

# Ocker Hill Academy

## Pupil Premium Report 2014-2015

Using The Sutton Trust 'Toolkit of Strategies to Improve Learning (Summary for schools spending the Pupil Premium)' By Professor Steve Higgins Durham University, Dimitra Kokotsaki and Professor Robert Coe CEM Centre, Durham University

The Leadership Team allocated pupil premium funding in the following way.

### **Back ground research**

In reading the report the Leadership Team realised that

'Investing for better learning, or spending so as to improve learning, is therefore not easy, particularly when the specific aim is to support disadvantaged learners whose educational trajectories are harder to influence. Much depends on the context, the school, the teachers (their levels of knowledge and experience), the learners (their level of attainment and their social background) and the educational outcomes that you want to improve (knowledge, skills or dispositions).'

(Higgins, Kokotsaki and Coe 2011)

This statement showed the difficulty in judging impact on overall learning for 'disadvantaged learners' but the toolkit gave indications of the most effective and best value strategies. The following strategies fulfilled the need to show the most impact and maximise the funding allocation. The Leadership Team ensured that the impact of the funding was monitored termly through the procedures and processes developed by the academy. This was then reported back to the governors would be able to ask questions of the Leadership Team regarding the effectiveness of how the Pupil Premium allocation was used.

### **Effective feedback**

Black and Wiliam (1998), in developing Assessment for Learning (AfL), emphasised the use of feedback to close the gap on current performance relative to a desired goal or outcome, and highlighted the importance of the student in identifying the gap and acting on the information (see also Metacognition and self-regulation strategies).

Average Impact: +9 months

Strength of research: 3

(Higgins, Kokotsaki and Coe 2011)

### **Meta-cognition and self-regulation strategies**

Meta-cognitive strategies are teaching approaches which make learners' thinking about learning more explicit in the classroom (Higgins et al., 2005). This is usually through teaching pupils various strategies to plan, monitor and evaluate their own learning (Haller et al., 1988). It is usually more effective in small groups so learners can support each other and make their thinking explicit through discussion (Higgins et al., 2005). Self-regulation (Dignath et al., 2008) refers to managing one's own motivation towards learning as well as the more cognitive aspects of thinking and reasoning. These approaches tend to have a consistent beneficial impact on learning outcomes both in terms of cognitive measures as well as curriculum outcomes (Higgins et al., 2005; Klauer & Phye, 2008).

Unusually, such approaches also appear to benefit low attaining pupils more than high achievers (Chiu, 1998), though this may be because the focus of the programme or approach did not extend high achievers' existing learning strategies.

Average Impact: +8 months

Strength of research: 4

(Higgins, Kokotsaki and Coe 2011)

The Teaching & Learning Team allocated part of the Pupil Premium fund towards developing effective feedback and meta-cognitive and self-regulation strategies as indicated in the National Standards AfL materials (formative assessment). This was in addition to intervention strategies and support which maximise the effectiveness of this training.

(Dylan Wiliam (2002) 'estimated the cost of a formative assessment project with an effect size of 0.32 on pupil attainment was about £2000 *per teacher* per year.)

Funding for Pupil Premium for 2011-2012 **£18,490 (£488 per pupil)**

Funding for Pupil Premium for 2012-2013 **£27,412 (£623 per pupil)**

Funding for Pupil Premium for 2013-2014 **£54,900 (£900 per pupil)**

Funding for Pupil Premium for 2014-2015 **£80,600 (£1300 per pupil)**

<b>Use of funding 2014-2015</b>	<b>Cost</b>
<b>Activities</b>	
2x Pupil Premium TLR2 Teachers (2x 0.5 FTE) Role will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Team teaching</li> <li>• 1 to 1 and small group sessions</li> <li>• Training of all staff</li> <li>• Termly Pupil Premium Progress Meetings with staff</li> </ul>	<b>£40,451</b>
Provide opportunities for extra-curricular activities	<b>£5,000</b>
Intervention Strategies including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Enable plus</li> <li>2. Sound Discovery</li> </ol>	<b>£7,000</b>
Yr5 & 6 Booster sessions	<b>£1,800</b>
Booster Resources	<b>£1,500</b>
Supply cover for releasing of staff to deliver sessions	<b>£4,500</b>
Learning Mentor sessions	<b>£7,000</b>
Learning Mentor resources	<b>£3,000</b>
School Attendance Improvement Officer	<b>£7,000</b>
Nurture dinnertime sessions	<b>£3000</b>
Nurture sessions resources	<b>£500</b>

Parent Curriculum Sessions – Reading, Writing & Numeracy	<b>£500</b>
<b>Total expenditure</b>	<b>£81,251</b>

The role of the Pupil Premium Leaders is to offer targeted support for pupils. They will work with teachers in the most effective way to deliver sessions to ensure that the gap closes due to better than expected levels of progress for Pupil Premium children.

Pupil Premium Leaders will also be teaching streamed intervention groups across every year group using APP for evidence and AfL to develop cognitive and meta cognitive skills to enhance progress in the classroom.

The following data provides the level of impact the development of these strategies and interventions had on attainment and achievement 2013-2014.

As a direct result of these actions:

### **Narrowing the Gaps**

#### **Year 6**

#### **End of Key stage 2 results 2014-2015**

% of eligible pupils who are either FSM eligible or LAC achieving level 4 or above in Reading 100%, Writing 86% and Maths 100%

FSM Students 22 children in Year 6 made 16.8 APS progress in Reading across the key stage, 14.7 APS progress in Writing across the key stage and 15.2 APS progress in Maths.

Non-FSM Students 45 children in Year 6 made 14.5 APS progress in Reading across the key stage, 15.2 APS progress in Writing across the key stage and 16.3 APS progress in Maths.

In Reading, Writing and Maths, FSM pupils made more progress than non-FSM pupils.

### **Levels of progress**

#### **Two Levels of Progress**

<b>FSM</b>	<b>Non-FSM</b>
Reading -100%	97%
Writing-100%	100%
Maths-100%	100%

#### **Three Levels of Progress**

<b>FSM</b>	<b>Non-FSM</b>
Reading -86%	50%
Writing-45%	66%
Maths-45%	68%

## Attendance

	FSM	Non FSM	Difference
<b>2012-13</b>	94.5%	97.3%	2.8%
<b>2013-14</b>	94.9%	97.7%	2.8%
<b>2014-15</b>	95.7%	97.9%	2.2%

Over a three year period of time, Non FSM attendance has risen by **0.6%** compared with FSM attendance which has risen **1.2%** in the same period of time.

The gap between FSM and non FSM attendance has narrowed significantly over time due to intervention of School Attendance Improvement Officer.

The target for 2015-16 will be that FSM attendance will be **96.5%** and the gap will be narrowed to no more than **1.5%**.

The Leadership Team feels that the research and impact of the strategies significantly justifies the allocation of Pupil Premium.

## References

William, D. (2002). *'Linking Research and Practice: knowledge transfer or knowledge creation?'* Plenary presentation at the annual conference of the North American Chapter of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education, Athens, Georgia, USA, October 2002.

Professor Steve Higgins Durham University Dimitra Kokotsaki and Professor Robert Coe CEM Centre, Durham University (2011) The Sutton Trust 'Toolkit of Strategies to Improve Learning (Summary for schools spending the Pupil Premium)'

Ofsted (2013) Pupil Premium: How schools are spending the funding successfully to maximise achievement.

Ofsted (September 2012, No. 120197) Report summary 'The Pupil Premium: How schools are using the Pupil Premium funding to raise achievement for disadvantaged pupils'.