

Pupil premium strategy statement – St Anne’s C of E Primary School

This statement details our school’s use of pupil premium (and recovery 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 outcomes for disadvantaged pupils last academic year.

School overview

| Detail | Data |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Number of pupils in school | 231 (including nursery) |
| Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils | 16% (38 pupils) |
| Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers (3 year plans are recommended) | 2022 / 2023 to 2025 /2026 |
| Date this statement was published | June 2023 |
| Date on which it will be reviewed | Annually. Final review June 2026 |
| Statement authorised by | Governing Board |
| Pupil premium lead | Suzanne Binks |
| Governor / Trustee lead | John Monaghan |

Funding overview

| Detail | Amount |
|---|---------|
| Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year | £65,631 |
| Recovery premium funding allocation this academic year | £5,365 |
| Pupil premium (and recovery premium*) funding carried forward from previous years (<i>enter £0 if not applicable</i>) <i>*Recovery premium received in academic year 2021 to 2022 can be carried forward to academic year 2022 to 2023. Recovery premium received in academic year 2022 to 2023 cannot be carried forward to 2023 to 2024.</i> | £0 |
| Total budget for this academic year <i>If your school is an academy in a trust that pools this funding, state the amount available to your school this academic year</i> | £70,996 |

Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

Statement of intent

Our intention is to provide high quality education for all pupils in our school with high quality teaching being central to this aim. Teachers will carefully assess the needs of the pupils and plan learning opportunities to cater to these needs. Staff will not make assumptions based on whether or not a child is classed as being disadvantaged. Our disadvantaged pupils will be appropriately challenged in their learning and will be encouraged and supported to succeed. Interventions and support will be provided where appropriate. In our school, we all acknowledge that raising attainment, including that of disadvantaged pupils is the responsibility of us all.

It is our belief that we must also support the social, emotional and mental health needs of our pupils and not just meet their academic requirements. Developing the whole child is important to us. We recognise that emotionally healthy children are more able to grow and learn.

The covid pandemic has had a definite detrimental impact on our pupils. They are not entering school in the early years with previous levels of independence, speech and language and motor skills. Further up the school, children have gaps in their knowledge and skills which must be addressed. This pupil premium strategy supports this education recovery.

Challenges

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

| Challenge number | Detail of challenge |
|------------------|---|
| 1 | Pupil, staff and parent surveys, discussions and observations indicate that the social, emotional and mental health of pupils is having an impact on behaviour and learning. A number of our disadvantaged pupils also face significant challenge in their home lives. |
| 2 | Assessments and observations show that a greater proportion of non-disadvantaged pupils compared to disadvantaged pupils met the expected standard in the phonics screening check. Only 33% of disadvantaged pupils met the standard (1 out of 3). |
| 3 | Assessment data, over a 3 year period, shows that fewer disadvantaged pupils than non-disadvantaged pupils met the expected standard in the end of KS2 SATs. In maths and writing in particular, fewer disadvantaged pupils are reaching the higher standard that non-disadvantaged pupils. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 4 | Due to the increased cost of living, many families do not have the funds to provide extra-curricular activities which can impact on academic attainment and progress and can impact on self-esteem. |
|---|---|

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 |
|--|--|
| Provision to meet the SEMH needs of pupils in school is embedded. | Observations, questionnaires and referral data for 2025 – 2026 shows that children feel well supported and significant SEMH needs are less prevalent in school. |
| To improve outcomes for disadvantaged children in phonics. | Phonics outcomes in 2025 – 2026 show that 90% of disadvantaged pupils meet the expected outcome in the Year 1 phonics screening check. |
| To improve outcomes for reading, writing and maths by the end of KS2, particularly for reaching the higher standard. | KS2 SATs outcomes in 2025 – 2026 show that disadvantaged pupils are achieving broadly in line with non-disadvantaged pupils at the expected standard and at the higher standard. |
| To ensure that disadvantaged pupils have access to extra-curricular activities. | Data shows that disadvantaged pupils regularly attend extra-curricular activities and therefore have broader and richer life experiences more in line with that of their peers. |

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 (for example, CPD, recruitment and retention)

Budgeted cost: £2,500

| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|--|---|-------------------------------|
| Purchase of a DfE validated phonics scheme | Phonics is an important and effective component in the early development of | 2 |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| and the associated resources and training programme | <p>reading, particularly from disadvantaged backgrounds. The teaching of phonics should be explicit and systematic to support children making connections between the sound patterns they hear in words and the way these words are written.</p> <p>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/phonics</p> <p>Providing training to the staff that deliver group support is likely to increase impact.</p> <p>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/small-group-tuition</p> | |
|---|--|--|

Targeted academic support (for example, tutoring, one-to-one support, structured interventions)

Budgeted cost: £48,500

| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|---|--|-------------------------------|
| Targeted intervention planned and delivered in small groups | <p>The average impact of small group tuition is an additional 4 months progress, on average, over the course of a year. Evidence shows that small group tuition is effective. Small group support can be effectively targeted at pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds.</p> <p>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/teaching-assistant-interventions</p> | 3 |
| Lexia Reading Programme | <p>Research shows that children eligible for Free School Meals who took participated in the programme made an additional two months of progress compared to children eligible for FSM who did not receive the intervention.</p> <p>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/news/eef-blog-lexia-reading-core5-what-does-the-research-tell-us</p> | 3 |
| Accelerated Reader Programme | <p>Evidence shows that the impact of the Accelerated Reader programme is a minimum of an additional 3 months of progress across the year.</p> | 3 |

| | | |
|--------------------------------|--|---|
| | https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/projects-and-evaluation/projects/accelerated-reader | |
| Targeted phonics interventions | <p>Targeted deployment, where teaching assistants deliver interventions to small groups has a higher impact. The average impact of the deployment of teaching assistants is about an additional 4 months progress over the year.</p> <p>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/teaching-assistant-interventions</p> <p>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/phonics</p> | 2 |

Wider strategies (for example, related to attendance, behaviour, wellbeing)

Budgeted cost: £26,000

| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|---|---|-------------------------------|
| Delivery of the Thrive programme in school. | <p>Social and emotional learning approaches have a positive of an additional 4 months progress in academic outcomes in the course of an academic year, on average.</p> <p>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/social-and-emotional-learning</p> | 1 |
| Delivery of targeted SEMH interventions | <p>Social and emotional learning approaches have a positive of an additional 4 months progress in academic outcomes in the course of an academic year, on average.</p> <p>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/social-and-emotional-learning</p> | 1 |
| Reduced cost or free clubs and trips. | <p>There is some evidence that sporting activity may improve attendance and retention. Evidence shows that there is around 1 additional month of progress for children who attend sporting activities.</p> <p>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/physical-activity</p> | 4 |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|
| | <p>Improved outcomes in English, maths and science (around 3 months additional progress) were identified as a result of arts participation.</p> <p>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/arts-participation</p> <p>Studies show that children who eat breakfast on school days concentrate better, have improved cognitive function and exhibit better learning behaviours.</p> <p>https://www.family-action.org.uk/content/uploads/2019/10/Adolphus-et-al-2019-Frontiers-in-Public-Health.pdf</p> | |
| Reduced cost or free music lessons | <p>Improved outcomes in English, maths and science (around 3 months additional progress) were identified as a result of arts participation.</p> <p>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/arts-participation</p> | 4 |

Total budgeted cost: £77,000

Part B: Review of the previous academic year

Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils

Review for 2021 – 2022

EYFS – 33% of disadvantaged pupils achieved a Good Level of Development compared to 53% of the cohort overall.

Year 1 phonics – 33% of disadvantaged pupils met the expected standard compared to 73% of the cohort overall and 84% of ‘others’ nationally.

Year 2 reading – 70% of disadvantaged children met the expected standard compared to 73% of the cohort overall and 78% of ‘others’ nationally.

Year 2 writing - 70% of disadvantaged children met the expected standard compared to 70% of the cohort overall and 73% of ‘others’ nationally.

Year 2 maths - 70% of disadvantaged children met the expected standard compared to 70% of the cohort overall and 79% of ‘others’ nationally.

Year 6 RWM - 86% of disadvantaged children met the expected standard compared to 83% of the cohort overall and 71% of ‘others’ nationally. 0% of disadvantaged pupils reached the higher standard compared to 10% of the cohort overall.

Year 6 reading - 100% of disadvantaged children met the expected standard compared to 93% of the cohort overall and 78% of ‘others’ nationally. 14% of disadvantaged pupils reached the higher standard compared to 17% of the cohort overall.

Year 6 writing - 86% of disadvantaged children met the expected standard compared to 90% of the cohort overall and 83% of ‘others’ nationally. 145 of disadvantaged pupils reached the higher standard compared to 20% of the cohort overall.

Year 6 GPS - 100% of disadvantaged children met the expected standard compared to 87% of the cohort overall and 83% of ‘others’ nationally. 14% of disadvantaged pupils reached the higher standard compared to 13% of the cohort overall.

Year 6 maths - 100% of disadvantaged children met the expected standard compared to 93% of the cohort overall and 84% of ‘others’ nationally. 0% of disadvantaged pupils reached the higher standard compared to 20% of the cohort overall.

Review for 2022 – 2023

EYFS – 0% of disadvantaged pupils (5) achieved a Good Level of Development compared to 60% of the cohort overall.

Year 1 phonics – 50% of disadvantaged pupils met the expected standard compared to 77% of the cohort overall. This is an increase on outcomes for disadvantaged pupils last year.

Year 2 reading – 67% of disadvantaged children met the expected standard compared to 80% of the cohort overall.

Year 2 writing - 33% of disadvantaged children met the expected standard compared to 77% of the cohort overall.

Year 2 maths - 67% of disadvantaged children met the expected standard compared to 80% of the cohort overall.

Year 6 RWM - 56% of disadvantaged children met the expected standard compared to 77% of the cohort overall. 0% of disadvantaged pupils reached the higher standard compared to 20% of the cohort overall.

Year 6 reading - 56% of disadvantaged children met the expected standard compared to 77% of the cohort overall. 0% of disadvantaged pupils reached the higher standard compared to 30% of the cohort overall.

Year 6 writing - 89% of disadvantaged children met the expected standard compared to 90% of the cohort overall. 0% of disadvantaged pupils reached the higher standard compared to 37% of the cohort overall.

Year 6 GPS - 89% of disadvantaged children met the expected standard compared to 87% of the cohort overall. 22% of disadvantaged pupils reached the higher standard compared to 40% of the cohort overall.

Year 6 maths - 78% of disadvantaged children met the expected standard compared to 83% of the cohort overall. 11% of disadvantaged pupils reached the higher standard compared to 33% of the cohort overall.

Review for 2023 – 2024

EYFS – 50% of Pupil Premium pupils achieved GLD compared to 60% of the cohort overall and 62% of non-pupil premium pupils. 50%, while still lower in comparison is an increase on 2023 where 0% of pupil premium pupils achieved GLD.

Year 1 phonics – 67% of pupil premium pupils passed the Year 1 phonics screening check compared to 87% of the cohort overall. While this is lower than the cohort overall and non-disadvantaged pupils, it is a 17% increase on 2023 data

Year 6 reading – 71% of pupil premium pupils reached the expected standard compared to 83% of the cohort overall. 0% of pupil premium pupils reached the higher standard compared to 24% of the cohort overall.

Year 6 writing – 71% of pupil premium pupils reached the expected standard compared to 86% of the cohort overall. 0% of pupils reached the higher standard compared to 28% of the cohort overall.

Year 6 maths – 86% of pupil premium pupils reached the expected standard compared to 93% of the cohort overall. 0% of pupil premium pupils reached the higher standard compared to 21% of the cohort overall.

Year 6 GPS – 86% of pupil premium pupils met the expected standard compared to 93% of the cohort overall. 14% of pupil premium pupils reached the higher standard compared to 48% of the cohort overall.

Year 6 RWM combined – 71% of pupil premium pupils reached the expected standard compared to 79% of the cohort overall. 0% of pupils reached the higher standard compared to 14% of the cohort overall.

Externally provided programmes

Please include the names of any non-DfE programmes that you used your pupil premium (or recovery premium) to fund in the previous academic year.

| Programme | Provider |
|-----------|----------|
| | |
| | |

