



Pupil Premium Strategy

2024-2027 (Alterations 2025)

Our philosophy

We believe in maximising the use of the pupil premium grant (PPG) by utilising a long-term strategy aligned to the school's core improvement plan. This enables us to implement a blend of short, medium and long-term interventions, and align pupil premium use with wider school improvements and improving readiness to learn.

Overcoming barriers to learning is at the heart of our PPG use. We understand that needs and costs will differ depending on the barriers to learning being addressed. As such, we do not automatically allocate personal budgets per pupil in receipt of the PPG. Instead, we identify the barrier to be addressed and the interventions required, whether in small groups, large groups, the whole school or as individuals, and allocate a budget accordingly.

Our priorities

Setting priorities is key to maximising the use of the PPG. Our priorities are as follows:

- Closing the attainment gap between disadvantaged pupils and their peers
- Providing targeted academic support for pupils who are not making the expected progress
- Addressing non-academic barriers to attainment such as attendance and behaviour
- Ensuring that the PPG reaches the pupils who need it most
- Creating a sense of belonging for these children

Barriers to future attainment

Academic barriers to attainment	Non-academic barriers to attainment
Phonics and Reading	Regulation in lessons
Writing: outcomes across the school	ACEs and parental situations
Fluency of maths: number and calculations	Self-esteem and aspirations
High correlation between pupil premium eligible children and SEND needs	Individual attendance in 24/25

Our implementation processes

We believe in identifying a small number of priorities and implementing them fully to ensure the best chance of success. We use evidence-based interventions and learn monitor their success in order to learn from our experiences. Annual light-touch reviews are utilised to ensure that our approach is effective and any interventions that are not having the intended impact are amended or removed.

We will:

Explore

- Identify a key priority that we can address
- Systematically explore appropriate programmes and practices
- Examine the fit and feasibility with the school

Prepare

- Develop a clear, logical and well-specified plan
- Assess the readiness of the school to deliver the plan
- Make practical preparations

Deliver

- Support staff and solve any problems using a flexible leadership approach
- Reinforce initial training with follow-on support
- Drive faithful adoption and intelligent adaption

Sustain

- Plan for sustaining and scaling the intervention from the outset
- Continually acknowledge, support and reward good implementation practices
- Treat scale-up as a new implementation process

Our tiered approach

To prioritise spending, we have adopted a tiered approach to define our priorities and ensure balance. Our tiered approach comprises three categories:

1. High-quality teaching
2. Targeted Academic Support
3. Wider strategies

Within each category, we have chosen a specific intervention. This focussed approach ensures the best chance of success for each intervention.

High-quality teaching

1. Implement the Literacy Tree curriculums in reading and writing to improve outcomes for all groups.
2. Upskill staff in adaptive teaching and understanding fixed end points but variable starting points.
3. Upskill staff in adjusting the curriculum to meet the needs of all groups.

Targeted Academic Support

1. Phonics and Reading keep up and catch-up support.
2. Statutory assessment points intervention.
3. After school booster sessions.
4. “If only...” interventions.

Wider strategies

1. Extracurricular club offer and enrichment support.
2. Breakfast club and after club support.
3. Parental support.
4. Pastoral support team.
5. Ensuring children are in champion positions.

Full planning details for interventions are outlined in the [‘Strategy planning in full’](#) section.

Our review processes

Annually reviewing a one-year pupil premium plan and creating a new plan each year is time-costly and ineffective. This three-year approach allows us to dedicate more time up-front and introduce light-touch reviews annually.

During a light-touch review, we will review the success of each intervention, based on evidence, and determine the most effective approach moving forwards – adapting, expanding or ceasing the intervention as required.

Individual barriers are identified for each pupil in receipt of the PPG and strategies are put in place so their progress towards overcoming their barrier can be measured.

The progress of pupils in receipt of the PPG is regularly discussed with class teachers.

Once the three-year term has been completed, a new three-year strategy will be created in light of the lessons learned during the execution of the previous strategy, and with regard to any new guidance and evidence of best practice that becomes available. The headteacher is responsible for ensuring a pupil premium strategy is always in effect alongside the Pupil Premium Lead.

Accountability

Ofsted inspections will report on the attainment and progress of disadvantaged pupils in receipt of the PPG.

The school is held to account for the spending of the PPG through the focus in Ofsted inspections on the progress and attainment of the wider pupil premium eligible cohort; however, they will not look for evidence of the grant's impact on individual pupils, or on precise interventions.

The school publishes its strategy for using the pupil premium on the school website.

The school publishes a link to the [school and college performance tables](#) and the schools' performance tables page on the school website.

Pupil Premium spending and its impact is monitored by the school's Governing Body. There is a named governor with responsibility for Pupil Premium.

Our funding

Funding summary: Year 1					
Total number of pupils	168	PPG received per pupil	£1455	Indicative PPG as advised in School Budget Statement	£37,765.50
		Number of pupils eligible for PPG	27	Actual PPG budget	£38247.50

Funding summary: Year 2					
Total number of pupils	175	PPG received per pupil	£1515	Indicative PPG as advised in School Budget Statement	£38750
		Number of pupils eligible for PPG	29 Oct 25	Actual PPG budget	

Funding summary: Year 3					
Total number of pupils		PPG received per pupil		Indicative PPG as advised in School Budget Statement	
		Number of pupils eligible for PPG		Actual PPG budget	

Strategy planning in full

Tiered Approach	High-quality Teaching		
Sub- category:	Curriculum and quality first teaching (Keep up)	Staff Lead	Tim Barrow
Intended outcomes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A curriculum for all which allows children to build schemas of knowledge. Staff secure in their understanding of working memory and skilled at developing this in children. Children secure in curriculum fundamentals. 	Success criteria:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Curriculum documentation which is clear in sequence, knowledge, skills and vocabulary and is accessible for all groups of learners. Staff able to build schemas of learning with pupils so that they can explain how knowledge links together. Children fluent in the curricular fundamentals so that the outcomes of PP children match their peers.
Implementation	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate the current curriculum documentation and redesign. Train staff in understanding of working memory and techniques. Redesign the curriculum to ensure knowledge, skills and vocabulary are sequenced. Ensure the curriculum is a curriculum of fundamentals where the core knowledge and skills are clear. Consider the starting points of all learners to ensure that the curriculum is accessible for all so the focus is always around pupils keeping up. Introduce a robust assessment system for all subjects to track progress. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate and adapt the new curriculum potentially in light of a new national curriculum. Evaluate the effectiveness of AFL and outcomes for pupils. Carry out key group experience monitoring to ensure the curriculum is meeting the needs of all. Monitor the retention of core knowledge and skills across all key groups of learners in school. Implement techniques to improve the teaching and learning quality to ensure lessons are engaging and increase retrieval or prior learning. Pupil outcomes increase as fundamentals are secure. Introduce Literacy Tree for reading and Writing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have a well-established curriculum which children are able to talk confidently about. The experience of all groups is positive and the gap between disadvantaged pupils and their peers is narrowed. Lessons show a range of established teaching and learning techniques which increase retention and retrieval of knowledge. A curriculum of fundamentals has meant that greater emphasis can be placed on stretching all learners. A curriculum of keep up means the need for catch up intervention reduces.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPD for staff on adaptive teaching and being responsive. • Embed case sampling monitoring to ensure needs are being met. 	
<p>Light-touch review notes</p>	<p>Curriculum review took place.</p> <p>Assessment system has been implemented.</p> <p>Clear progression within the curriculum documents for staff to follow and for children to be taught in a logical sequence.</p> <p>Staff becoming familiar with end points but curriculum is not always well adapted to the starting points of children.</p> <p>Teaching is not always well adaptive and the responsive aspect of teaching and learning could improve in some classes.</p> <p>Staff's confidence and quality of English delivery is not high enough which has a detrimental effect on outcomes but especially in writing. This has the largest impact on the most vulnerable children.</p> <p>Case sampling style of monitoring highlights that some PP children do not have their needs specifically met.</p>		

<p>Light-touch review overall assessment</p>	<p>The intervention is performing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Far above expectations <input type="checkbox"/> • Above expectations <input type="checkbox"/> • As expected <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> • Below expectations <input type="checkbox"/> • Far below expectations <input type="checkbox"/> 		<p>The intervention is performing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Far above expectations <input type="checkbox"/> • Above expectations <input type="checkbox"/> • As expected <input type="checkbox"/> • Below expectations <input type="checkbox"/> • Far below expectations <input type="checkbox"/> 		<p>The intervention is performing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Far above expectations <input type="checkbox"/> • Above expectations <input type="checkbox"/> • As expected <input type="checkbox"/> • Below expectations <input type="checkbox"/> • Far below expectations <input type="checkbox"/> 	
<p>Anticipated expenditure</p>	<p>Year 1</p>	<p>Subject leader release time through HLTA:</p> <p>Staff CPD:</p>	<p>Year 2</p> <p>Is expenditure anticipated to increase, decrease or remain the same?</p>	<p>Subject leader release time through HLTA:</p> <p>For case sampling</p> <p>Staff CPD:</p> <p>Literacy Tree Training</p> <p>Literacy Tree resources</p> <p>Adaptive teaching training.</p>	<p>Year 3</p> <p>Is expenditure anticipated to increase, decrease or remain the same?</p>	<p>Subject leader release time through HLTA:</p> <p>For case sampling</p> <p>Staff CPD:</p> <p>Literacy Tree Training</p> <p>Literacy Tree resources</p> <p>Adaptive teaching training.</p>
	<p>Total anticipated expenditure:</p>	<p>Forecast for 2024/25 Cost of providing HLTA cover at 76 hours per year = £1,213 Cost of providing CPD = £1,500 =£2713</p> <p>Forecast 25/26 Literacy Tree Scheme: £399.50</p>				

		Literacy Tree books: £1000 9hours x 6 members of staff training cover: £2718				
Actual expenditure	Year 1	Spend from PP budget was not this as this was taken from other cost centres. Impact on PP but school contributed to this in addition of the PP budget. This was also supported by trust centralised spending.	Year 2	£3117.50	Year 3	
			Did expenditure increase, decrease or remain the same?		Did expenditure increase, decrease or remain the same?	Increased <input type="checkbox"/> Decreased <input type="checkbox"/> Remained the same <input type="checkbox"/>
	Total actual expenditure:					

Tiered Approach	Targeted Academic support		
Sub- category:	Intervention	Staff Lead	SLT
Intended outcomes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pupils who fall behind in early reading have intensive phonics intervention to allow them to close the gap and learn to read. Children whose scaled scores fall below working in year group expectations are given intervention to improve outcomes. 	Success criteria:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GLD at national and outcomes of disadvantaged pupils are in line with their peers. PSC data is above national averages. Disadvantaged pupils achieve above the national average for their group. The gap between the groups remains narrow.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retrieval, reading fluency, number and calculation as fundamentals score highly in assessments and catch up is targeted around these. • Pupils attain highly at statutory assessment points to track in line with their peers through catch-up intervention. • “If only...” interventions for children on key learning. • SALT interventions for children particularly in the early years. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Times table check above national average for full marks and average score. Narrow gap between disadvantaged pupils and their peers. • Outcomes of KS2 assessments at national and outcomes for disadvantaged pupils are in line with their peers. • Internal data shows attainment in line with KS2 national averages and outcomes for disadvantaged pupils are in line with their peers.
Implementation	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phonics intervention groups in year 1 target group 1 catch up: covering phase 1 -3 throughout Autumn and moving on to phase 5. • Phonics intervention groups in year 1 target group 2 keep up: covering phase 3 -5 following whole class intervention to narrow the gap between these children and their peers. • After school booster sessions for year 6, run by teachers to improve outcomes in response to tracking. • Whole school intervention programme in assembly time to improve outcomes in fundamental skills. • Implement tracking systems for intervention effectiveness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phonics intervention groups for catch-up began at the end of EYFS so children enter KS1 on track. • Groups for year 1 run and have clear intervention trackers so support is bespoke and targeted. Children make rapid progress to catch up with their peers which enables them to keep up in the phonics lesson. • After school boosters have measurable outcomes which allow them to adapt to the needs of cohort pupils. Fewer children need after school boosters as fundamental skills are more secure. • Whole school intervention is run in a strategic way which allows progress to be tracked and support adapted appropriately. • Implement “if only” interventions as a way of improving outcomes to EXS and GDS. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intervention strategies and tracking processes are well-established. • Progress is measurable and attainment increases as a result. • Attainment above national averages as a result of sustained intervention throughout children’s time at school.
Light-touch review notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whole school interventions are overseen in conjunction between PP lead and SENDCO. This has allowed them to be matched to the needs of pupils. • Phonics interventions last year had clear impact on outcomes of year 1 being above PSC national average. 100% of 		

	<p>children passed PSC by the end of KS1 last year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was no gap between the attainment in PSC for PP vs non-PP. • There was an insignificant gap between PP vs non-PP in MTC. • Area of concern was RWM combined difference. This was linked to lower performance in writing. • More yr2s not having passed PSC means that intervention resources will need to target this group. This does include PP child. • Interventions primarily targeted pupils who were not EXS and did not always stretch pupils who could achieve higher. 					
<p>Light-touch review overall assessment</p>	<p>The intervention is performing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Far above expectations <input type="checkbox"/> • Above expectations <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> • As expected <input type="checkbox"/> • Below expectations <input type="checkbox"/> • Far below expectations <input type="checkbox"/> 		<p>The intervention is performing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Far above expectations <input type="checkbox"/> • Above expectations <input type="checkbox"/> • As expected <input type="checkbox"/> • Below expectations <input type="checkbox"/> • Far below expectations <input type="checkbox"/> 		<p>The intervention is performing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Far above expectations <input type="checkbox"/> • Above expectations <input type="checkbox"/> • As expected <input type="checkbox"/> • Below expectations <input type="checkbox"/> • Far below expectations <input type="checkbox"/> 	
<p>Anticipated expenditure</p>	<p>Year 1</p>	<p>Cost of HLTA intervention groups:</p>	<p>Year 2</p> <p>Is expenditure anticipated to increase, decrease or remain the same?</p>	<p>Cost of HLTA intervention groups:</p> <p>Cost of year 6 booster sessions in time in lieu</p>	<p>Year 3</p> <p>Is expenditure anticipated to increase, decrease or remain the same?</p>	<p>Cost of HLTA intervention groups:</p> <p>Cost of year 6 booster sessions in time in lieu</p>

	Total anticipated expenditure:	<p>Costing forecast 2024 Cost of small group work around phonics, LSA intervention and other intervention at 380 hours per year = £15.97p/h = £6,069 Cost of year 6 SATS intervention at 48 hours per year = £54.38p/h average = £2,610</p> <p>£8679</p> <p>Costing forecast 2025</p> <p>EYFS PP support afternoons = £8440 Year 5 in class PP support = £4220 Phonics intervention groups = £3376 Year 6 maths tutor (payback) = £533 1-1 reading support = £1266 Foundational target support of half morning: £6330</p>				
Actual expenditure	Year 1	£17964.35	Year 2	£24165	Year 3	
		<p>Pastoral spend was reallocated within year to be spent on targeted interventions. Identified that for many children the academic barriers were the cause of other barriers.</p> <p>Centralising whole school interventions targeted more pupils but</p>	Did expenditure increase, decrease or remain the same?		Did expenditure increase, decrease or remain the same?	<p>Increased <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Decreased <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Remained the same <input type="checkbox"/></p>

		did increase the cost of these.				
	Total actual expenditure:					

Tiered Approach	Wider Support					
Sub- category:	Support around the child and family			Staff Lead	SLT	
Intended outcomes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Behaviour incidents are reduced especially around our most vulnerable pupils. Pastoral interventions improve mental health and wellbeing through measurable impacts. Families in need have access to breakfast and after school club provision. Extracurricular club and enrichment financial support. Parental support through multi-agency support. Champion roles include disadvantaged pupils. 			Success criteria:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Behaviour trends show no disparity between vulnerable pupils and their peers. Behaviour incidents reduce across the school in and outside the classroom. Attendance of disadvantaged pupils is high and children feel positive about school. Pupil interviews of disadvantaged pupils show positive views of school and safety. Attendance at clubs is high for pupil premium children. Barriers identified for PP children are reduced. 	
Implementation	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New behaviour monitoring systems allow SLT to track and analyse patterns in behaviour. • Lunch time offer to be reconsidered to include a greater range of activities and clubs that engage pupil interest. Lunch time clubs monitored to track the number of disadvantaged pupils who regularly attend. • Pastoral lead intervention system to be changed to include forms for referral and 8-week cycle. This will include baseline and assessment against clear success criteria. • Parents when there are signs of struggle are offered a package of support which includes access to breakfast and afterschool clubs. • Pupils eligible for pupil premium funding are offered a sports and creative club each half term. • Parental support workshops run by pastoral lead. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lunch time and club offer is run strategically and is monitored to reflect the interest of vulnerable pupils. Tracking of attendance and participation ensures targeting most vulnerable pupils. • Pastoral support interventions are measurable and impactful. Children who participate in them improve in key areas such as attendance, social groups and behaviour. • Need for MARFs or the severity of content is reduced as parent support is recognised early and intervention for families is more bespoke. • After school clubs provide a range of key areas around rising aspirations, developing healthy lifestyles and relationships and providing life skills. Children eligible for pupil premium discuss the option of attending clubs if they want to. • Pastoral lead runs a systematic programme of workshops with parents throughout the school year. • Leaders work on correlation of impacts such as difficulties at home linking to attendance and behaviour to provide the correct system of support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lunchtime and club offer is maintained at the high standard. • Pastoral interventions are impactful and target the barriers to learning of children. Barriers to learning are precisely identified. • Family support offer is maintained as bespoke and adapts to meet the needs of changing demographics and cohorts. • Wider curriculum and extra curriculum offer are well established and funding is used to impact pupils in the greatest possible ways. • Parent workshops have clear foci that adapt to the changing needs of cohorts and parents and focus on providing the best early start for pupils.
<p>Light-touch review notes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pastoral structure worked more effectively in 24/25 academic year but change in staffing has allowed for overhaul of how pastoral interventions are staffed. This has allowed the creation of a pastoral team. • Pastoral interventions are matched to need and the best person to deliver the intervention. • In 24/25, children were offered a range of after school clubs as enrichment. 		

	<p>Enrichment was not always the child's biggest barrier so a more bespoke approach required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDQs to be introduced in pastoral interventions as children are not always tracked in a data-based way to comment on impact. • Bespoke support packages became more readily available throughout the year as barriers were better understood. • Parent support session offers poorly attended. 					
<p>Light-touch review overall assessment</p>	<p>The intervention is performing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Far above expectations <input type="checkbox"/> • Above expectations <input type="checkbox"/> • As expected <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> • Below expectations <input type="checkbox"/> • Far below expectations <input type="checkbox"/> 		<p>The intervention is performing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Far above expectations <input type="checkbox"/> • Above expectations <input type="checkbox"/> • As expected <input type="checkbox"/> • Below expectations <input type="checkbox"/> • Far below expectations <input type="checkbox"/> 		<p>The intervention is performing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Far above expectations <input type="checkbox"/> • Above expectations <input type="checkbox"/> • As expected <input type="checkbox"/> • Below expectations <input type="checkbox"/> • Far below expectations <input type="checkbox"/> 	
<p>Anticipated expenditure</p>	<p>Year 1</p>	<p>Out of school provision costs:</p> <p>Behaviour and Pastoral Lead:</p> <p>Individual child bursary:</p>	<p>Year 2</p> <p>Is expenditure anticipated to increase, decrease or remain the same?</p>	<p>Out of school provision costs:</p> <p>Behaviour and Pastoral team:</p> <p>Individual child bursary:</p>	<p>Year 3</p> <p>Is expenditure anticipated to increase, decrease or remain the same?</p>	<p>Out of school provision costs:</p> <p>Behaviour and Pastoral team:</p> <p>Individual child bursary:</p>

	Total anticipated expenditure:	<p>Costings forecast 2024: Pastoral Intervention - mentor = £24,667 Enrichment activities - afterschool clubs - 2 clubs per week per PP child = £13,851 Trip support - 50% of the residential trips = based on approx. 3 children per year = £650</p> <p>£39,168</p> <p>Costing forecast 2025</p> <p>7 hours a week pastoral intervention: £5906</p> <p>Bursary amount (includes trips, clubs and uniform): £4961.50</p> <p>Champions events: £600</p>				
Actual expenditure	Year 1	<p>£20,283.15</p> <p>Pastoral support offer was too high for the school so much of this was moved over to targeted support.</p> <p>Club offer take up slightly below what was budgeted as some PP children's parents did not take up two clubs.</p>	Year 2	£11467.50	Year 3	<p>Increased <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Decreased <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Remained the same <input type="checkbox"/></p>
	Total actual expenditure:					