

Pupil premium strategy statement

This statement details our school's use of pupil premium funding to help improve the attainment of our disadvantaged pupils.

It outlines our pupil premium strategy, how we intend to spend the funding in this academic year and the effect that last year's spending of pupil premium had within our school.

School overview

| Detail | Data |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| School name | St Andrew's CE (VA) Junior School |
| Number of pupils in school | 224 |
| Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils | 30% |
| Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers (3 year plans are recommended) | 2025-2028 |
| Date this statement was published | December 2025 |
| Date on which it will be reviewed | November 2026 |
| Statement authorised by | Cath Palmer |
| Pupil premium lead | Louisa Clarke |
| Governor / Trustee lead | Graham Lawley |

Funding overview

| Detail | Amount |
|---|-----------------|
| Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year | £109,710 |
| Recovery premium funding allocation this academic year | £0 |
| Pupil premium funding carried forward from previous years (enter £0 if not applicable) | £0 |
| Total budget for this academic year | £109,710 |
| If your school is an academy in a trust that pools this funding, state the amount available to your school this academic year | |

Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

Statement of intent

At St Andrew's Junior School, we have high expectations for all pupils in our school. We believe that every child, irrespective of their backgrounds, can make good progress and fulfil their individual potential. The focus of our pupil premium strategy is to support disadvantaged pupils to achieve that goal and ensure that there is progress for all and challenge for those who are already high attainers.

Through quality first teaching, an individualised learning approach and effective engagement with parents, we believe that all children can achieve, both academically and socially. Leaders ensure that all children receive high quality teaching in every lesson and that disadvantaged children receive frequent intervention and daily support to close any gaps in their learning. Our aim is that disadvantaged children make as much progress as non-pupil premium children, both within our school and when compared nationally.

How this strategy works towards those objectives:

- We use the DfE “Menu of Approaches” (three-tier model) to prioritise spending and activity across:
 - Tier 1 — High-quality teaching (whole-school improvement of curriculum, assessment and staff expertise).
 - Tier 2 — Targeted academic support (small-group and one-to-one interventions linked closely to classroom teaching).
 - Tier 3 — Wider strategies to remove non-academic barriers (attendance work, SEMH support, parental engagement and enrichment).
 - Evidence-based choices are drawn primarily from the Education Endowment Foundation (EEF) guidance and reviews and the DfE Menu resource [Menu of approaches: evidence brief and supporting resources](#) (DfE/EEF summary) and EEF Teaching & Learning Toolkit guidance throughout this plan.
 - DfE Menu of Approaches (summary): [Menu of approaches: evidence brief and supporting resources](#)

In addition to our academic focus, we are committed to meeting our pupils' pastoral and social needs in a nurturing environment. We recognise that pupil premium children may not be exposed to rich learning experiences out of school, so we provide 'memorable experiences' through the curriculum to address this. All children, including those who are not disadvantaged, benefit from this approach. Additional help with funding for trips and experiences for disadvantaged children ensure that no one misses out on this crucial part of learning.

The progress of pupil premium children is robustly monitored through Sonar and pupil progress meetings. Any gaps or challenges are addressed quickly. Our response will be based on assessment, not assumptions, about the impact of disadvantage.

Challenges

This details the key challenges to achievement that we have identified among our disadvantaged pupils.

| Challenge number | Detail of challenge | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|------------------|------------|------------------|------------|-------|-------|-------------------------------------|-------|-------|--------------------|-------|-------|-----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|-------|---------------------------|-------|
| 1 | <p>Attendance data shows that the attendance of our pupil premium children is lower than that of non-pupil premium children. Persistent absence is also much higher amongst pupil premium children.</p> <p>Graph alternative: table of attendance for different pupil groups from the start of the academic year 2024 to 2025, up to Wednesday 13 August 2025.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Pupil group</th><th>Attendance</th><th>National average</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>All pupils</td><td>95.9%</td><td>94.8%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Pupils with free school meals (FSM)</td><td>94.2%</td><td>92.2%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Pupils with no FSM</td><td>96.6%</td><td>95.8%</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Persistent Absence</p> <p>18.2% of your school's Disadvantaged cohort are persistently absent, 14 pupils out of 77.</p> <p>This is 7.9% higher than the national Non-Disadvantaged cohort at 10.3%.</p> <p>Your school's gap to Non-Disadvantaged pupils nationally has decreased by 0.9% from +8.8% in 2023/24, to +7.9% in 2024/25.</p> <p>Your Disadvantaged cohort's persistent absence has decreased by 2.1% from 20.3% in 2023/24, to 18.2% in 2024/25.</p> <p>The Disadvantaged pupil(s) in your school are in percentile 29 for persistent absence when compared to other schools.</p> <p>GAP TO:</p> <table> <tr> <td>National: Non-Disadvantaged</td> <td>+7.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>National: Disadvantaged</td> <td>-6.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>School: Non-Disadvantaged</td> <td>+9.6%</td> </tr> </table> <p>SCHOOL: VALUE</p>  <p>TREND -2.1% PERCENTILE RANK 29th</p> | Pupil group | Attendance | National average | All pupils | 95.9% | 94.8% | Pupils with free school meals (FSM) | 94.2% | 92.2% | Pupils with no FSM | 96.6% | 95.8% | National: Non-Disadvantaged | +7.9% | National: Disadvantaged | -6.0% | School: Non-Disadvantaged | +9.6% |
| Pupil group | Attendance | National average | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All pupils | 95.9% | 94.8% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pupils with free school meals (FSM) | 94.2% | 92.2% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pupils with no FSM | 96.6% | 95.8% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| National: Non-Disadvantaged | +7.9% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| National: Disadvantaged | -6.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| School: Non-Disadvantaged | +9.6% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 2 | <p>Assessment data, observations, books and discussions show that there is a gap in attainment between pupil premium children and non-pupil premium children in writing.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="3">Year group</th> <th colspan="6">Writing</th> </tr><tr> <th colspan="3">ARE+</th> <th colspan="3">GD</th> </tr><tr> <th>All</th> <th>Non PP</th> <th>PP</th> <th>All</th> <th>Non PP</th> <th>PP</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Year 3 (51) Non pp (40) PP (11)</td><td>63% (32)</td><td>65% (26)</td><td>55% (6)</td><td>6% (3)</td><td>7.5% (3)</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr> <td>Year 4 (64) Non pp (40) PP (24)</td><td>79% (50)</td><td>80% (32)</td><td>78% (18)</td><td>27% (17)</td><td>33% (13)</td><td>17% (4)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Year 5 (54) Non pp (37) PP (17)</td><td>64% (34)</td><td>67% (25)</td><td>56% (9)</td><td>9% (5)</td><td>11% (4)</td><td>6% (1)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Year 6 (66) Non pp (47) PP (19)</td><td>83% (54)</td><td>94% (44)</td><td>56% (10)</td><td>14% (9)</td><td>19% (9)</td><td>0</td></tr> </tbody> </table> | Year group | Writing | | | | | | ARE+ | | | GD | | | All | Non PP | PP | All | Non PP | PP | Year 3 (51) Non pp (40) PP (11) | 63% (32) | 65% (26) | 55% (6) | 6% (3) | 7.5% (3) | 0 | Year 4 (64) Non pp (40) PP (24) | 79% (50) | 80% (32) | 78% (18) | 27% (17) | 33% (13) | 17% (4) | Year 5 (54) Non pp (37) PP (17) | 64% (34) | 67% (25) | 56% (9) | 9% (5) | 11% (4) | 6% (1) | Year 6 (66) Non pp (47) PP (19) | 83% (54) | 94% (44) | 56% (10) | 14% (9) | 19% (9) | 0 |
|--|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|--|--|------|--|--|----|--|--|-----|--------|----|-----|--------|----|--|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|------------|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|
| Year group | Writing | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | ARE+ | | | GD | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | All | Non PP | PP | All | Non PP | PP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Year 3 (51) Non pp (40) PP (11) | 63% (32) | 65% (26) | 55% (6) | 6% (3) | 7.5% (3) | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Year 4 (64) Non pp (40) PP (24) | 79% (50) | 80% (32) | 78% (18) | 27% (17) | 33% (13) | 17% (4) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Year 5 (54) Non pp (37) PP (17) | 64% (34) | 67% (25) | 56% (9) | 9% (5) | 11% (4) | 6% (1) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Year 6 (66) Non pp (47) PP (19) | 83% (54) | 94% (44) | 56% (10) | 14% (9) | 19% (9) | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | <p>In school observations, pupil planners and reading data shows a lack of engagement in reading for pupil premium children. This lack of engagement is impacting on attainment for pupil premium children.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="3">Year group</th> <th colspan="6">Reading</th> </tr><tr> <th colspan="3">ARE+</th> <th colspan="3">GD</th> </tr><tr> <th>All</th> <th>Non PP</th> <th>PP</th> <th>All</th> <th>Non PP</th> <th>PP</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Year 3 (51) Non pp (40) PP (11)</td><td>86% (44)</td><td>90% (36)</td><td>73% (8)</td><td>31% (16)</td><td>33% (13)</td><td>27% (3)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Year 4 (64) Non pp (40) PP (24)</td><td>78% (50)</td><td>80% (32)</td><td>75% (18)</td><td>27% (17)</td><td>33% (13)</td><td>17% (4)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Year 5 (53) Non pp (37) PP (17)</td><td>77% (41)</td><td>81% (30)</td><td>69% (11)</td><td>26% (14)</td><td>24% (9)</td><td>31% (5)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Year 6 (66) Non pp (47) PP (19)</td><td>92% (60)</td><td>98% (46)</td><td>78% (14)</td><td>40% (26)</td><td>53% (25)</td><td>6% (1)</td></tr> </tbody> </table> | Year group | Reading | | | | | | ARE+ | | | GD | | | All | Non PP | PP | All | Non PP | PP | Year 3 (51) Non pp (40) PP (11) | 86% (44) | 90% (36) | 73% (8) | 31% (16) | 33% (13) | 27% (3) | Year 4 (64) Non pp (40) PP (24) | 78% (50) | 80% (32) | 75% (18) | 27% (17) | 33% (13) | 17% (4) | Year 5 (53) Non pp (37) PP (17) | 77% (41) | 81% (30) | 69% (11) | 26% (14) | 24% (9) | 31% (5) | Year 6 (66) Non pp (47) PP (19) | 92% (60) | 98% (46) | 78% (14) | 40% (26) | 53% (25) | 6% (1) |
| Year group | Reading | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | ARE+ | | | GD | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | All | Non PP | PP | All | Non PP | PP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Year 3 (51) Non pp (40) PP (11) | 86% (44) | 90% (36) | 73% (8) | 31% (16) | 33% (13) | 27% (3) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Year 4 (64) Non pp (40) PP (24) | 78% (50) | 80% (32) | 75% (18) | 27% (17) | 33% (13) | 17% (4) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Year 5 (53) Non pp (37) PP (17) | 77% (41) | 81% (30) | 69% (11) | 26% (14) | 24% (9) | 31% (5) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Year 6 (66) Non pp (47) PP (19) | 92% (60) | 98% (46) | 78% (14) | 40% (26) | 53% (25) | 6% (1) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | <p>Improve oral language, vocabulary and communication so pupils can access classroom talk and written tasks more readily.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | <p>High proportion of pupil premium pupils (43%) have additional needs (SEND, including SEMH) — this compounds the attainment, attendance and engagement issues and requires SEND-specific approaches, adaptive practice and careful TA deployment.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Intended outcomes

This explains the outcomes we are aiming for **by the end of our current strategy plan**, and how we will measure whether they have been achieved.

| Intended outcome | Success criteria |
|--|---|
| 1. To narrow the gap in attendance for our PP children so that it becomes broadly in line with the attendance of our non-pupil premium children. | Attendance of PP children will improve so that the gap between PP children and non-PP children narrows. Evidence source: EEF attendance evidence brief EEF: Evidence brief on improving attendance and support for disadvantaged pupils . |
| 2. To reduce the attainment gap of PP children in writing to be more in-line with non-pupil premium children. | Narrow the gap in attainment between PP and non-PP children in writing by enabling more PP children to reach ARE or above. Use internal tracking (Target Tracker) to monitor progress of PP children to ensure it is equal to or greater than their non-PP peers. Evidence source: EEF Improving Literacy in Key Stage 2 [EEF: Improving Literacy in Key Stage 2]. |
| 3. To foster a love of reading in order to narrow the attainment gap in reading. | Narrow the gap in attainment between PP and non-PP children in reading. Increase the amount of reading PP children do both in school and at home. Use pupil voice to measure pupil's opinions of reading. Star Reader data to monitor reading ages and gaps between reading age and real age. Phonics interventions for those unable to access Accelerated Reader. Evidence sources: EEF Early Literacy and Parental engagement [EEF: Early Literacy; EEF: Parental engagement]. |
| 4. Improve oral language, vocabulary and communication so pupils can access classroom talk and written tasks more readily. | - Targeted pupils show measurable gains on standardised / age-appropriate oral language checks and teacher-recorded measures (termly). - Oral language interventions are embedded in classroom practice and supporting improvement across the curriculum. Evidence source: EEF Oral language interventions [EEF: Oral language interventions]. |
| 5. Ensure SEND Pupil Premium pupils make strong progress through | SEND Pupil Premium pupils have high-quality, evidence-linked provision in place (PPPs and One Page Plans |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>evidence-based SEND approaches and effective TA deployment.</p> | <p>(OPPs) reflect EEF recommended approaches and/or ECHPs).</p> <p>Teaching assistants are trained and deployed effectively (aligned with EEF 'Making Best Use of Teaching Assistants'), and progress for targeted SEND pupils is tracked and shows improvement term-on-term.</p> <p>Evidence sources: EEF SEND guidance and TA deployment [EEF: Special educational needs and disabilities; EEF: Making Best Use of Teaching Assistants].</p> |
|--|--|

Activity in this academic year

This details how we intend to spend our pupil premium (and recovery premium funding) **this academic year** to address the challenges listed above.

Teaching (Tier 1: High-Quality Teaching, CPD, curriculum & staffing)

Budgeted cost: £ 49,369

| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|--|---|-------------------------------|
| <p>Quality first teaching for all pupils</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing CPD for all teachers in English and maths from English and maths lead Prioritise foundational knowledge in all subjects and plan and adapt lessons accordingly CPD on Adaptive Teaching for all teacher and support staff Writing is a priority on the school development plan. Continue to embed the 7 Stages of Writing, sentence level work, exemplar modelling and | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EEF Guide to Pupil Premium shows that teaching is the top priority, including CPD. Sutton Trust says that quality first teaching has a direct impact on student outcomes. EEF guidance: Improving Literacy in Key Stage 2 and EEF's KS2 literacy guidance pages summarising effective practises. These resources emphasise high-quality classroom teaching, vocabulary instruction and deliberate practice for writing. | 2, 3, 4, 5 |

| | | |
|---|---|---------|
| <p>vocabulary instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupil progress meetings track progress of PP pupils and appropriate, timely interventions are put in place • Pupil Premium outcomes and strategies monitored by Assistant Head • Learning By Questions implemented in Year 6 as a quality teaching and intervention resource | | |
| <p>Teaching Assistants and class teacher to target PP children for regular reading in class.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All classes have a reading folder to track reading • TA for every class in a morning • PP and those below ARE are a focus • Folders are monitored by SLT to ensure they are being used and to identify the need for any CPD • Ongoing CPD for TAs for reading strategies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In school data/monitoring shows that PP pupils are the ones most likely to not read at home. • Teaching 'Reading comprehension strategies' is shown as high impact, very low cost based on EEF research (+6 months) EEF Toolkit • EEF Early Literacy and KS2 literacy guidance: Early Literacy and EEF guidance on reading comprehension strategies and the Guide to the Pupil Premium. | 2, 3, 5 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phonics teaching and intervention for pupils who cannot access Accelerated Reader and independent reading • Read Write Inc phonics scheme and all resources to be used | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a junior school, we are currently increasing the amount of trained, skilled phonics teachers that we have • The DfE says schools which have a consistent approach to phonics achieve good results DfE Reading Framework 2021 • EEF research shows phonics teaching is high impact, low cost | 2, 3, 5 |

| | | |
|---|--|---------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Done as a continuation from the infant school to link with their practice and ensure a smooth transition • Collaboration with the infant school for TA training and assessment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • based on extensive evidence (+5 months) EEF Toolkit • EEF Early Literacy and KS2 literacy guidance: Early Literacy and EEF guidance on reading comprehension strategies and the Guide to the Pupil Premium | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeted professional development on formative assessment, deliberate practice, adaptive teaching and feedback. Includes coaching cycles for staff to refine teaching and reduce misconceptions. • Ongoing CPD for teachers on Adaptive Teaching, Zones of Regulation, metacognition and My Happy Mind • Quick 6 used in all foundation subjects to revisit sticky knowledge • Misconceptions mapped in all foundation subjects. • Staff encouraged to undertake CPD including NPQ, subject leadership networks and CPD for inclusive practice. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching children to understand their learning style and use approaches that work will help them take ownership of their learning. (EEF Toolkit - high impact, very low cost based on extensive research +7 months) • EEF guidance on Effective Professional Development and implementation: Menu of approaches & Effective Professional Development resources. Strong PD increases teacher effectiveness — a core Tier 1 approach. | 2, 3, 5 |

Targeted academic support (Tier 2: small group/1:1 tuition, interventions)

Budgeted cost: 29,621

| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|---|--|-------------------------------|
| <p>SHINE interventions (y3-5) and Learning By Questions (LBQ) for year 6.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Targeted reading comprehension interventions (small group tuition on comprehension strategies, explicit vocabulary sessions and guided reading) and monitored paired reading programmes to increase fluency and engagement. Include parental reading support packages for targeted pupils (home reading prompts and resources). LBQ targeted interventions in English and Maths for year 6 pupils | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SHINE interventions and LBQ in reading and maths are used to give individualised targets and support Allows adults to give specific feedback (EEF Toolkit +6 months) Individualised instruction helps children understand their strengths and weaknesses (EEF Toolkit +4 months) EEF: Early Literacy; EEF reading comprehension guidance [Improving Literacy in KS2]. Also parental engagement guidance for supporting reading at home Working with Parents to Support Children's Learning. | 2, 3, 5 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> External catch-up tutoring provided in maths, reading and writing for CLA children (Children Looked After) After school tuition provided weekly for CLA | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> External provider of small group catch up in English and maths (EEF Toolkit +4 months) | 2, 3, 5 |
| <p>Same day intervention in school</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same-day catch-up interventions provided by teacher or TA daily | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TAs provide same day intervention to allow children to keep up, not catch up with their peers. Children feel more confident knowing they can have extra teaching and support if necessary. | 2, 3, 5 |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intervention is timetabled and happens daily • PP children are prioritised for these intervention sessions | <p>EEF Toolkit shows TA interventions can increase attainment by 4 months and small group tuition by 4 months.</p> <p>EEF: [One-to-one and small group tuition; Making a Difference with Effective Tutoring] (evidence and practical guidance on design and delivery).</p> | |
|---|--|--|

Wider strategies (Tier 3: attendance, SEMH, parental engagement, enrichment)

Budgeted cost: £30, 718

| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food and resources provided in and out of school for those in need • Funded breakfast club and after-school club places • Breakfast provision / targeted meal support for pupils with attendance or engagement barriers (priority access for identified pupils) and monitored uptake. • Food parcels provided for PP families in need • Free uniform provided if required • 'Jigsaw Juice' club provided for PP children at playtimes • Milk provided at lunchtimes • Fruit snack provided daily for morning playtime/start of school for vulnerable children | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breakfast club places ensure children are at school on time. • Having a breakfast allows children to be ready to learn when they reach the classroom (Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs) • DfE Menu & EEF summaries identify breakfast provision as a potentially beneficial wider strategy and cite evidence including evaluations of Magic Breakfast and similar programmes (see DfE/EEF Menu): Menu of approaches: evidence brief. | 1, 5 |

| | | |
|---|---|-------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attendance to be monitored closely every week First day calling procedures used for all EWO to be made aware of PP children with poor attendance in a timely manner Attendance officer in school to liaise regularly with parents and carers Individual attendance plans put into place for children under 95% attendance Holistic approach to attendance plans and EWO attendance letter to build a relationship with the family and create a supportive approach to attendance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DfE Menu & EEF summaries identify breakfast provision as a potentially beneficial wider strategy and cite evidence including evaluations of Magic Breakfast and similar programmes (see DfE/EEF Menu): Menu of approaches: evidence brief. EEF Attendance rapid evidence review shows that interventions that take a holistic approach in understanding pupils and their specific needs and address specific barriers show the most promise. | 1 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding for enrichment activities, including after-school clubs and school trips Pupil premium children are prioritised for places in extra-curricular clubs Class teachers monitor attendance and suggest clubs that would be suitable for their pupil premium children. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DfE Menu & EEF: extracurricular activities can raise engagement and provide non-cognitive benefits when combined with curriculum aims (see Menu of approaches) | |
| Full and part time Learning Mentors in school <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All PP children have access to a Learning Mentor (LM) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PP children are more likely to be identified as needing additional support for behaviour and emotional difficulties (DfE Mental Health and Wellbeing Provisions in Schools) | 5, 1, |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LMs carry out home visits for pupils not in school • LMs are out in the playground each morning to meet parents or children with any concerns • They are a point of contact for vulnerable families and create relationships with them to encourage interaction • SEMH interventions run by LMs including Calm Club and Jigsaw Juice • Safe space provided for children including LM office and calm room | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EEF shows parental engagement makes a difference in attainment (EEF Toolkit +4 months) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEMH support: expand Zones of Regulation rolled-out across school for use in all classes • My Happy Mind implemented in all classes through weekly lesson and daily happy breathing practice • Daily check-ins with pupils to identify need early • Targeted small-group SEMH interventions (mentoring, social skills groups) • Regular brain and movement breaks, including sensory circuits, incorporated into all classes for all pupils to help with emotional regulation so children are ready to learn • Develop the school environment to reduce clutter and | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EEF guidance on Social & Emotional Learning and Improving Behaviour in Schools (evidence that well-implemented SEL and behaviour interventions can improve outcomes). See EEF resources referenced in the DfE Menu of Approaches: Menu of approaches: evidence brief. | |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| minimise sensory overload in order to improve learning behaviours and concentration | | |
| Fostering a love of reading <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parent information meetings at school to help teach strategies to improve and encourage reading • Planners used throughout school to promote home-school engagement with focus on PP children to encourage more interaction • School to facilitate all children to join the local library to encourage engagement with reading outside of school • School library regularly restocked with new book releases or requests from school council. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EEF – parental engagement + 4 months (EEF Toolkit) • Reported outcomes of improved parental engagement include improved academic performance. (NFER Teacher Guide: Parental Engagement and Narrowing the Gap in Attainment for Disadvantaged Children 2013) • EEF: Working with Parents to Support Children's Learning and Parental engagement strand in the Teaching & Learning Toolkit. Parental engagement yields measurable gains (+3–4 months on average) when well implemented. | 3 |

Total budgeted cost: £109, 710

Part B: Review of outcomes in the previous academic year

Pupil premium strategy outcomes

This details the impact that our pupil premium activity had on pupils in the 2025-2026 academic year.

This strategy will be reviewed in October 2026.

Externally provided programmes

Please include the names of any non-DfE programmes that you purchased in the previous academic year. This will help the Department for Education identify which ones are popular in England

| Programme | Provider |
|-----------|------------|
| Tutoring | Go Educate |
| | |