Annex 2c: Pupil premium strategy statement (primary)

1. Summary information					
School	Rookery School				
Academic Year	2016/17	**Total PP budget**	**£273,265**	**Date of most recent PP Review**	
Total number of pupils	480	**Number of pupils eligible for PP**	128	**Date for next internal review of this strategy**	

The Progress of Disadvantaged Pupils was a strength in the KS2 tests 2016 (evidenced by the Inspection Dashboard 2016)

2. Current attainment				
Y6 test data 2016	All pupils Rookery	Rookery DP	National	Rookery Boys
Reading	**100.1**	**99.5**	**103**	**98.7**
Writing	**104**	**102**	**104**	**102.5**
Maths	**103.3**	**102**	**103**	**101.6**
Y6 test data 2016 %	**%** At National Rookery (main school)	**%** At National Rookery DP	% At National	% At National Rookery Boys
Reading	**55**	**46**	**66**	**46**
Writing	**68**	**75**	**74**	**64**
EGPS	**77**	**71**	**72**	**64**
Maths	**68**	**64**	**70**	**68**

Rookery Progress scores Y2- Y6 2016	Rookery	Rookery DP		National	Rookery Boys
Rookery has all <u>positive</u> progress scores so our children have done better at KS2 than those children with similar prior attainment nationally.		Main School	Main School +Base		
Reading	**+1.5**	**+1.6**	**+0.8**	**0**	**+0.7**
Writing	**+2.5**	**+2.9**	**+2.4**	**0**	**+2.5**
Maths	**+3.4**	**+3.1**	**+2.6**	**0**	**+3.6**

"In judging achievement, inspectors will give most weight to pupils' progress. They will take account of pupils' starting points in terms of their prior attainment and age when evaluating progress. Within this, they will give most weight to the progress of pupils currently in the school, taking account of how this compares with the progress of recent cohorts, where relevant."

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)	
In-school barriers *(issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills)*	
A.	Poor fluency skills with mathematical facts, poor reasoning skills, poor understanding of language
B.	Weak de-coding, weak speech and language skills, weak application of grammar in reading and writing.
C.	Ineffective engagement of pupil premium boys across the curriculum.
External barriers *(issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)*	
D.	Lack of support for home reading.

4. Desired outcomes *(Desired outcomes and how they will be measured)*		**Success criteria**
A.	Higher attainment in Maths for PP children to close the gap with all pupils nationally	
B.	Higher attainment in Reading for PP children to close the gap with all pupils nationally	
C.	Improved outcomes for PP boys in reading, writing, EGPS and maths.	
D.	PP children become independent home readers.	

5. Planned expenditure						
Academic year	**2016/2017**					
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**	**Costs**	**Staff lead**	**When will you review implementation?**
A	**Embed the use of the Rising Stars Maths Scheme**	Progress and attainment during initial implementation significant (ex Y3/Y5) Lesson obs. indicate improving subject knowledge in developing conceptual understanding Lesson obs. indicate better assessment in moving children who are “below” to “at”	Appraisal target Monitoring and moderation systems	Maths Scheme £5000 CPD £18000 (in total) –Maths, RWI, Colmore visits, Senco Standards,	Appraisal Team Maths Subject Leader PHT EB	Continually through monitoring and moderation systems Half- termly meetings Maths Reviews February 2017 June 2017
B	**Promote a love of reading** **Improve children’s vocabulary** through RWI , ECAT ,York Reading Project(YRP) Intervention Dialogical Teaching Improve application of grammar for reading and writing using whole school prompts, YRP intervention	Independent reading impeding the development of fluency and speed RWI /ECAT language layering successful in improving written outcomes and speaking and listening York project successful in supporting TA intervention Dialogical teaching project improved speaking and listening and has potential for assessment for learning GLS and End of Key Stage Tests indicate poor understanding at sentence level and weakness in constructing answers	Appraisal target Monitoring and moderation systems	Books £5000 RWI £5000 Speech and Language £24000 CPD £18000 (as above)	Appraisal Team English Subject Leaders AHTs PHT DL	Continually through monitoring and moderation systems Half- termly meetings English Reviews December 2016 April 2017

C	**Improved engagement of boys** through: pastoral support, better personalisation of learning, more appropriate curriculum and materials	Boys underperforming compared to girls (except y1) Pastoral support and PSPs are proven to develop resilience and engagement Adaptation of curriculum successful in Reception	Appraisal target Monitoring and moderation systems	Pastoral staff £60,853 Sports leader £9000 Sports and Arts director to improve boys curriculum in FS £34000 GL standardised test £9000 LM £27,412 Y4 /Y6 intervention £33000 Y3 intervention £33000 Special projects £5000 Artist in residence £5000 CPD –as above	Appraisal Team English and Maths Subject Leaders AHTs PHTs EB/DL	Continually through monitoring and moderation systems Half- termly meetings English Reviews December 2016 April 2017 Maths Reviews February 2017 June 2017

D	**Teachers to ensure that parents promote independent reading at home** through: Parental workshops Effective communication with parents Reward system Pastoral support	PP children making slower progress and attaining lower than other pupils	Appraisal target Monitoring and moderation systems	Pastoral staff £60,853 (as above) CPD £18000 (as above)	Appraisal Team English Subject Leaders AHTs Pastoral Manager PHTs EB/DL	Continually through monitoring and moderation systems Half- termly meetings English Reviews December 2016 April 2017
					Total DP budgeted cost 2016/2017	**£273,265**

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?**
PP maths attainment in line with all pupils nationally	Intervention teacher Learning mentor support Specialist art/ music/ PE /outdoor ed. teaching	Successful strategy academic year 2015/2016 Some success academic year 2015/2016 Successful strategy 2015/2016	AHTs EYFS KS1 KS2 AHT ASC base Curriculum Leader	DHT PHTs DHT PHTs DHT PHTs	November 2016 February 2017 May 2017
PP reading and EGPS attainment in line with all pupils nationally	Intervention teacher Learning mentor support Specialist art/ music/ PE /outdoor ed. teaching	Successful strategy academic year 2015/2016 Some success academic year 2015/2016 Successful strategy 2015/2016	AHTs EYFS KS1 KS2 AHT ASC base Curriculum Leader	DHT PHTs DHT PHTs DHT PHTs	November 2016 February 2017 May 2017
PP boys engage better in the curriculum	Learning mentor support Specialist art/ music/ PE /outdoor ed. teaching	Successful strategy academic year 2015/2016 Some success academic year 2015/2016 Successful strategy 2015/2016	AHTs EYFS KS1 KS2 AHT ASC base Curriculum Leader	DHT PHTs DHT PHTs DHT PHTs	November 2016 February 2017 May 2017

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?**

Ensure equality of opportunity	Further CPD of protected characteristics in Jigsaw scheme Curriculum monitoring of RE	Jigsaw programme taught over last year; lessons and books indicated pupils were aware of issues. Further subject knowledge of links needed More confidence and self- knowledge of all staff needs developeing	Training will be led by well – qualified experts in the scheme	DHT EP Pastoral Phase Leaders Pastoral Manager Curriculum Leader	RE / Jigsaw outcomes half-termly Impact of Jigsaw training May /June /July 2017
Raise the aspirations of pupils through a study of invention and innovation	Local history project with Secret City Arts	WW1 project had a wide impact on the whole school community More teachers to observe methods used by Secret City Arts	Evaluation by Secret City Arts for Lottery/ English Heritage Funding	Curriculum Leader	July 2017

6. Review of expenditure				
Previous Academic Year				
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**
			For approaches which did not meet their success criteria, it is important to assess whether you will continue allocating funding and if, so, why.	
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**

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**

7. Additional detail
In this section you can annex or refer to **additional** information which you have used to support the sections above.