

# Oakfield Primary School

## Pupil premium strategy statement 2016/2017

1. Summary information					
School	Oakfield Primary School				
Academic Year	2016/2017	Total PP budget	£102,840	Date of most recent PP Review	Nov 2015
Total number of pupils	314	Number of pupils eligible for PP	77	Date for next internal review of this strategy	May 2017

2. Current attainment		
	PP 2017	Non Ppm National
% achieving ARE in reading, writing and maths	85%/92%/ 85% Combined 71%	
% achieving AARE in reading, writing and maths	38%/ 15%/ 31% Combined 15%	
% making progress in reading	2.26	
% making progress in writing	-0.22	
% making progress in maths	2.24	

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP, including high ability)	
In-school barriers (issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills)	
A.	Higher attaining pupils who are eligible for Ppm make less progress than other higher attaining pupils. This prevents sustained high achievement over time.
B.	The cross-over of those pupils that are Ppm and SEND is high and therefore affects the progress of this group.
C.	Pupils eligible for the Ppm make less progress than 'other' pupils in Year 1,2,3 and 4 in Reading, Year 3, 4 and 5 in Writing, Year 1, 2 and 3 in Maths and Year 1, 2, 3 and 4 in Grammar .

External barriers (issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)		
D.	Attendance rates in years 1, 2 and 4 are slightly lower than the national of 95%. This reduces their school hours and impacts on their learning and progress.	
4. Desired outcomes		
	Desired outcomes and how they will be measured	Success criteria
A.	Higher rates of progress for those children in receipt of the PPM	Pupils eligible for PPM make as much progress as 'other' pupils across all year groups in Reading, Writing and Maths. Measured by triangulation of teacher assessments, observations and moderation.
B.	Higher rates of progress across the school for higher attaining pupils eligible for the PPM	Pupils eligible for PPM identified as higher attainers make as much progress as 'other' pupils identified as higher attaining across all year groups in Reading, Writing and Maths. Measured by triangulation of teacher assessments, observations and moderation.
C.	Higher rates of progress across the school for SEND pupils eligible for PPM	Pupils eligible for PPM identified as SEND make as much progress as 'other' pupils identified as PPM across all year groups in Reading, Writing and Maths. Measured by triangulation of teacher assessments, observations and moderation.
D.	Increased attendance rates for pupils eligible for PPM in years 1, 2 and 4.	Reduce the number of persistent absentees among pupils eligible for PPM to 3% or below. Overall PP attendance for persistent absentees improves from 91% 95% in line with 'other' pupils.

5. Planned expenditure					
Academic year	2016/2017				
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?
Improved progress for PPM pupils	CPD and in house support and monitoring to provide high quality QFT for pupils in receipt of the PPM	PPm pupils are making less progress than 'other' pupils. To ensure that PPM pupils can achieve ARE.	Staff CPD Staff training on high quality QFT Triangulated monitoring	SLT PPM lead	Ongoing

Improved progress for PPM and Higher attaining pupils	CPD and in house support and monitoring to provide challenge for those higher attaining pupils who are also in receipt of the PPM	High ability pupils eligible for PPM are making less progress than other higher attaining pupils. To ensure that PPM pupils can achieve high attainment as well as simply 'meeting expected standards'. Train all staff on the expectations for depth and Mastery in Reading, Writing and Maths.	Use INSET days to deliver training. Maths training (Inspire textbook) In house monitoring Peer coaching in and across phases	SLT PPm lead	March 2017/Sept 2017
Improved progress for pupils in receipt of PPM and are also SEND	CPD and in house support and monitoring progress for PPM and SEND children	SEND eligible for PPM are making less progress than other PPM pupils. To ensure that PPM and SEND pupils can achieve at least expected standard. Train staff on awareness of these children's needs.	SEND review Continue to work closely with SENDCo to monitor the provision for these children.	SENDCo	March 2017/Sept 2017

**Total budgeted cost** £7790

## 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?
Increase progress for PPM pupils	TA in class every morning to support learning Pm interventions	Some of the pupils need extra support in class to accelerate up progress. The TA support both in a morning and through targeted interventions has been proven to be effective in supporting individuals and helping to accelerate progress.	Organise timetable to ensure TA's are strategically placed to support individuals/ small groups.	SLT PPm lead	Ongoing
Increase progress for those pupils in receipt of the PPM and are also higher attaining	TA in class every morning to support learning Pm interventions		Organise timetable to ensure TA's are strategically placed to support individuals/ small groups.	SLT PPm lead	Ongoing
Increase progress for those pupils in receipt of the PPM and are also SEND	TA in class every morning to support learning 1:1 and small group provision	Giving small group and 1:1 support means the children receive a more personalised programme.	Liaise with SENDCo to ensure provision is accurate for these individuals.	PPm lead SENDCo	Ongoing

**Total budgeted cost** £94250

## 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
-----------------	------------------------	---	---	------------	----------------------

					<b>implementation?</b>
Increase attendance rates	Admin assistant and Learning Mentor monitor pupils and follow up quickly on absences	Improved attendance leads to more learning time and therefore increase of progress for these individuals	Learning Mentor/ Admin assistant attend attendance courses and keep up to date with new policy. They then feedback to relevant staff members and SLT.	Learning Mentor Admin assistant (LT) PPm lead	Ongoing
<b>Total budgeted cost</b>					£9872

### Impact 2016/2017

#### GLD Outcome 2017

	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>Impact</b>
All	70.45%	75.6%	+5.15%
<u>PPm</u>	0%	83.3%	+83.3%
<u>Non PPM</u>	-	74.4%	

#### Phonics

	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>Impact</b>
All	86%	67%	-19%
<u>PPm</u>	91%	50%	-41%
<u>Non PPM</u>	84%		

(13 children PPM in 2016, 4 PPM children in 2017- SEND)

#### Key Stage One

	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>Impact</b>
<u>Reading</u>			
All	75%	67%	-8%
<u>PPm</u>	60%	54%	-6%
<u>Non PPM</u>	79%	72%	-7%

<b>Writing</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>Impact</b>
All	68%	51%	-17%
<u>PPm</u>	60%	38%	-12%
<u>Non PPm</u>	71%	56%	-15%

<b>Maths</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>Impact</b>
All	80%	71%	-9%
<u>PPm</u>	80%	62%	-18%
<u>Non PPm</u>	79%	75%	-4%

### Key Stage Two

The Gap has closed between PP and non PP in 2017. PP children performed better than Non PP in writing. A clear increase from 2016 results.

<b>Reading</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>Impact</b>
All	64%	86%	+22%
<u>PPm</u>	50%	85%	+35%
<u>Non PPm</u>	71%	87%	+16%

<b>Writing</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>Impact</b>
All	76%	86%	+10%
<u>PPm</u>	64%	92%	+28%
<u>Non PPm</u>	82%	87%	+5%

<b>Maths</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>Impact</b>
All	71%	86%	+15%
<u>PPm</u>	43%	85%	+42%
<u>Non PPm</u>	86%	87%	+1%

<b>SPAG</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>Impact</b>
All	83%	93%	+10%
<u>PPm</u>	71%	92%	+21%
<u>Non PPm</u>		93%	

### Attainment

Attainment is beginning to increase this year. More focussed interventions are in place for next year. Individual context sheets for PP children will be in place for teachers so they can begin to work on diminishing the differences from September.

2017 results	Reading	Writing	Maths	Grammar
Year 1 PPM	0%	0%	0%	0%
Non PPM	35%	20%	20%	20%
Year 3 PPM	18%	18%	27%	46%
Non PPM	70%	48%	61%	67%
Year 4 PPM	38%	13%	19%	50%
Non PPM	72%	66%	79%	76%
Year 5 PPM	25%	8%	33%	25%
Non PPM	61%	46%	15%	70%

### Progress

Year 1,2,3 and 4 in reading, year 1,2,3,4 and 5 in writing, year 1,2 and 3 in maths and year 1,2,3 and 4 in grammar made less than expected progress last year. Although, the gap has not narrowed, the children are now either making expected progress or monitoring in being carried out to increase the number of children making expected progress in these areas.

2017 results Expected (More than expected)	Reading	Writing	Maths	Grammar
Year 1 PPM	33% (33%)	0%(0%)	0%(0%)	0%(0%)
Non PPM	15% (0%)	23% (3%)	25% (3%)	10% (0%)
Year 3 PPM	55% (18%)	27% (0%)	46% (27%)	72% (9%)
Non PPM	67% (15%)	58%(15%)	61% (9%)	88% (39%)
Year 4 PPM	81% (63%)	69% (50%)	75% (44%)	81% (63%)
Non PPM	93% (72%)	97% (72%)	93% (62%)	97% (69%)
Year 5 PPM	33% (18%)	58% (18%)	58% (18%)	42% (9%)
Non PPM	64% (3%)	61% (6%)	88% (26%)	64% (6%)

### PPM & SEND Progress

Children are beginning to make progress in these year groups. Key stage One is the focus for this group in September 2017 with more individual focus on progress.

2017 results Expected (More than expected)	Reading	Writing	Maths	Grammar
Year 1 (2 children)	0% (0%)	0% (0%)	0% (0%)	0% (0%)
Year 2 (1 child)	0% (0%)	0% (0%)	100% (0%)	0% (0%)
Year 3 (2 children)	50% (50%)	0% (0%)	50% (50%)	50% (50%)
Year 4 (6 children)	67% (33%)	33% (17%)	67% (33%)	67% (67%)
Year 5 (4 children)	25% (25%)	25% (25%)	50% (25%)	25% (25%)
Year 6 (2 children)	50% (50%)	50% (50%)	50% (50%)	50% (50%)

### PPm & HAT Progress

Hat & PP children making expected progress over the year has risen to 100% except for maths in years 3 and 4. At the end of 2016, Hat & PP children made less than expected progress in years 1,3 and 4 for reading, 1,3,5 and 6 for writing, 1,3,4,5 and 6 in maths. The progress gap has narrowed in these year groups.

2017 results Expected (More than expected)	Reading	Writing	Maths	Grammar
Year 1	-	-	-	-
Year 2	100%(0%) 1 child	-	-	100% (0%) 1 child
Year 3	100% (0%) 1 child	-	0% (0%) 3 children	-
Year 4	100% (75%) 4 children	100% (50%) 2 children	0% (0%) 1 child	-
Year 5	100% (0%) 1 child	100% (0%) 1 child	100% (0%) 1 child	-
Year 6	100% (29%) 7 children	100% (25%) 4 children	100% (20%) 5 children	100% (0%) 3 children

### Attendance

Attendance for all pupils has been in line with National (96%) over the last 3 years. The attendance for PP children in Year 3, 5 and 6 has improved since Summer 2016.

	Summer 2016	Summer 2017
EYFS PPm	(3) 97.85%	(8) 94.60%
Non PPm	(43) 95.66%	(37) 95.71%
Year 1 PPm	(12) 93.08%	(3) 91.53%
Non PPm	(30) 95.39%	(41) 95.26%
Year 2 PPm	(10) 96.21%	(14) 92.33%
Non PPm	(34) 97.41%	(31) 94.45%
Year 3 PPm	(13) 91.53%	(12) 95.76%

Non PPM	(33) 96.29%	(34) 95.93%
Year 4 PPM	(11) 97.58%	(18) 94.16%
Non PPM	(34) 98.17%	(27) 96.89%
Year 5 PPM	(14) 95.56%	(11) 97.00%
Non PPM	(31) 95.76%	(34) 96.45%
Year 6 PPM	(12) 93.82%	(14) 96.55%
Non PPM	(30) 97.53%	(31) 95.30%