# Pupil premium strategy statement: Moor Park 2016 – 17 – Review Date Sept 2017

## Based on the TSC Pupil Premium Toolkit

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Summary information**
 |
| **School** |  |
| **Academic Year** | 2016/17 | **Total PP budget** |  | **Date of most recent PP Review** | n/a |
| **Total number of pupils** |  | **Number of pupils eligible for PP** |  | **Date for next internal review of this strategy** | July 2017 |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Current attainment (Now showing 2017 data in provisional using Sig+ Value Added tracker v3)**
 |
|  | *Pupils eligible for PP (figues in red 2016-17)* | *Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)*  |
| **% achieving Expected or above in reading, writing and maths**  | 31% | 53% |
| **Progress for Reading**  | -0.9 (3.61) | 0.3 |
| **Progress for Writing**  | 3 (0.52) | 0.1 |
| **Progress for Maths**  | 0.9 (1.25) | 0.2 |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **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)* |
|  | Communication Language and Literacy issues in EYFS / KS1 cause PP pupils to make slow progress |
|  | As a result of prior lower attainment in KS1, PP children performed less well in reading than nonPP children.  |
| **C.** | **Higher ability PP children in KS2 did not make same progress as higher achieving nonPP children**  |
| **D** | Combined Reading, Writing and Maths was lower at KS2 for PP children and, on exploration, is lower across KS2 |
|  **External barriers** *(issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)* |
| **E**  | Behaviour at lunchtimes during academic year 2015 – 16 was raised as a concern by pupils  |
| 1. **Outcomes**
 |
|  | *Desired outcomes and how they will be measured* | *Success criteria*  |
|  | Improved oral language in reception and KS1 | Pupils eligible for PP in Reception and KS1 classes make rapid progress by the end of the year so that all pupils eligible for PP meet age related expectations. |
|  | PP children across KS2 achieving in line with or exceeding their peers in reading  | PP pupils in reading achieve in line with their peers across KS2In Y6, PP children achieve in line or exceed national nonPP children. |
|  | Higher achieving children achieving in line or exceeding their peers across KS2 in Reading, Writing and Maths  | In KS2, higher-achieving KS1 pupil’s attainment in line with peers. In Y6, same as national nonPP Higher achieving children.  |
|  | The gap in achievement between PP and nonPP in combined RWM closes | RWM achievement in the same for PP and nonPP childrenCombined RWM is a performance management target for staff |
|  | Improved provision at lunchtime through additional use of Sports Coaches  | Behaviour incidents at lunchtime are minimised |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **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.  |
| 1. **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** | **Review** |
| A. Improved oral language skills in Reception / KS1 | Staff training on high quality feedback.Staff training on developing oracy for the high attaining pupils in EYFS and reception Y1 from EYFS/Reception SLE. | We want to invest some of the PP in longer term change which will help all pupils. Many different evidence sources, e.g. EEF Toolkit suggest high quality feedback is an effective way to improve attainment, and it is suitable as an approach that we can embed across the school. | Staff training on CLLD to ensure appropriate interventions are well run.Monitoring language skills for target children through baseline assessment and end of project to Lessons from training embedded in school feedback policy. | AHT for EYFS / KS1Deputy Head | This will remain a priority – data showed a dip |
| 1. PP children across KS2 achieving in line with or exceeding their peers in reading
 | Guided reading training for all staffIncrease challenge of books provided for pupilsCreate a canon of literature for pupils at Moor ParkStrengthen teacher assessmentRegular reading within KS2 Development of home reading  | Evidence from Reading Reconsidered and Good Habits of Great Readers shows that high quality guided reading where children read challenging books from contemporary authors blended with books written between 1920 and 1960 improves reading ability | Monitoring of reading agesLAPs documents to record progress and inform planning will be monitoredUse of optional tests in KS2Intervention in Y6 to close gaps | AHT for KS2Deputy Head | Data across KS1 / 2 shows that achievement in in line with peers. End of KS2 data shows: PP nonPPR 74% 83%W 84% 86%M 74% 83%Showing improvements except for writing.  |
| 1. The gap in achievement between PP and nonPP in combined RWM closes
 | Target for RWM combined set as part of appraisal cycleAppropriate interventions for pupils that close gaps identified on LAPs | Tracking of RWM on a regular basis to identify key pupils for interventions: End of* Nov
* Feb
* Start April
* May
* July

Half termly data health check to identify pupils off track | Moderation staff meetings to build capacity in teacher moderationUse of test data to benchmark against | All Staff | End KS Data: PP nonPPR 74% 83%W 84% 86%M 74% 83%Data is broadly in line. Similar % diff across year groups in school.  |
| 1. Behaviour incidents at lunchtime are minimised
 | Provide organised sporting / play activities for pupils at a lunchtime | We know that when games and activities are organised, pupils respond positively to the structure.We will work with BfC Community Trust, the Learning Mentor and the DHT to provide a series of organised games for pupils.  | Compare incidents to previous year.  | WelfareBfCDHTLM | No exclusions for lunchtime behaviour  |
| **Total budgeted cost** | £ |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **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** | **Review** |
| D. Increased attendance rates  | PWO to monitor pupils and follow up quickly on absences. First day response provision.  | We can’t improve attainment for children if they aren’t actually attending school. NfER briefing for school leaders identifies addressing attendance as a key step. | Thorough briefing of PWO about existing absence issues. PP coordinator, PWO, head etc. will collaborate to ensure new provision and standard school processes work smoothly together.  | Pupil Premium Coordinator | Absence:PP: 4.0% (in-line with 2015-16)nonPP: 3.2% (inline with 2015 – 16) PA: Increase in both due to different calculation. PP: 6%nonPP: 4.3%Majority of PA pupils are no longer on roll. Change in measurement and 4 short stay pupils skewed PA attendance.  |
| Improve the quality of Teaching and Learning across school  | Staff sent on external ‘growth mind-set’ course Work with Bill Thompson to develop teacher pedagogy to focus on learning and assessment | We know that quality first teaching is paramount in getting the best results for pupils.  | Staff have an appraisal target related to the work undertaken with Bill ThompsonStaff CPD sessions focusing on marking and feedback will monitor the quality of feedback given. Use of visualisers to transform approaches to T & L in classroomsGrowth Mindset project data will show how children are becoming more resilient.  | HT / DHT | See SDPStaff using visualisers – pupils act as teachers. RAG cups in all classrooms.Growth mind-set underpinning approach to pedagogy  |
| **Total budgeted cost** |  |

All Pupils

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | **Reading** | **Writing** | **Maths** |
| **Pupil Count** | 46 | 46 | 46 |
| **Confidence Interval** | 1.81 | 1.83 | 1.54 |
| **Upper CI** | 4.51 | 2.79 | 3.29 |
| **Lower CI** | 0.89 | -0.86 | 0.21 |
| **School VA Score** | **2.70** | **0.97** | **1.75** |
| **Significance** | **Sig+** | **In Line** | **Sig+** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | **Reading** | **Writing** | **Maths** |
| **Pupil Count** | 21 | 21 | 21 |
| **Confidence Interval** | 2.68 | 2.70 | 2.28 |
| **Upper CI** | 6.29 | 3.22 | 3.53 |
| **Lower CI** | 0.93 | -2.18 | -1.03 |
| **School VA Score** | **3.61** | **0.52** | **1.25** |
| **Significance** | **Sig+** | **In Line** | **In Line** |