

Pupil premium strategy statement: The Cooper School 2017/18

1.Summary information					
School information	A lower than average proportion of students is eligible for the Pupil Premium at The Cooper School: approximately 15.2% of the school's cohort compared to 29.2% nationally.				
Academic year	2017/18	Total PP budget	£152,405	Date of most recent PP Review	Peter Barnes in December 2015
Total number of pupils (including Post-16)	1284	Number of students eligible for the PPF	190	Date of next internal review of this strategy	October 2018
2. Current attainment (See Appendix A for data relating to current year groups)					
	<i>Students eligible for PP (TCS)</i>	<i>Students not eligible for PP (TCS)</i>	<i>Students not eligible for PP (national average) Unvalidated ASP data as Jan 2018</i>		
Progress 8 score average	-0.29	+0.24	+0.11		
Attainment 8 score average	37.39	51.66	49.51		
% of students attaining a Grade 5+ in E+M	23	61	49		
% of students achieving the EBacc at Grade 5/C+	3	16	25		
% of students entering the	3	22	43		

EBacc			
-------	--	--	--

3. Barriers to future attainment (for students eligible for PP including high ability)	
In-school barriers (issues to be addressed in school)	
A:	Literacy and numeracy (Basic Skills) are lower for incoming students who are eligible for the PPF
B:	Behaviour issues for some eligible students is having a detrimental impact on their progress
C:	Character, especially a lack of resilience, courage, respect and self-discipline
External barriers (issues which also require action outside of school)	
D:	Parental engagement with the school
E:	Attendance rates

4. Outcomes		
	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>
A:	High levels of progress in literacy and numeracy for students in KS3 (particularly those students who are currently eligible for FSM).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PP gap diminishing at GCSE including in English and Maths • Good levels of progress in reading age in Year 7 to 8 • Sound progress made by PP students in maths relative to their peers

B:	Behaviour of students to meet Ofsted 'Outstanding' descriptor.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reduced PEX and internal exclusions for PP students (particular focus on groups FSM and AEN) as noted on behaviour tracking documents held by individual Heads of Houses and also centrally on the school's MIS. ● Students have had opportunity to develop their ideas of self-discipline, courage and respect
C:	Character, especially a lack of resilience, courage, respect and self-discipline are improved in our students	We have a developed curriculum in character education in our pastoral system and this is supported by teaching in subject areas
D:	Parents of PP students embrace a range of opportunities aimed at increasing parental engagement with the learning process.	School records show that parents engage with the school in some form - either recorded as attended a Parents' Consultation Evening or individual student logs show engagement with a relevant member of staff via another form of communication (e.g. phone or email).
E:	Increased attendance rates for students eligible for PP across all Year Groups.	Our school attendance data demonstrates that there is no gap between eligible students and their peers.

5. Planned expenditure

Academic year 2017/18

The three headings below demonstrate how we are using the PPF to i) improve classroom pedagogy, ii) provide targeted support and iii) 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 we ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will the implementation be reviewed?
To create positive culture for learning in all classes	Majority of mixed-ability teaching in KS3	EEF Toolkit shows that streaming or setting has a negative impact on progress	Review/tracking of LOP across year groups	RWh (AHT: Assessment, Achievement and Outcomes) - tracking progress	Via T&L TCS Observation Protocols (Focus Weeks/Learning Walks/Book Monitoring/Work Scrutiny/Assessment Check-Points). Monitoring and Review of SDP (December and June/July)
To create high quality teaching for all	Common framework for Teaching and Learning across school (Core	DFE briefing paper 'supporting the attainment of disadvantaged pupils'	Staff training through T+L briefings; CPL based upon 'Learning Communities' ;	GM (DHT).	Via T&L TCS Observation Protocols (Focus Weeks/Learning

	<p>expectations)</p> <p>Creation of focussed CPL (Learning Communities) to improve practice in all classrooms</p> <p>T+L rolling team to provide support for raising the quality of T+L across the school</p>	<p>Sutton Trust; What Makes great teaching? Professor Rob Coe; learning and teaching magpie blog</p> <p>As above</p>	<p>monitoring of T+L</p> <p>Monitoring of actions and impact after each session; monitoring of T+L; evaluation of outcomes</p> <p>Teacher support document which reviews progress</p>	<p>GM (DHT)</p> <p>RMW (AHT)</p>	<p>Walks/Book Monitoring/Work Scrutiny/Assessment Check-Points). Monitoring and Review of SDP (December and June/July)</p>
Improving the quality of marking and feedback to students	Further development and implementation of assessment and feedback methods	OUDES review of marking and assessment 2016 'A Marked Improvement'	By regular monitoring of review in departments and at SLT level	GM (DHT)	Bi-termly
To provide an aspirational curriculum for all	Review of curriculum at KS4 for 2017 to include all students within EBACC offer	DFE Guidance	Consult with HODs/parents and students in order to provide inclusive curriculum for all	BB/RWH/GM	Sept 2019
Character, especially a lack of resilience,	We have a developed curriculum	Many pieces of evidence (e.g.	HoH/HoY do drop ins for form tutors and	RMW (AHT)	Ongoing through 2017-2018

courage, respect and self-discipline are improved in our students	in character education in our pastoral system and this is supported by teaching in subject areas	Jubilee Centre) pointing towards a need to make values of the school apparent and to develop them in students	lead on discussions as appropriate HoDs do drop ins of teachers and lead discussions as appropriate		
Total budgeted cost					39, 278.22
ii) Targeted support					
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will we ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will the implementation be reviewed?
A: High levels of progress in literacy and numeracy for students in KS3	Accelerated Reader in years 7&8 to measure reading ages at least 4 times a year and to prompt intervention if necessary.	At end of Year 7 2017, average reading age of non-PP students: 11.1 years, average reading age of PP students: 10.2 years (cohort average: 10.9 years)	One English lesson per fortnight focuses on reading - these lessons will be dedicated to the AR programme and will be monitored by the English department. The Reading Coordinator will monitor and analyse reading reports to determine where specific interventions need to be targeted.	SS and Reading Coordinator	September 2018

	PP students with low ATL/progress to have raised profile and school along side meetings with AHT	PiXL advice and evidence of positive effect at TCS from 2016-2017; now being fed down into Y7-10	Internal data and conversations with students will be used to establish progress once problem has been first identified	SB/RMW	As reporting cycle for particular year groups
	Skills Sessions for KS3 students in need of targeted support. Students will be disapplied from a subject for 6 weeks.	To increase literacy skills enabling them to access the curriculum and extend their chances in GCSEs.	One to one intervention in the Inclusion Centre.	IT/AP	Ongoing
B: Behaviour of students to meet Ofsted 'Outstanding' descriptor	Education Coach to work with vulnerable students on a 1:1 or small group basis	Some students need coaching to enable them to have strategies in times of distress (impulse management strategies). EEF shows that behaviour management strategies have moderate impact for moderate cost. The school's data shows that eligible students are disproportionately represented for FEX and other sanctions	The Education Coach holds multiple qualifications and is a trained teacher with experience of behaviour strategies. She will monitor and evaluate her work.	IT (AHT: Inclusion) with JR (Education Coach)	Ongoing throughout 2017-18
C: Destination data reflects lower P16	Follow up meetings with Y11 PP in	Previous data suggests that a low	To provide careers advice for Y11	SSB (AHT: Academic Achievement for	Review following internal data

application amongst PP students than their peers	response to Y11 SLT interviews.	number of Y11 PP students apply to P16 at TCS and are less likely to enter into high quality FE.	students and previous contact with PP students. Analysis of previous destination data to measure previous PP students' engagement with careers advice and FE. Record PP student engagement with open evenings and student responses to follow up interviews. Use of RONI and student voice to identify priority students.	KS4)	collection in Y11 and Y10.
Total budgeted cost					82064.20
iii) Other approaches					
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will we ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will the implementation be reviewed?
D: Parents of PP students embrace range of	Increased opportunities for parents to engage	Internal data shows underperformance linked with	Monitor attendance at P.E., with student support, AHT (SSB),	SSB, RMW, IT	After each parents' evening

opportunities aimed at increasing parental engagement with the learning process	with school - such as pre-emptive phone calls in advance of PCE, additional 'catch up sessions' for families not attending and home visits where necessary.	attendance to parents evenings (Attend = 0.48 P8 and 64% A* - C vs. Not attend = -0.07 and 36.10% A*-C) . Eligible students' families disproportionately underrepresented at PCEs. Educational research shows that parental engagement is a key factor in their children making progress in school.	Head of Year 11 (JS) and Head of Year 10 (KW) to follow up with additional evenings or home visits where appropriate. RMW & IT to work with the Student Support Managers for KS3.		
Increased attendance rates for students eligible for PP across all Year Groups	Contracts to be drawn up between the school and families of children who are persistently absent or who are late for school.	External educational research shows that a student makes less progress if their attendance is low or is erratic. This is confirmed with in school data (especially with reading ages for non-attenders).	Termly checks on attendance for groups of key students.	RH (AHT: Behaviour & Attendance) with the attendance team	Termly
Total budgeted cost					8222.22

6. Review of expenditure				
Previous Academic Year		2016/2017		
i) Quality of teaching for all				
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	Estimated impact: did you meet the success criteria? (including impact on students who are not eligible for the PPF in appropriate)	Lessons learned (and whether we would continue with this approach)	Cost
To create positive culture for learning in all classes	Majority of mixed- ability teaching in KS3	EEF Toolkit shows that streaming or setting has a negative impact on progress and we have not noted any negative impact on progress on any group of students as a result of this	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further training can be needed for staff as there can be a more varied approach needed to meet the needs of all learners; • Mixed attainment to be further investigated and implemented at KS4 	Negligible
To create high quality teaching for all	Common framework for Teaching and Learning across school (Core expectations)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GCSE results show a diminished gap between disadvantaged students and their peers with a four year positive trend in Progress 8 score for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to work on these items in 2017-2018 to further developing T&L e.g. feedback, character 	£5,200 (R&R Allowance for T&L Rolling Team inclusive of on-costs)

	<p>Creation of department-led CPL (Learning Communities) to improve practice in all classrooms</p> <p>T+L rolling team to provide support for raising the quality of T+L across the school</p>	<p>disadvantaged students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2014: -0.52 • 2015: -0.42 • 2016: -0.34 • 2017: -0.29 • This is repeated in other years e.g. year 7 and year 8 there is no difference in progress between disadvantaged students and their peers. 		
Improving the quality of marking and feedback to students	Development and implementation of new school assessment policy involving STAR/dot and hinge marking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Departments picking up on common strategies e.g. comment only marking 	Continue to work on this with middle leaders and department teams in 2017-2018	Negligible
To provide an aspirational curriculum for all	Review of curriculum at KS4 for 2017 to include all students within EBACC offer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curriculum revised to include 4 optional subjects and to increase the proportion of students following EBacc subjects • 28.6 % of disadvantaged students are entered for the full EBacc for Summer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We will continue to promote an aspirational curriculum for all students regardless of background, but we will also consider what is best for each student as an individual and 	Negligible

		<p>of 2018 compared to 29.4% of other students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These numbers are mirrored for 2019 entries • For Summer of 2020 entries 54.1% of disadvantaged students are entered for full Ebacc alongside 67.2 % of other students (however percentages are directly comparable when separated by Prior Attainment groups) 	won't sacrifice this for higher entry percentages in every EBacc pillar.	
ii) Targeted support				
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	Estimated impact: did you meet the success criteria? (including impact on students who are not eligible for the PPF in appropriate)	Lessons learned (and whether we would continue with this approach)	Cost
To improve the reading ages of all children in Years 7 & 8	Accelerated Reader programme, fortnightly reading lesson in English, investment in library	Good: students made good progress with their reading	We are going to continue with this strategy in order to improve literacy for all students. In 2016/17 we	£30,000

	(books and resources) plus partial salary for a full-time Reading Coordinator		will develop a tracking system which will allow us to easily see any disparity between the progress being made between different groups of students	
Disadvantaged students' self esteem and confidence is raised to ensure they are better able to access the full curriculum	Eligible students have priority access to well-being interventions such as the Education Coach, School Counsellor and our Home/School Link Worker	Good : the Education Coach holds exit interviews with her clients to gauge their progress and level of engagement with strategies	The School Counsellor is attending a year-long trauma recovery course run by a leading practitioner in the field of trauma, this will enable her to better support those disadvantaged student who have also suffered from trauma. Our HSLW will continue to work with disadvantaged families in the same capacity as 2015/16.	£30,000 (Staffing inc Education Coach, School Counsellor, HSLW. Course costs and travel expenses)
iii) Other approaches				
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	Estimated impact: did you meet the success criteria? (including impact on students who are not eligible for the PPF in appropriate)	Lessons learned (and whether we would continue with this approach)	Cost
Disadvantaged students (especially boys) who are	Courses at a local college to be offered to selected	Medium: all the students involved are now	In 2017/18 closer selection about which	£15,000 approx (cost of courses, transport inc.

<p>in danger of multiple FEX or PEX are offered a suitable alternative curriculum external to the school to keep their interest</p>	<p>students; including engineering and food technology</p>	<p>progressing in their education or career paths. (Review of Alternative Provision July 2016 found deficiencies in suitability for all students which resulted in significant provision changes for 2016/17)</p>	<p>courses to offer to carefully selected students to ensure these courses meet both the needs and interests of the students involved to ensure progress is made both academically and in their social skills.</p>	<p>staff costs, fuel, depreciation in minibus value etc)</p>
<p>Disadvantaged students have access to the full school experience (including educational visits and extra-curricular activities)</p>	<p>Students in receipt of the PP are given priority access to some clubs and extra-curricular activities (some funded or partly funded); staff running clubs or activities ensure they attempt to gain a diverse range of students participating (including those who are eligible for the PPF)</p>	<p>Good: in school information shows that disadvantaged students are proportionately represented on school trips and activities so that financial disadvantage is not a barrier to full participation in the school experience.</p>	<p>In 2017/18, we will continue to help finance activities and trips for eligible students.</p>	<p>£12,000 (Funding for equipment, cost of trips, associated staff costs, transport etc)</p>
<p>There will be no difference between the attendance of eligible students and the rest of the school</p>	<p>Work with parents to encourage participation in school via home/school attendance contracts and flexible timetables where relevant and useful</p>	<p>Good: there was no discernible difference between the attendance of eligible students and their peers</p>	<p>In 2017/18 we will continue to use home/school attendance contracts where necessary and ensure we identify any areas of concern at the earliest possible opportunity</p>	

Appendix A: Current Data for Current Year Groups

We track all students at least three times a year and compare the data of different groups of students (including students who are eligible for the Pupil Premium and their non-eligible peers). The following data is a summary of our tracking for 2016/17:

Key Stage 3:

Year 7	Measure	Nov WAG		Mar WAG		Jun WAG	
ALL STUDENTS		Students	%	Students	%	Students	Cummul %
217 Nov	Ave Residual		-0.8		-0.3		0.0
220 Mar	within 0.5 of Target	43	19.8	138	62.7	192	88.9
216 Jul	APS		4.4		4.8		5.1
PUPIL PREMIUM	Measure	Nov WAG		Mar WAG		Jun WAG	
		Students	%	Students	%	Students	Cummul %
44 Nov	Ave Residual	-0.7	-0.7		-0.2		0.0
42 Mar	within 0.5 of Target	12	27.3	29	69.0	44	100.0

44 Jul	APS	4.2	4.2	4.7	5.0		
NON_PP	Measure	Nov WAG	Mar WAG	Jun WAG	Cummul %		
		Students	%	Students	%		
173 Nov	Ave Residual	-0.9	-0.9	-0.4	-0.1		
178 Mar	within 0.5 of Target	31	17.9	109	61.2	148	86.0
172 Jul	APS	4.4	4.4	4.9	5.2		
Year 8	Measure	Dec WAG	May WAG	Jul WAG	Cummul %		
ALL STUDENTS		Students	%	Students	%		
221 Nov	Ave Residual	-0.7	-0.7	-0.3	-0.3	-0.1	-0.1
218 May	within 0.5 of Target	73	33.0	163	74.8	192	88.5
217 Jul	APS	5.3	5.3	5.7	5.7	5.9	5.9

	Measure	Dec WAG		May WAG		Jul WAG	
		Students	%	Students	%	Students	Cummul %

PUPIL PREMIUM

38 Nov	Ave Residual	-0.7	-0.7	-0.3	-0.3	-0.1	-0.1
--------	--------------	------	------	------	------	------	------

37 May	within 0.5 of Target	10	26.3	29	78.4	38	84.4
--------	----------------------	----	------	----	------	----	------

45 Jul	APS	5.2	5.2	5.6	5.6	5.7	5.7
--------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

	Measure	Dec WAG		May WAG		Jul WAG	
		Students	%	Students	%	Students	Cummul %

NON_PP

183 Nov	Ave Residual	-0.7	-0.7	-0.3	-0.3	-0.1	-0.1
---------	--------------	------	------	------	------	------	------

181 May	within 0.5 of Target	63	34.4	134	74.0	154	89.5
---------	----------------------	----	------	-----	------	-----	------

172 Jul	APS	5.3	5.3	5.7	5.7	5.9	5.9
---------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Year 9

		Measure	Nov WAG		Feb WAG		Jul WAG	
ALL STUDENTS			Students	%	Students	%	Students	Cummul %
221 Nov		Ave Residual	-0.8	-0.8	-0.4	-0.4	-0.1	0.0
221 Feb		within 0.5 of Target	60	27.1	135	61.1	168	76.4
220 Jul		APS	5.8	5.8	6.1	6.1	6.4	2.9
		Measure	Nov WAG		Feb WAG		Jul WAG	
PUPIL PREMIUM			Students	%	Students	%	Students	Cummul %
32 Nov		Ave Residual	-1.0	-1.0	-0.6	-0.6	-0.4	-0.4
33 Feb		within 0.5 of Target	5	15.6	14	42.4	18	56.3
32 Jul		APS	5.5	5.5	5.7	5.7	5.9	5.9
		Measure	Nov WAG		Feb WAG		Jul WAG	
NON_PP			Students	%	Students	%	Students	Cummul %
189 Nov		Ave Residual	-0.8	-0.8	-0.4	-0.4	-0.1	-0.1
188 Feb,Jul		within 0.5 of Target	55	29.1	121	64.4	150	79.8
		APS	5.8	5.8	6.2	6.2	6.5	6.5