



Pupil premium strategy statement:

1. Summary information					
School	Montgomery High School				
Academic Year	2016/17	Total PP budget	£474,980	Date of most recent PP Review	April 2015
Total number of pupils	1318	Number of pupils eligible for PP	531	Date for next internal review of this strategy	TBC

2. Current attainment		
	<i>Pupils eligible for PP (your school)</i>	<i>Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)</i>
% achieving 5A* - C incl. EM (2015/16 only)	39%	
% achieving expected progress in Maths (2015/16 only)	43%	
% achieving expected progress in English (2015/16 only)	73%	
Progress 8 score average (from 2016/17)	N/A	
Attainment 8 score average (from 2016/17)	N/A	

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP including high ability)	
In-school barriers (<i>issues to be addressed in school, such as poor literacy skills</i>)	
A.	Poor literacy skills
B.	Engagement in after school interventions
C.	Behaviour of students
External barriers (<i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i>)	
D.	Attendance of students lower than non-eligible students, but improving

E.	Parental engagement	
4. Outcomes		
	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>
A.	Achievement gap between PP students and national non-PP to close, measured by the progress 8 scores of PP students (16-17) against non PP students national average.	Progress 8 score of school's PP students and national average of non-PP students to be less than or equal to 0.2
B.	Improved attendance of PP families at school events, measured by the attendance figures from school events	Gap between non-PP families and PP families to be less than 20% Attendance at specific targeted PP events to be above 60%
C.	Behaviour of students improves, measured by reduction in school behaviour points given to PP students	Reduction in behaviour points given to PP students
D.	Attendance of PP students to continue to improve, measured by school attendance figures.	Attendance of PP students to continue to improve

5. Planned expenditure

Academic year

2016/17

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?
<p>Achievement gap between PP students and national non-PP to close</p> <p>Progress 8 score of school's PP students and national average of non-PP students to be less than or equal to 0.2</p>	Staffing - PP Focused Time.	<p>Previous academic year this approach resulted in: Threshold measures for disadvantaged students improved: 5A*-C EM improved by 3% to 39% (national PP 2015 was 36%). 5A*-C and basics improved by 4%. Expected progress in English improved by 12% and in maths by 8%. Threshold measures for disadvantaged students improved: 5A*-C EM improved by 3% to 39% (national PP 2015 was 36%). 5A*-C and basics improved by 4%. Expected progress in English improved by 12% and in maths by 8%.</p>	<p>Progress meetings- discussions with Deputy Principal, Assistant Leader of Disadvantaged students, Progress Managers and all CAL's. Analysis of data at the end of each assessment cycle Assessment data Mock examination outcomes Staff appraisals</p>	MTA/CMO	<p>Cycle 1 Cycle 2 Cycle 3 Cycle 4</p>
<p>Achievement gap between PP students and national non-PP to close</p> <p>Progress 8 score of school's PP students and national average of non-PP students to be less than or equal to 0.2</p>	Staffing – TLR holders to in English, maths and science to have specific PP student focus	<p>Previous academic year this approach resulted in: Threshold measures for disadvantaged students improved: 5A*-C EM improved by 3% to 39% (national PP 2015 was 36%). 5A*-C and basics improved by 4%. Expected progress in English improved by 12% and in maths by 8%. 5A*-C and basics improved by 4%. Expected progress in English improved by 12% and in maths by 8%.</p>	<p>Progress meetings- discussions with Deputy Principal, Assistant Leader of Disadvantaged students, Progress Managers and all CAL's. Meetings with TLR holders CPD opportunities for TLR holders Analysis of data at the end of each assessment cycle Assessment data Staff appraisals</p>	MTA	<p>Ongoing Cycle 1 Cycle 2 Cycle 3 Cycle 4</p>

Achievement gap between PP students and national non-PP to close Progress 8 score of school's PP students and national average of non-PP students to be less than or equal to 0.2	Staffing – Appointment of Assistant Leader of Disadvantaged students.	Achievement gap of -0.54 between school PP students and national average non-PP students	Progress meetings- discussions with Deputy Principal, Assistant Leader of Disadvantaged students, Year 11 Progress manager and all CAL's. Meetings line manager CPD opportunities Analysis of data at the end of each assessment cycle Assessment data Staff appraisals	MTA/CMO	Ongoing
Achievement gap between PP students and national non-PP to close Progress 8 score of school's PP students and national average of non-PP students to be less than or equal to 0.2 Improve the resilience of PP students	Staffing – member of staff appointed to work with students to improve resilience	PP students observed to have a lower level of resilience than non-PP students. Progress of PP students between Mock exams and final GCSE exams lower than non-PP students	Analysis of data at the end of each assessment cycle Assessment data Staff appraisals Student Voice Targeted intervention Progress meetings- discussions with Deputy Principal, Assistant Leader of Disadvantaged students, Progress Managers and all CAL's.	DMA	Ongoing

Total budgeted cost Approx £250,000

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?
Achievement gap between PP students and national non-PP to close	KS3 Targeted Intervention PP students to be targeted for early intervention in English, Maths and Science	Large achievement gaps exist between school PP and non-PP students at KS3. Targeted intervention earlier in school will hopefully have the desired effect of PP students achieving a positive progress 8 score in Year 11	Assessment of students at the start and end of every intervention cycle – analysing of these results. Monitoring of student progress at the end of each assessment cycle. Student Voice Meetings with TLR holders with PP focus Attendance records All staff informed of targeted students Letters sent home prior to interventions starting Weekly texts sent home to parents	MTA/PMO	End of every half term

Achievement gap between PP students and national non-PP to close Progress 8 score of school's PP students and national average of non-PP students to be less than or equal to 0.2	Year 11 Targeted Intervention PP Students with predicted negative Progress 8 score to receive targeted intervention	Gaps exist in progress of in school PP and non-PP students 2015-16 Achievement gap of -0.54 between school PP students and national average non-PP students Disadvantaged students on average increased their ATPS by 10 from 2014/2015 to 2015/2016.	Progress meetings- discussions with Deputy Principal, Assistant Leader of Disadvantaged students, Year 11 Progress manager and all CAL's. Monitoring of student progress at the end of each assessment cycle. Student Voice Attendance records All staff informed of targeted students Letters sent home prior to interventions starting Weekly texts sent home to parents	CMO/MTA/ RWI	Ongoing Cycle 1 Cycle 2 Cycle 3
Achievement gap between PP students and national non-PP to close Progress 8 score of school's PP students and national average of non-PP students to be less than or equal to 0.2	Interventions including mentoring, anger management and counselling. Additional schooling at Easter and on Saturdays during the Spring term to ensure we are meeting the needs of disadvantaged students.	Disadvantaged students on average increased their ATPS by 10 from 2014/2015 to 2015/2016.	Assessment of students at the start and end of every intervention cycle – analysing of these results. Monitoring of student progress at the end of each assessment cycle. Student Voice Meetings with TLR holders with PP focus Attendance records All staff informed of targeted students Letters sent home prior to interventions starting Weekly texts sent home to parents	MTA/CMO	Ongoing
Total budgeted cost					Approx £55,000
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?
Improve social and cultural experiences of PP students	Cultural Citizens Programme	PP students have less social and cultural experiences. Aim to improve the social and cultural aspirations of PP students by providing the opportunity to experience them with support from the school.	Culture Coach to be appointed CPD and training provided Senior Member of staff to oversee the programme Support from external agencies 'Cultured Minds' Evaluation of programme after cohort one	MTA	End of academic year 2016-17
Promote PP attendance to school intervention programmes	Rewards	PP students' attendance at after school targeted intervention programmes lower than non-PP students.	Progress Meetings Discussions with key stakeholders. Progress Managers, CALs, Deputy Principal. Monitoring of attendance Student Voice	MTA	Ongoing Cycle 1 Cycle 2 Cycle 3 Cycle 4

		Achievement gap of -0.54 between school PP students and national average non-PP students	Letters and phone calls to home Individual timetables created for students Meetings with targeted students		
Improved attendance of PP students	Staffing – Pupil Welfare Officer	Whole school disadvantaged student attendance improved by 1%. This was 0.7% greater improvement than non-disadvantaged students – the gap narrowed. PP students attendance still lower than non-PP students in school	Meetings with ATB/GSH Tracking of PP students' attendance Behaviour and Attendance managers to monitor year group attendance Weekly information provided to progress tutors Reward positive attendance	MTA/ATB/GSH	Ongoing Cycle 1 Cycle 2 Cycle 3 Cycle 4 End of Academic year 2016/17
Behaviour of PP students improves, measured by reduction in school behaviour points given to PP students and reduction of days exclusion for PP students	SOLO room	PP students receive higher number of school behaviour points than non-PP students PP students receive higher number of days exclusion than non-PP students.	ADB to oversee the room Timetable of staff to support the room created Monitoring of student exclusion data Re-integration meeting to take place if students are placed there.	ADB	End of Academic year 2016/17
Achievement gap between PP students and national non-PP to close	All staff to have PP focused target on their appraisal for the academic year 2016-17	Achievement gap of -0.54 between school PP students and national average non-PP students	Appraisal meetings Deputy Principal and Principal to oversee targets set for the appraisal cycle	CMO/SCA	End of Appraisal cycle 2016-17
Improved attendance of PP families at school events	Additional Progress Evenings for targeted PP students and their families	Attendance of PP students and their families lower than that of non-PP students and their families	Review attendance of PP students at events Meetings with staff member responsible for Parental Engagement Letters/texts/phone calls made home to targeted families Rewards for attendance Alternate off school site for events	MTA/CMO/SSK	Ongoing End of Academic year 2016/17
Achievement gap between PP students and national non-PP to close	Provision of set texts for GCSE exam courses for PP students Cover the costs of essential trips for GCSE subjects for PP students	Achievement gap of -0.54 between school PP students and national average non-PP students	CALs to provide subject specific information Resources to be given to students Monitoring of assessment data	MTA	End of Academic year 2016/17
Total budgeted cost					Approx £45,000

6. Review of expenditure				
Previous Academic Year		2015-16		
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
Reduce the gap of achievement between PP students and non-PP students	Staffing - PP Focused Time.	Threshold measures for disadvantaged students improved: 5A*-C EM improved by 3% to 39% (national PP 2015 was 36%). 5A*-C and basics improved by 4%. Expected progress in English improved by 12% and in maths by 8%. Threshold measures for disadvantaged students improved: 5A*-C EM improved by 3% to 39% (national PP 2015 was 36%). 5A*-C and basics improved by 4%. Expected progress in English improved by 12% and in maths by 8%.	Did improve PP student outcomes but also improved non-PP student outcomes. PP students therefore to be targeted above non-PP students at key school events e.g. interventions	£235,400
Reduce the gap of achievement between PP students and non-PP students	Staffing – Additional Maths Teacher Full time Mathematics support specifically focusing on the progress of PP students.	Expected progress in maths for disadvantaged students increased by 8% and better than expected progress by 5%. Gaps narrowed.	Continue to support Maths staffing due to positive progress in this key area.	£27,000
Reduce the gap of achievement between PP students and non-PP students	Staffing – Accelerated Reader Programme	40 disadvantaged students that regularly accessed the Accelerated Reader programme, they made gains equal to non-PP students.	Literacy remains a key focus for PP students within school.	£16,800
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

Reduce the gap of achievement between PP students and non-PP students	Interventions including mentoring, anger management and counselling. Additional schooling at Easter and on Saturdays during the Spring term to ensure we are meeting the needs of disadvantaged students.	Disadvantaged students on average increased their ATPS by 10 from 2014/2015 to 2015/2016.	Interventions improved outcomes but further work needed. Increased earlier focus on PP students targeted for intervention.	£43,800
Reduce the gap of achievement between PP students and non-PP students	Borwick Hall Programme 3 additional weekends offsite tuition for PP students targeted at improving results	A total of 27 disadvantaged students over 2 weekends attended a residential facility revising English, maths and science. English progress 8 difference form mock to outcome 0.31 (non-disadvantaged 0.27) Maths progress 8 difference form mock to outcome 1.03 (non-disadvantaged 0.87)	Positive impact. To be continued with a PP focus	£9,300
Reduce the gap of achievement between PP students and non-PP students	Educational Materials Includes educational equipment, ingredients for catering, revisions guides, and course materials for PP students.	As above: Threshold measures for disadvantaged students improved: 5A*-C EM improved by 3% to 39% (national PP 2015 was 36%). 5A*-C and basics improved by 4%.	Positive impact. To continue to support all departments regarding PP students and exam preparation and provision of key course resources	£15,600
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
Improved tracking and monitoring of PP student's progress	Staffing – Data Analysis	End of cycle data is provided in a timely fashion to all stakeholders including Academy Council, Principal, CALs, Progress Managers and Tutors. War boards are updated and data is interpreted to enable strategies to be deployed where they have the biggest impact.	Massive impact. Greater availability and analysis of data enabled staff to be aware of the progress of PP students in their classes.	£5,700

Reduce the gap of achievement between PP students and non-PP students	Staffing – Nurture Unit	2 Year 11 disadvantaged students accessed the unit throughout the year. These students had complex mental health issues. Disadvantaged students in other year groups also access this facility.	SSC to be remodelled to continue to help provide PP students with additional support to achieve greater outcomes.	£14,200
Improved attendance of PP students	Staffing – Pupil Welfare Officer	Whole school disadvantaged student attendance improved by 1%. This was 0.7% greater improvement than non-disadvantaged students – the gap narrowed.	Continue to support and focus on the attendance of PP students. More work needed to improve further.	£24,000
Reduce the gap of achievement between PP students and non-PP students Improved aspiration and career information provided to PP students	Staffing – Careers Advisor	All students received an interview and only 2 disadvantaged student are not in education, employment or training. Connexions are still involved with these students.	Continue, highly successful.	£9,200
Reduce the gap of achievement between PP students and non-PP students	Music Lessons Free music lessons for PP students undertaking music as a chosen subject	5 disadvantaged students accessed free peripatetic music lessons.	Continue to support department to enrich the experiences of PP students. Led to the uptake of the Cultural Citizens Programme to further enhance student experience in this area.	£8,800
Reduce the gap of achievement between PP students and non-PP students	IT Subscriptions Accelerated Reader, Mint Class, Vision 2 Learn, SISRA software subscriptions	Software facilitates improvements in tracking, analysing and testing students.	Massive impact. Greater availability and analysis of data enabled staff to be aware of the progress of PP students in their classes.	£10,150
Reduce the gap of achievement between PP students and non-PP students	Portakabin Lease Half of the leased Portakabin (1 room) is used as 'buddy space' for PP students	10 of our harder to reach disadvantaged students were regularly timetabled to this facility. They improved by an average of 31 points between the mocks and final outcomes.	Allowed students to complete study and exams who may have been at risk of exclusion or permanent exclusion. Alternative facility to be created	£7,100

Reduce the gap of achievement between PP students and non-PP students	School Visit Contributions Contributions to school visits for PP students eligible to take part who may otherwise miss out due to hardship issues.	A total of 27 disadvantaged students over 2 weekends attended a residential facility revising English, maths and science. English progress 8 difference form mock to outcome 0.31 (non-disadvantaged 0.27) Maths progress 8 difference form mock to outcome 1.03 (non-disadvantaged 0.87)	Positive impact. To be continued with a PP focus	£2,000
---	--	---	--	--------

7. Additional detail