

# Oldfield Park Junior School

*....inspiring excellence, achieving together!*



OPJS Pupil Premium Statement  
Academic Year 2016-2017



### Rationale

Achieving excellence for all is paramount at OPJS. A key group and priority at OPJS is the achievement and progress of children entitled to Pupil Premium. A comprehensive review of data, whereby gaps in data between PP and Non PP were identified, coupled with a review was undertaken in July 2017. Consequently, the PPG provision has been altered building upon good practice and new initiatives put in place to drive improvement and narrow the gap. A number of pupils have multiple vulnerabilities and, consequently, receive a universal as well as a targeted offer from the PP funding.

Universal Offer: PPG Mentor, Librarian, subsidized residential trips, attendance focus, feedback, art projects and cookery.

Targeted Offer: Reduced class sizes in Y6, TA support and mentoring

It is the aim of this plan to ensure that all PP pupils realise their potential through the targeted and effective use of PP funding.

### 2016-2017 Summary Information

Academic	2016-2017	Total PP budget	£69860 (based on 58 pupils)	Date of most recent PP Review	5/7/16
Total number of pupils	257 (as at 20/9/16)	No. of pupils eligible for PP	27 FSM 24 Ever 6 3 Adopted from Care 1 Services 55 in total (as at 20/9/16)	Date for next PP Strategy Review	Undertaken at assessment points throughout year

### Attainment – 2016 and 2017 KS2 Data – Y6

*2016 - 11 pupils eligible for PP, 18% were EHCP, 36% were SEN and 55% were below ARE at KS1	Pupils eligible for PP		Pupils not eligible for PP		Gap between PP and nonPP	
	2016*	2017**	2016	2017	2016 Gap	2017 Gap
% achieving ARE Combined	18%	66.7%	72%	71%	-54%	-4.3%
% ARE in Reading	55%	83%	83%	89%	-28%	-6%
% ARE in Writing	27%	76.9%	79%	78%	-52%	-1.1%
% ARE in Maths	36%	83.3%	79%	86%	-43%	-2.7%



<b>Whole School Overall In Year Progress</b>						
Subject	Pupils eligible for PP		Pupils not eligible for PP		Gap between PP and Non PP	
	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016 Gap	2017 Gap
Reading	+3	+4.3	+2.9	+4	+0.1	+0.3
Writing	+2.8	+3.1	+3.5	+3.3	-0.7	-0.2
Maths	+3.2	+3.9	+2.9	+3.8	+0.3	+0.1
Combined	+3	+3.8	+3.1	+3.7	-0.1	+0.1

<b>Y3, Y4 and Y5 EoY Attainment – OPJS Data</b>						
% achieving ARE or above in reading, writing & maths	Pupils eligible for PP		Pupils not eligible for PP		Gap between PP and Non PP	
	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017
Year 3	20%	29.4%	55%	67.4%	-35%	-38%
Year 4	46%	15.4%	60%	58.8%	-14%	-43.4%
Year 5	31%	53.8%	41%	70.4%	-10%	-16.6%



**2016-2017 Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)**

**In-school barriers** *(issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills)*

Ensuring that all teaching and non-teaching staff are fully aware of vulnerable groups and have the highest expectations for all.

Significant gap between the disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged children within the school and related expectations.

Social engagement in aspects of learning coupled with parental involvement.

Reading comprehension skills that impacts upon writing.

Ensuring that effective and challenging feedback is provided to drive further improvement.

Consistent quality first teaching.

**External barriers** *(issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)*

Specific cases of low attendance rates of PP children.

Family support for specific cases (SFC).

Targeted parental engagement (Cookery/Library).



1. Outcomes <i>(Desired outcomes and how they will be measured)</i>			Success criteria	End of Year Review
<b>A</b>	Attainment gap between PP and non PP further narrowed across all year groups in all subjects but with specific focus upon writing and maths.	Baseline point in Sept '16 using previous EoY results and NFER Assessment Cycle followed with % gaps narrowed on average to 15% gap between PP and non PP.	Outcome successful with improvement in although there is a gap still evident across year groups and this has increased slightly in Y3 and Y5 but significantly so in Y4.	
<b>B</b>	PP children in year progress above expected <b>and</b> above non PP children.	At least 3.5 points progress (average is 3) for PP children.	Combined progress above 3.5 for PPG children	
<b>C</b>	Improved attendance for all PP children.	No PP child under 95% target and the average for PP children is as close to whole school target of 97%.	Overall attendance: 96.94% PPG attendance: 94.98% Non PPG attendance: 97.55%	
<b>D</b>	Increase parental engagement of targeted children/families through activities, events and opportunities.	100% attendance of PPG Parent/Carer Consultation Evenings. 100% agreement sought with Home and School Agreement. 100% attendance of targeted families for events (i.e. SFC and Family Cookery). All PPG children access all trips and possibility to attend residential	95% return of Home School Agreement 90% attendance of PPG children at Parent/Carer Consultation Evenings Mixed attendance at events of targeted families	
<b>E</b>	Coordination of PP provision across whole school to enable all aspects of plan to be fully implemented, monitored and reviewed.	Above Success Criteria met. Stakeholders held to account through PP Lead. No. of PP children at or above ARE increased. Data focus upon progress and attainment.	Change of leaderships regarding PPG HT and DHT with responsibility for PPG	



2. Planned Expenditure – Academic Year 2016-2017					
Quality of teaching for all					
Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach/cost	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
A and B	Smaller class sizes for Y6 (Max. of 22 children) £17769	Historical evidence of impact of smaller class sizes for Maths through above expected progress exhibited.  Adopt strategies from other LA schools (deemed Outstanding) with similar %PP.  Evidence from Sutton Trust and EEF coupled with quality first teaching and effective feedback.	Termly observations  Pupil Progress Meetings  PDM and CPD – AfL and feedback  Effective Teaching and Learning and Marking and Feedback Policies	All staff SLT PP Lead SLs	Review at end of financial year as well as academic year but ongoing termly review – data through Pupil Progress Meetings.
A and B	CPD on effective and targeted feedback through talk for learning, AfL and injecting challenge into next step comments £600	Recommendation from PPG LA Review  Sutton Trust and EEF research	PDMs  INSET (Twilight sessions)	PP Lead	Work scrutiny reviews on a termly basis
<b>Total budgeted cost</b>					<b>£18269</b>



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?
A and B	Smaller class sizes in Years 4, 5 and 6 to support and extend mathematics until August 2016 (£6886)	<p>Historical evidence of impact of smaller class sizes for Maths through above expected progress exhibited.</p> <p>Adopt strategies from other LA schools (deemed Outstanding) with similar %PP.</p> <p>Evidence from Sutton Trust and EEF coupled with quality first teaching and effective feedback.</p>	<p>Termly observations</p> <p>Pupil Progress Meetings</p> <p>PDM and CPD – AfL and feedback</p> <p>Effective Teaching and Learning and Marking and Feedback Policies</p>	LB and SLT	<p>Review at end academic year but ongoing termly review – data through Pupil Progress Meetings.</p> <p>Intervention concluded and funding reallocated to fund overall smaller class sizes in Y6 from September 2016.</p>
A and B	Targeted TA support across year groups (Y3 and Y4) £16355	<p>Adopt strategies from other LA schools (deemed Outstanding) with similar %PP.</p> <p>Evidence from Sutton Trust and EEF coupled with quality first teaching and feedback.</p>	<p>Performance Management</p> <p>Pupil Progress Meetings</p> <p>Intervention programme in place</p>	SLT	Pupil Progress Meetings
C and D	Targeted emotional and mentoring support for children who have difficulty accessing the curriculum £2000 (coupled with £10k Medlock funding)	Following analysis of the needs of PP children, a no. of children require emotional and behaviour support through mentoring.	<p>SENCo to monitor implementation and review</p> <p>Mentor reviews</p>	SENCo	<p>Termly reviews</p> <p>Assessment data</p>
<b>Total budgeted cost</b>					<b>£25241</b>



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?
A, B and D	Continue to employ School Librarian with particular focus upon PP children to improve reading % ARE and progress (£9537).	Support Reading and build upon the positive impact on PP children (note progress data).  Impact noted of approach from previous years coupled with related impact upon writing (key area).	Regular monitoring reports from Librarian  English SL monitoring	GD and FC	Termly basis through Pupil Progress Meetings
C and D	Family Cookery project and intervention (£1792).	Enhance family and parental engagement of hard to reach families with view of impacting upon.	PP Lead overview	LB	Termly basis
C	Art Mural Projects (£600)	Enhance and ensure children's engagement through cross curricular project.  Support and increase attendance.	Art Lead	EP	At end of project and through termly review of attendance
D	Enhance enrichment opportunities for children: Trip, Residential, Chess and Club provision (£3500)	Impact upon children's social and emotional wellbeing to support academic progress, access to curriculum and improvement.	SLT overview and monitoring	LB and SLT	Termly basis review of attendance and trips undertaken
<b>Total budgeted cost</b>					<b>£15429</b>





### 3. Additional detail

#### Information as at September 2016:

- ✚ As at September 2016, £58939 of PPG allocated with £9000 remaining to target. Anticipated that remaining funds to be used for release time for teaching staff to provide effective 1:1 feedback and provision and also enhance opportunities for children. This will be decided upon following conversion to academy status on 1<sup>st</sup> November 2016.
- ✚ Review of OPJS PPG provision by LA on 14<sup>th</sup> October.
- ✚ LA Review to be undertaken on 13<sup>th</sup> October.
- ✚ OPJS review and analysis planned at January 2017, April 2017 and July 2017
- ✚ New plan put into place for next academic year



2016/17 In Year Progress – End of Term 2									
Year Group	Reading			Writing			Maths		
	PP	Non PP	Diff	PP	Non PP	Diff	PP	Non PP	Diff
Y3	3.3	2.4	+1.2	1.3	1.5	-0.2	2.9	2.4	-0.5
Y4	0.9	0.8	+0.1	0.8	0.8	+/-0	0.5	1	-0.5
Y5	1.3	1.1	+0.2	1.2	1.1	+0.1	0.8	0.9	-0.1
Y6	1.1	1.2	-0.1	0.8	1.4	-0.6	0.1	0	-0.1
KS2	1.9	1.3	+0.6	1.1	1.2	-0.1	1.2	1.2	+0

Key:  
 Green: Above expected progress of 1 point  
 Light Green: Positive difference between PP and Non PP  
 Amber: Progress/Difference neutral  
 Red: Below expected progress  
 Pink: Negative difference between PP and Non PP

Analysis	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✚ Overall positive progress difference between PP and Non PP exhibited.</li> <li>✚ Reading outperforms other subjects – illustrating impact of PPG Library provision.</li> <li>✚ Writing slight negative difference – review of assessment procedures for writing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✚ Maths – neutral difference.</li> <li>✚ Review of interventions during Pupil Progress Meetings</li> <li>✚ Y6 Revision and intervention programme in place from T3 onwards to accelerate progress further.</li> </ul>



2016/17 Attainment – End of Term 2												
Year Group	Reading			Writing			Maths			Combined		
	PP	Non PP	Diff	PP	Non PP	Diff	PP	Non PP	Diff	PP	Non PP	Diff
Y3	29	63	-34	29	52	-23	24	63	-39	12	48	-36
Y4	38	79	-41	15	58	-43	31	73	-42	15	52	-37
Y5	62	75	-13	62	71	-9	46	69	-23	46	63	-17
Y6	54	74	-20	46	80	-34	23	46	-23	23	42	-19

**Analysis**

- ✚ Improved trend through the school as gap between PP and Non PPG exhibited through the three subjects as well as combined.
- ✚ Review of interventions during Pupil Progress Meetings.
- ✚ Y6 Revision and intervention programme in place from T3 onwards to accelerate progress further.



2016/17 In Year Progress – End of Term 4									
Year Group	Reading			Writing			Maths		
	PP	Non PP	Diff	PP	Non PP	Diff	PP	Non PP	Diff
Y3	4.6	3.5	+1.1	2.2	2.4	-0.2	3.7	3.4	-0.3
Y4	1.3	1.6	-0.3	2	1.9	+0.1	1.6	2.1	-0.5
Y5	2.3	2.1	+0.2	2	2.1	-0.1	2.2	1.9	+0.3
Y6	2.4	2.7	-0.3	2.4	3	-0.6	2	2.7	-0.7
KS2	2.8	2.5	+0.3	2.1	2.3	-0.2	2.5	2.5	+/-0

Key:  
 Green: Above expected progress of 2 point  
 Light Green: Positive difference between PP and Non PP  
 Amber: Progress/Difference neutral  
 Red: Below expected progress  
 Pink: Negative difference between PP and Non PP

Analysis	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✚ Overall positive progress exhibited for PP and Non PP.</li> <li>✚ Reading outperforms other subjects – illustrating impact of PPG Library provision.</li> <li>✚ Writing slight negative difference – review of assessment procedures for writing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✚ Maths – neutral difference.</li> <li>✚ Review of interventions during Pupil Progress Meetings</li> <li>✚ Y6 Revision and intervention programme in place from T5 onwards to accelerate progress further.</li> </ul>



2016/17 Attainment – End of Term 4												
Year Group	Reading			Writing			Maths			Combined		
	PP	Non PP	Diff	PP	Non PP	Diff	PP	Non PP	Diff	PP	Non PP	Diff
Y3	35.3	63.5	-28.2	23.5	42.9	-19.4	29.4	57.1	-27.7	33.3	17.6	-15.7
Y4	15.4	57.6	-32.4	23.1	54.5	-31.4	30.8	68.2	-37.4	45.5	7.7	-37.8
Y5	53.8	69.2	-15.4	46.2	61.5	-15.3	46.2	61.5	-15.3	55.4	38.5	-16.9
Y6	53.8	74.6	-20.8	69.2	78.1	-8.9	76.9	81.3	-4.4	69.2	70.3	-0.9

Analysis	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✚ Difference between PP and Non PP has diminished in the majority of subjects since the last data set at the end of T2.</li> <li>✚ Difference in Y6 is slight for Writing and Maths – one or two pupils.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✚ Trend from Y3-Y6 indicates that the difference between PP and PPG diminishes illustrating positive impact of PPG provision.</li> <li>✚ Concern regarding Y4 – review of provision and strategy.</li> </ul>