

Pupil premium strategy statement – Richmond Avenue Primary and Nursery 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	372 (+33 YR2 & YR3 Nursery)
Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils	24.7% (97)
Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers (3 year plans are recommended)	2024/2025
Date this statement was published	October 2024
Date on which it will be reviewed	July 2024
Statement authorised by	
Pupil premium lead	Dan Mattingly
Governor / Trustee lead	Sarah Webb

Funding overview

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year	£143,560
Recovery premium funding allocation this academic year	£0
Pupil premium (and recovery premium*) funding carried forward from previous years (<i>enter £0 if not applicable</i>)	£0
Total budget for this academic year	£143,560

Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

Statement of intent

The school motto is, 'Learning, Achieving Together'. We passionately believe that all children, regardless of background, can achieve well. We set out to identify any barriers to learning for our disadvantaged pupils and carefully plan our annual Pupil Premium Action Plan based on overcoming these barriers. We recognise that there are many reasons our disadvantaged pupils need additional support from SEND to AMA, family circumstances, life experiences and social, emotional and mental health aspects of learning. Our intent is to diminish the difference in achievement between disadvantaged (PP) and non-disadvantaged pupils (NPP) so that PP pupils are prepared to achieve well in the next stage in their education.

Challenges

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

Challenge number	Detail of challenge
1	Gaps in prior learning for PP children in all year groups.
2	Social, emotional and behavioural barriers to learning.
3	Greater proportion of PP children on SEND register. (43% of our PP pupils also have SEND vs 24% of our NPP pupils), nationally, 30% of PP pupils have SEND.
4	Low attendance and punctuality and persistent absenteeism.
5	Low aspirations and expectations. Lack of 'cultural capital'.

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
To ensure that PP children's attainment moves to broadly in line with national standards across all subjects, by ensuring accelerated progress for these children.	PP pupils make accelerated progress in Reading, Writing and Mathematics from their starting points (end of 2023/24 KPI summary data, baseline 2022/23 to year end point).
To support PP children's social, emotional and mental health needs.	Learning mentors'/play therapists' initial assessment of needs vs outcome; children's' self-assessment; parents' assessment.
To identify and overcome PP children's SEND barriers to learning.	Staff use appropriate tools (eg Maths Box, Phonic Box, Lexia intervention) to identify and overcome SEND barriers to learning. Progress data from PP/SEND interventions shows these children make accelerated progress.
To improve the attendance of Pupil Premium Pupils to ensure that they are in school regularly and on time promoting increased attainment and progress for identified pupils.	Difference in attendance between PP and NPP children diminishes.
To promote higher aspiration for the PP children and to give the children wider experiences of the world around them.	Pupils have a good understanding of the opportunities available to them and strive to achieve their best. Pupils access positive experiences in the wider world.

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:

£21,154.72 salary costs + 2 days teacher release

£1825.52 Curriculum enrichment – trips and visits to engage learners and ‘hook’ their interest.

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Provide third teacher to enable 3 maths sets in Y6	Reducing teaching groups enables teaching to be targeted more sharply at learning need. Smaller group size means more feedback between each pupil and teacher	1,3
Provide CPD to ensure high quality QFT	EEF: The type and quality of CPD that schools use really matters when it comes to improving teacher quality and pupil attainment. Usually, effective CPD is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported by the school’s leadership, • sustained over at least two terms, • includes expert input, peer collaboration, and opportunities for teachers to consider and experiment with their learning and get feedback on their work. All the programmes evaluated by the EEF with positive impact for pupils have high-quality staff training at their heart.	1,2,3
Provide supply cover for 2 days teacher release time for Pupil Premium Review days.	The single biggest reason programmes evaluated by the EEF do not work is because of poor implementation, usually linked to challenges with training.	1,2,3,4,5

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

Budgeted cost:

£82,708.85 salary costs

£6020 online learning platform subscriptions (eg Lexia, Bug Club, RM Easimaths)

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
<p>Provide qualified experienced teacher 4 mornings per week to enable small group teaching in Year 3 in English and Maths.</p> <p>Provide trained support staff to deliver effective interventions.</p>	<p>EEF: ‘Targeted deployment, where teaching assistants are trained to deliver an intervention to small groups or individuals has a higher impact, whereas deployment of teaching assistants in everyday classroom environments has not been shown to have a positive impact on learner outcomes.’</p> <p>EEF: ‘Investing in professional development for teaching assistants to deliver structured interventions can be a cost-effective approach to improving learner outcomes due to the large difference in efficacy between different deployments of teaching assistants.’</p> <p>EEF: ‘The average impact of the deployment of teaching assistants is about an additional four months’ progress over the course of a year. However, effects tend to vary widely between those studies where teaching assistants are deployed in everyday classroom environments, which typically do not show a positive benefit, and those where teaching assistants deliver targeted interventions to individual pupils or small groups, which on average show moderate positive benefits. The headline figure of four additional</p>	<p>1,3</p>

	<p>months' progress lies between these figures.</p> <p>Research which focuses on teaching assistants who provide one to one or small group targeted interventions shows a stronger positive benefit of between four and six additional months on average. Often interventions are based on a clearly specified approach which teaching assistants have been trained to deliver.'</p>	
<p>Provide high quality, individualised programs of learning (eg via Lexia, Bug Club and Easimaths) for identified PP pupils to enable rapid progress in reading and maths</p>	<p>Evidence-based research studies have demonstrated that Lexia's literacy program, Core5, contributes to students' success on standardised reading assessments. In multiple studies published in peer-reviewed journals, Lexia Reading Core5 has been found to accelerate the development of literacy skills.</p> <p>Key Findings: Lexia programs contribute to improved scores on standardized reading tests for students in preschool and elementary school. Targeted populations (such as students who are low performers) benefit significantly from Core5.</p>	1
<p>Provide CPD for teachers, SENCO and support staff delivering PP/SEND interventions so that PP/SEND intervention provision is consistently high quality.</p>	<p>EEF: The type and quality of CPD that schools use really matters when it comes to improving teacher quality and pupil attainment. Usually, effective CPD is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported by the school's leadership, • sustained over at least two terms, • includes expert input, peer collaboration, and opportunities for teachers to consider and experiment with their learning and get feedback on their work. <p>All the programmes evaluated by the EEF with positive impact for pupils have high-quality staff training at their heart. The single biggest reason programmes</p>	2,3

	evaluated by the EEF do not work is because of poor implementation, usually linked to challenges with training.	
--	---	--

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

Budgeted cost:

£16,350.91 salary costs

£14,000 Play therapy

£500 Attendance prizes

£1,000 Aspirations events (eg O2 trip, Residential Trip Subsidies)

£0 Parental engagement (eg F.R.E.D program, Curriculum Workshops, meeting authors who have spoken to pupils)

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
<p>Provide on-going regular learning mentor support for identified pupil premium pupils who need emotional or social support.</p> <p>Provide play therapy sessions for identified EYFS and KS1 pupil premium pupils.</p>	<p>Educational Endowment Fund: 'Wider strategies relate to the most significant non-academic barriers to success in school, including attendance, behaviour and social and emotional support. While many barriers may be common between schools, it is also likely that the specific features of the community each school serves will affect spending in this category.'</p> <p>Children's Commissioner: 'We know that the loss of learning during lockdown disproportionately affects children from disadvantaged groups. The digital divide, with too many students having no access to online learning, was just one reason that, despite the huge efforts of many teachers and support staff, more than two million children did hardly any learning during the first school shutdown'.</p>	2

<p>Identify pupil premium pupils whose attendance is less than 'good' (95%)</p> <p>Intervene through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Incentivising good attendance through attendance prizes for class with highest percentage attendance •Work with Early Help to ensure that Level 2 and 3 intervention is actioned for persistent absence 	<p>Education Endowment Fund: 'There is a risk that high levels of absence after schools formally reopen poses a particular risk for disadvantaged pupils.'</p> <p>'Interventions ... are likely to be most effective when deployed alongside efforts to improve teaching, and attend to wider barriers to learning, such as attendance and behaviour.'</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Provide events to raise pupils' awareness of the necessary steps to achieving their aspirations (eg trip to University of East Anglia; provide resources (eg sleeping bag, rucksacks) for PP children attending Residentials).</p>	<p>EEF: 'Most young people have high aspirations for themselves. Ensuring that students have the knowledge and skills to progress towards their aspirations is likely to be more effective than intervening to change the aspirations themselves.'</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Improve parental engagement with pupils' learning.</p> <p>Fathers Reading Every Day Program</p> <p>Facilitate parents meeting authors who are visiting pupils.</p>	<p>EEF: 'The average impact of the Parental engagement approaches is about an additional four months' progress over the course of a year. There are also higher impacts for pupils with low prior attainment'.</p>	<p>1, 4, 5</p>

Total budgeted cost: £143.560

Contingency: £0

Part B: Review of the previous academic year

Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils

Academic Impact

- 12% of Y6 pupils made more than expected progress in reading, 65% in writing and 18% in maths
- 11 of 17 Y6 PP pupils had SEND needs, with 4 EHCPs and 3 who did not take SATS. Despite this, 53% attained the expected standard in reading, 59% in writing and 47% in maths.
- The percentage of PP eligible children at a Good Level of Development increased from 0% at beginning of reception year to 40% at year end.
- The gap between Y6 PP and NPP combined attainment narrowed by 10% in reading, 40% in writing and 14% in combined over the year.

Impact of providing 3rd teacher for setting in maths in Y6

- Mock SATS in Sept 24 – 12% PP on track – end KS2 SATS = 47% on track.

Impact of providing third English and maths teacher in Y3

- 36% of Y3 PP pupils make above expected progress in reading vs 14% NPP
- 9% PP make above expected progress in maths
- 100% PP make at least expected progress in maths vs 89% NPP
- In addition to working in Y3, PP teacher was also able to deliver training to teachers and LSAs in Number Box and Phonics Box Interventions delivered across KS1 and LKS2, with impact recorded on pupils' ISP reviews.

Learning Mentor/Play Therapy Impact

- PPG has enabled RAPS to provide weekly of 1-1 play therapy for identified pupils throughout the year as well as regular and ad hoc learning mentor support for internally monitored children.

Attendance Impact

- RAPS disadvantaged pupils' attendance was average was 92.2% (0.4% higher than last year and 2.8% higher than provisional national average for primary age PP pupils).
- This now represents a three year trend of RAPS PP attendance being higher than the national average.
- The average improvement over the year for a Pupil Premium pupil was 2.1%
- PP persistent absence was also 2.1% lower than the provision national average figure for primary PP pupils.

- 52% (14 of 27) persistently absent pupils in AUT term are not by end SUM term.
- 10% of PP pupils attendance improves 10% or more over year.
- 23% of PP pupils' attendance improves by 5% or more over the year.

This was achieved by a systematic approach to timely Level 2 & 3 attendance meetings with pupils whose attendance was of concern and maintaining the profile of the importance of attendance with parents (regular messaging, attendance fridge magnets, school signage, home visits for vulnerable pupils) and with pupils (attendance pencils, Attendance Teds, Attendance Superheroes, attendance goody bags).

Case Study: Pupil A – family on PLO/CP; maternal and paternal substance misuse; Pupil A has accessed Play Therapy, subsidised Football Club place throughout the year. Attendance, despite context is over 97% for the year and Phonics score went from 12 in Y1 to 33 in Y2.

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
NA	

Service pupil premium funding (optional)

<i>For schools that receive this funding, you may wish to provide the following information: How our service pupil premium allocation was spent last academic year</i>
NA
The impact of that spending on service pupil premium eligible pupils

Further information (optional)

Use this space to provide any further information about your pupil premium strategy. For example, about your strategy planning, or other activity that you are implementing to support disadvantaged pupils, that is not dependent on pupil premium or recovery premium funding.