

# Ocker Hill Academy

## Pupil Premium Report 2015-2016

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)**

Funding for Pupil Premium for 2015-2016 **£87,120 (£1300 per pupil)**

<b>Use of funding 2015-2016</b>	<b>Cost</b>
<b>Activities</b>	
2x Pupil Premium TLR2 Teachers (0.5 & 0.4 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>£46,451</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>£87,251</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 2015-2016.

As a direct result of these actions:

### Closing the Gaps with Pupil Premium at Key Stage 2

- **Disadvantaged KS2 pupils' progress in all subjects was significantly above average overall and not significantly below average for ANY prior attainment group.**
- **Disadvantaged KS2 pupils had an average scaled score equal to or above the national score for other pupils in reading and mathematics.**

### Attainment

RWM Exp+ **FSM 75%** (Nat 60%) **Non FSM 95%** (Nat 60%)  
**FSM Reading 106.8** (Nat 103.8) **Non FSM 109.7** (Nat 103.8)  
**FSM Writing Exp+ 75%** (Nat 79%) **Non FSM Exp+ 95%** (Nat 79%)  
**FSM Maths 105.3** (Nat 104.1) **Non FSM 107.8** (Nat 104.1)  
**FSM GPS 104.5** (Nat 105) **Non FSM 107.8** (Nat 105)

### Progress

**FSM Reading +6.87 Non FSM +4.8**  
**FSM Writing +2.83 Non FSM +4.03**  
**FSM Maths +4.43 Non FSM +2.84**

### Attendance

	<b>FSM</b>	<b>Non FSM</b>	<b>Difference</b>
<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%
<b>2015-16</b>	96.2%	97.9%	1.7%

Over a four year period of time, Non FSM attendance has risen by **0.6%** compared with FSM attendance which has risen **1.7%** 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 (Gap decreased by 1.1% over four years).

The target for 2016-17 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

Wiliam, 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'.