

Pupil Premium Strategy Statement

Rivelin Primary School 2024-2025

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 outcomes for disadvantaged pupils last academic year.

| School Overview | | |
|---|-----------------------------|--|
| Detail | Data | |
| Number of pupils in school | 401 | |
| Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils | 17% | |
| Academic year/years that our current pupil | 2024-2025 | |
| premium strategy plan covers | | |
| Date this statement was published | 25.10.24 | |
| Date on which it will be reviewed | 25.10.25 | |
| Statement authorised by | Headteacher – Hayley Wright | |
| Pupil Premium Lead | Headteacher – Hayley Wright | |
| Governor Lead | Dave Higgens | |

| Funding Overview | | |
|--|----------|--|
| Detail | Amount | |
| Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year (24/25) | £94, 720 | |
| Pupil premium (and recovery premium) funding carried forward from previous years | £0 | |
| Total budget for this academic year | £94, 720 | |



Part A: Pupil Premium Strategy Plan

Statement of Intent

Our intention is that all pupils, irrespective of their background or the challenges they face, make good progress and achieve high attainment across all subject areas. The focus of our pupil premium strategy is to support disadvantaged pupils to achieve that goal, including progress for those who are already high attainers.

17% percentage of our pupils are disadvantaged and as a result, face significant barrier to learning including:

- Limited access to activities beyond the school day
- Family circumstances which may affect attendance
- Social and economic challenges experienced by families including; housing, finance, family literacy, domestic violence, children's health and parental anxieties
- Lower oral, language skills and reading skills, especially in KS1
- Higher proportion of SEMH needs in disadvantaged children
- Higher proportion of SEND in disadvantaged children

These challenges will be addressed via a series of robust assessments, leading to targeted intervention. These include:

- Little Wandle Phonic intervention (FS/KS1/KS2)
- Maths Mastery Intervention across school (KS1/KS2)
- SEMH support via Nurture Provision (FS/KS1/KS2)
- Additional Speech and Language Assessment (FS/KS1/KS2)
- Learning Support Assessment

We will consider the challenges faced by vulnerable pupils, such as those who have a social worker and young carers. The activity we have outlined in this statement is also intended to support their needs, regardless of whether they are disadvantaged or not.

High-quality teaching is at the heart of our approach, with a focus on areas in which disadvantaged pupils require the most support. This is proven to have the greatest impact on closing the disadvantage attainment gap and at the same time will benefit the non-disadvantaged pupils in our school.

Implicit in the intended outcomes detailed below, is the intention that non-disadvantaged pupils' attainment will be sustained and improved alongside progress for their disadvantaged peers.

Challenges

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

| papiis. | |
|-----------|---|
| Challenge | Detail of challenge |
| Number | |
| 1 | Assessments, observations, and discussions with pupils indicate underdeveloped oral language skills and vocabulary gaps among many disadvantaged pupils. These are evident from Foundation Stage through to KS2 and in general, are more prevalent among our disadvantaged pupils than their peers. |

| RIVELIN PRIMARY SCHOOL |
|---------------------------|
| _ |

| 2 | Assessments, observations, and discussions with pupils suggest disadvantaged |
|---|--|
| | pupils generally have greater difficulties with phonics than their peers. This |
| | negatively impacts their development as readers. |
| 3 | The attendance of Pupil Premium is lower than that of non-pupil premium |
| | children. |
| 4 | Children's access to wider experiences which enhance their confidence and |
| | cultural capital are limited, this is exacerbated by current financial pressures |

| | 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 | Success criteria | | |
| outcome | | | |
| Improved oral language skills and vocabulary among disadvantaged pupils. Improved phonics attainment among disadvantaged pupils. Attendance of all children including those who | Assessments and observations indicate significantly improved oral language among disadvantaged pupils. This is evident when triangulated with other sources of evidence, including engagement in lessons, book scrutiny and ongoing formative assessment. KS1 phonics assessments will be in line or above National expectations. Whole school attendance will be in line in or above National Average. Attendance of those children who are Pupil Premium is in line with or above that of their non -Pupil Premium counterparts. | | |
| are disadvantaged is improved Curriculum Design and | A significant increase in participation in enrichment activities, particularly | | |
| enrichment activities raise aspirations for Pupil Premium Children | among disadvantaged pupils Curriculum Design recognises the barriers facing those PP children and actively takes measures to address these. | | |
| Improved outcomes and engagement for children and their families in relation to long term experiences of education and engagement with wider agency support | Successful transition to next stages of education Increased parental engagement with child's education Empowerment of children and parent's aspiration for future opportunities for employment | | |



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: | |
|-----------------------|--|
|-----------------------|--|

| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| Training for staff in language interventions to support communication development. Training for staff to ensure assessments are interpreted and administered correctly (including LEAP and socially speaking) | The LEAP is a structured 12 session programme, which aims to develop children's oral language skills. The LEAP is appropriate for children from F1 –Y1 who may have limited speaking and listening skills for a range of reasons. This could include children with English as an additional language, children with poor speaking and listening skills, or children who have had limited opportunities to develop their speaking and listening | 1 |
| Embedding dialogic activities across the school curriculum. These can support pupils to articulate key ideas, consolidate understanding and extend vocabulary. We will purchase resources and fund ongoing teacher training and release time. | There is a strong evidence base that suggests oral language interventions, including dialogic activities such as high quality classroom discussion, are inexpensive to implement with high impacts on reading: Little Wandle 'Keep Up' Group Oral language interventions Toolkit Strand Education Endowment Foundation EEF | 1, 2 |
| Purchase of a DfE validated Systematic Synthetic Phonics programme to secure stronger phonics teaching for all pupils. | Little Wandle: Phonics approaches have a strong evidence base that indicates a positive impact on the accuracy of word reading (though not necessarily comprehension), particularly for disadvantaged pupils: Phonics Toolkit Strand Education Endowment Foundation EEF For children to make accelerated progress in phonics and reading so that the gap closes between their attainment and the phonics stage they should be working at | 1, 2 |
| Improve the quality of social and emotional (SEL) learning. The Nurture Provision will be led by our SENCO and SEN TAs | There is extensive evidence associating childhood social and emotional skills with improved outcomes at school and in later life (e.g. improved academic performance, attitudes, behaviour and relationships with peers): | 3, 6 |



https://napac.org.uk/trauma-informed
practice-what-it-is-and-why-napac supportsit/
https://www.gov.uk/government/publication
s/working-definition-of-traumainformedpractice/working-definition-oftraumainformed-practice

| TARGETED ACADEMIC SUPPORT, ONE-TO-ONE SUPPORT STRUCTURED INTERVENTIONS | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
| Purchase of a programme to improve listening, narrative and vocabulary skills for disadvantaged pupils who have relatively low spoken language skills. | Oral language interventions can have a positive impact on pupils' language skills. Approaches that focus on speaking, listening and a combination of the two show positive impacts on attainment: Oral language interventions EEF (educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk | 1 |
| Additional 1:1 reading practice for children not working at ARE in phonics/reading Additional phonics sessions targeted at disadvantaged pupils who require further phonics support. This will be delivered in collaboration with our local English hub. | For children to make accelerated progress in reading so that the gap closes between their attainment and the phonics stage they should be working at. Phonics approaches have a strong evidence base indicating a positive impact on pupils, particularly from disadvantaged backgrounds. Targeted phonics interventions have been shown to be more effective when delivered as regular sessions over a period up to 12 weeks: Phonics Toolkit Strand Education Endowment Foundation EEF | 2 |
| SEMH provision following a trauma informed approach to provide nurturing activities to enable better emotional regulation, access to curriculum and relationship building / | https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/working-definition-of-trauma-informed-practice/working-definition-of-trauma-informed-practice | 3 |



| repairing. | |
|------------|--|
| | |

| WIDER STRATEGIES (FOR EXAMPLE, RELATED TO ATTENDANCE, BEHAVIOUR, WELLBEING) | | |
|--|--|-------------------------------|
| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
| TEAM TEACH Level 1 tri yearly update Staff training on behaviour management approaches with the aim of developing our school ethos and embedding positive behaviour and engagement across school. | Both targeted interventions and universal approaches can have positive overall effects: Behaviour interventions EEF (educationendowmentfoundation.o rg.uk) https://cpduk.co.uk/providers/team -teach | 3 |
| To develop personal and social skills, to promote engagement in school and sport, to give children larger cultural capital | Both targeted interventions and universal approaches can have positive overall effects: Behaviour interventions EEF (educationendowmentfoundation.o rg.uk) | 3, 4, 5, |
| SEMH provision following a trauma informed approach to provide nurturing activities to enable better emotional regulation, access to curriculum and relationship building / repairing. | Both targeted interventions and universal approaches can have positive overall effects: Behaviour interventions EEF (educationendowmentfoundation.o rg.uk) https://www.gov.uk/government/pu blications/working-definition-oftrauma-informed-practice/workingdefinition-oftrauma-informedpractice | 3 |
| Embedding principles of good practice set out in the DfE's Improving School Attendance advice. This will involve training and release time for staff to develop and implement new procedures and appointing attendance/support officers to improve | The DfE guidance has been informed by engagement with schools that have significantly reduced levels of absence and persistent absence. | 4 |



| PRIMARY SCHOOL | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---------|
| attendance. | | |
| | | |
| Curriculum Design and | Research shows that an engaging | 3, 4, 5 |
| enrichment | and enriched curriculum supports | |
| activities raise aspirations for | good attendance, raises aspiration | |
| Pupil | for all and ensure all children | |
| Premium Children | benefit from rich experiences | |
| | https://assets.publishing.service.g | |
| | ov.uk/government/uploads/system | |
| | /uploads/attachment_data/file/997 | |
| | 897/Against_the_odds_report.pdf | |
| School visits including | Research shows that an engaging and | 3, 4, 5 |
| residential will be | enriched curriculum supports good | |
| subsidised 15% and 20% in | attendance, raises aspiration for all and | |
| order to | ensure all children benefit from rich | |
| ensure PP children's | experiences | |
| participation | https://assets.publishing.service.g | |
| | ov.uk/government/uploads/system | |
| | /uploads/attachment_data/file/997 | |
| | 897/Against_the_odds_report.pdf | |



Part B: Review of the previous academic year

OUTCOMES FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS

We have analysed the performance of our school's disadvantaged pupils during the 2022/23 academic year using key stage 1 and 2 performance data, phonics check results and our own internal assessments.

Below is a range of headline data which indicates our progress towards closing the gap between our disadvantaged pupils and their non- disadvantaged counterparts.

| KS2 Cohort Information | | | | | |
|-------------------------|----|--|--|--|--|
| Number of Pupils | 59 | | | | |
| Number of Boys | 31 | | | | |
| Number of Girls | 28 | | | | |
| EAL pupils | 25 | | | | |
| PP | 13 | | | | |
| Pupils with EHCP | 3 | | | | |
| Pupils with SEN support | 8 | | | | |

| KS2 Outcomes | | | | | |
|--|-----|--|--|--|--|
| Reading | 71% | | | | |
| Writing | 65% | | | | |
| Maths | 86% | | | | |
| Combined | 53% | | | | |
| SPaG | 73% | | | | |
| Percentage of PP in year group | 22% | | | | |
| Percentage of PP children who achieved | | | | | |
| expected in: | | | | | |
| Reading | 33% | | | | |
| Writing | 17% | | | | |
| Maths | 83% | | | | |
| Combined | 17% | | | | |
| SPaG | 33% | | | | |
| Attendance of whole cohort | 92% | | | | |
| Attendance of PP children | 94% | | | | |



Pupils Achieving Greater Depth Standard

| | GDS Overall | GDS - PP | GDS - National | |
|----------|-------------|----------|----------------|--|
| Reading | 25% | 10% | 73% | |
| Writing | 10% | 3% | 71% | |
| Maths | 18% | 13% | 73% | |
| Combined | 3% | 0% | 59% | |
| EGPS | 37% | 31% | -% | |

Attendance Data

| Figure in brackets is | HT1 | HT2 | HT3 | HT4 | HT5 | HT6 | TOTAL |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| amount of students | Sep-Oct | Oct-Dec | Jan-Feb | Feb-Mar | Apr-May | Jun-Jul | Sep-Jul |
| pp | 94.56 | 93.35 | 93.07 | 92.55 | 91.46 | 91.83 | 92.90 |
| 2018-19 | (271) | (265) | (270) | (270) | (269) | (269) | (292) |
| pp 2019-20 | 93.80 u - (269) | 91.33 0 · (267) | 94.03 n · (265) | 93.50 n · (266) | No Data | 31.840 · (269) | 87.99 u - (277) |
| pp | 92.09 u - | 88.77 u - | 95.17 n · (283) | 92.23 u - | 91.95 n - | 88.560 - | 90.79 n - |
| 2020-21 | (285) | (283) | | (280) | (279) | (278) | (289) |
| pp 2021-22 pp | 90.42 u - (260) | 90.00 n · (263) | 89.37 u - (269) | 89.54 u - (272) | 87.30 u - (284) | 88.30U - (279) | 89.07 U · (291) |
| 2022-23 | 91.50 · · · (264) | 87.58 u · | 89.160 - | 88.30 0 - | 87.22 0 - | 87.190 - | 88.68 0 - |
| pp | 90.42 · · · | (268) | (269) | (271) | (271) | (271) | (283) |
| 2023-24 Difference | (259) 1.08U | | | | | | |
| Non PP | 96.23 | 95.73 | 95.81 | 96.35 | 94.71 | 95.04 | 95.64 |
| 2018-19 | (160) | (163) | (169) | (169) | (170) | (175) | (180) |
| Non PP 2019-20 | 95.73 u - (162) | 93.40 u · (162) | 96.11 n - (168) | 94.89 u - (168) | No Data | 68.41 u - (171) | 92.79 u · (175) |
| Non PP | 95.09 U - | 95.260 - | 98.960 - | 96.310 - | 95.45 n - | 94.460 · | 95.42 n · (172) |
| 2020-21 | (147) | (146) | (152) | (159) | (160) | (159) | |
| Non PP | 93.13 | 93.960 - | 93.510 - | 92.77 u - | 93.30U - | 92.410 - | 93.60U - |
| 2021-22 | (163) | (159) | (161) | (162) | (164) | (168) | (175) |
| Non PP | 94.87 n - | 93.220 · | 93.64n - | 93.82 n - | 92.78 u - | 93.41 0 · | 94.22 n · (192) |
| 2022-23 | (168) | (174) | (183) | (181) | (184) | (182) | |
| Non PP 2023-24 | 94.11 0 · (179) | | | | | | |
| Difference | 0.760 - | | | | | | |

To help us gauge the performance of our disadvantaged pupils we compared our results to those for disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils at a national and regional level. We also looked at these comparisons using pre-pandemic scores for 2019, in order to assess how the performance of our disadvantaged pupils has changed during this period.

The attainment gap between our disadvantaged pupils and non-disadvantaged pupils remain, however this can largely be explained by the high incidence of disadvantaged pupils who also have a diagnosed special educational need.

The attainment of our disadvantaged pupils in comparison to their non-disadvantaged counterparts is broadly in line.