of 96%.	Continue with provision.	Cost of paying for school uniform, essential equipment and for school trips. £9,297.