

Pupil premium strategy statement – WALTER HALLS PRIMARY SCHOOL

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 outcomes for disadvantaged pupils last academic year.

School overview

| Detail | Data |
|--|--|
| Number of pupils in school | 420 |
| Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils | 35% |
| Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers (3-year plans are recommended – you must still publish an updated statement each academic year) | 2025-2028 (3 Years, reviewed annually) |
| Date this statement was published | October 2025 |
| Date on which it will be reviewed | October 2026 |
| Statement authorised by | James Sullivan, Chair of Governors |
| Pupil premium lead | Emma Beardah, Headteacher |
| Governor / Trustee lead | Julie Miles, Governor |

Funding overview

| Detail | Amount |
|--|-----------------|
| Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year | £199,219 |
| Pupil premium funding carried forward from previous years (enter £0 if not applicable) | £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> | £199,219 |

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.

We will consider the challenges faced by vulnerable pupils, such as those who have a social worker, are a young carer or who face difficulties within the family home. 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.

Our strategy will continue to consider where additional support is required for pupils whose education is being negatively impacted by poor mental health, social and emotional needs, wider family-life struggles and how this links with significant barriers with good attendance at school.

Our approach will be responsive to common challenges and individual needs, rooted in robust diagnostic assessment, not assumptions about the impact of disadvantage. The approaches we have adopted complement each other to help pupils excel. To ensure they are effective we will:

- ensure disadvantaged pupils are challenged in the work that they're set
- act early to intervene at the point need is identified
- adopt a whole school approach in which all staff take responsibility for disadvantaged pupils' outcomes and raise expectations of what they can achieve.

Challenges

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

| Challenge number | Detail of challenge |
|------------------|---|
| 1 | Assessments, observations, and discussions with pupils indicate underdeveloped oral language skills and vocabulary gaps among many disadvantaged pupils. These are evident from Reception through to KS2 and in general, are more prevalent among our disadvantaged pupils than their peers. |
| 2 | <p>Assessments, observations, and discussions with pupils suggest disadvantaged pupils generally have greater difficulties with reading and writing than their peers.</p> <p>On entry to Reception we consistently see 0% of our disadvantaged pupils working at age-related expectations in reading and writing compared to 2-6% of other pupils bring on-track at entry points. This gap narrows but remains significant to the end of KS2.</p> |
| 3 | <p>Internal and external assessments indicate that maths attainment among disadvantaged pupils is significantly below that of non-disadvantaged pupils.</p> <p>On entry to Reception class we consistently see, 0% of our disadvantaged pupils working at age-related expectations compared to 6-10% of other pupils. This gap narrows but remains significant to the end of KS2. This gap remains steady to the end of KS2.</p> |
| 4 | <p>Our assessments, observations and discussions with pupils and families have identified social and emotional issues for many pupils, notably due complex family scenarios and lack of enrichment activity. These challenges particularly affect disadvantaged pupils, including their future aspirations, attainment and attendance at school.</p> <p>Levels of SEMH support are consistently high. In 2024-25, 45 pupils (90% of whom are disadvantaged) required additional support with social and emotional needs, with 28 (95% of whom are disadvantaged) receiving regular small group or 1:1 intervention.</p> |
| 5 | <p>Our attendance data over the last 3 years indicates that attendance among disadvantaged pupils has been between 3-4% lower than for non-disadvantaged pupils.</p> <p>In 2024-25, 29 out of 46 persistently absent children were disadvantaged; this represents 63% of PA children. Our assessments and observations indicate that absenteeism is negatively impacting disadvantaged pupils' progress.</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 – end of 2027/28 |
|--|---|
| Improved oral language skills and vocabulary among disadvantaged pupils. | 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. |
| Improved reading and writing attainment among disadvantaged pupils. | KS2 reading outcomes by 2026/27 show that more than 50% of disadvantaged pupils met the expected standard. |
| Improved maths attainment for disadvantaged pupils at the end of KS2. | KS2 maths outcomes by 2026/27 show that more than 50% of disadvantaged pupils met the expected standard. |
| <p>To achieve and sustain improved wellbeing for all pupils in our school, particularly our disadvantaged pupils.</p> <p>Pupils with SEMH needs show improved emotional regulation, resilience and engagement in learning, as evidenced by behaviour logs and wellbeing assessments.</p> | <p>Sustained high levels of wellbeing by 2026/27 demonstrated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • qualitative data from student voice, student and parent surveys, teacher observations and play therapy assessments • a significant increase in individuals attendance data • a significant increase in participation in enrichment activities, particularly among disadvantaged pupils. |

Activity in this academic year

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

Teaching (for example, CPD, recruitment and retention)

Budgeted cost: £ 78,500

| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|--|--|-------------------------------|
| <p>High-quality teaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Employment of new TLR for Curriculum & Assessment leadership and associated release time. A sharper focus on the leadership of pupil premium will be possible - Release time for assistant heads and English and Maths leaders to drive forward standards in teaching and learning - Membership of Nottingham School's Trust (NST) to deliver and support improvements in teaching and learning and support leadership team | <p>UK Government Reports</p> <p>A 2025 House of Commons report highlights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only 25% of disadvantaged pupils achieved grade 5+ in English and Maths GCSEs (vs. 52% of nondisadvantaged). • The Pupil Premium has a relatively strong evidence base, but its impact depends on how effectively schools use it. • Schools that use EEF evidence to guide spending decisions tend to see better outcomes. It is the role of the pupil premium lead to ensure that the pupil premium budget is well managed. <p>There is strong and consistent evidence that high-quality teaching has a particularly positive impact on disadvantaged pupils, helping to close the attainment gap.</p> <p>Here are some key findings from leading research and organisations:</p> <p>1) Education Endowment Foundation (EEF) The EEF states that: "High-quality teaching is the most important lever schools have to improve pupil attainment, particularly for disadvantaged pupils."</p> <p>Effective teaching strategies include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicit instruction • Scaffolding • Metacognitive strategies • Flexible grouping • Diagnostic assessment <p>These approaches are especially beneficial for disadvantaged pupils, who may not have the same support structures outside school.</p> <p>2) Sutton Trust & LSE Research A landmark study by the Sutton Trust and LSE found that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disadvantaged pupils taught by highly effective teachers make 1.5 years of progress in a single academic year, compared to just 0.5 years with a poorly performing teacher. | 1,2,3,4 & 5 |

| | | |
|---|---|----------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact of teacher quality is even greater for disadvantaged pupils than for their peers. • Raising the performance of the lowest 10% of teachers to the average could significantly improve national attainment and international rankings <p>CPD, over the past three years, has been explicitly focused on items listed above. Rosenshine's principles offer a wealth of evidence for schools to use.</p> | |
| <p>Purchase of standardized diagnostic assessments.</p> <p>Training for staff to ensure assessments are interpreted and administered correctly.</p> | <p>When used effectively, diagnostic assessments can indicate areas for development for individual pupils, or across classes and year groups:</p> <p>Diagnostic assessment EEF</p> | 1, 2, 3, |
| <p>Embedding oracy and Makaton communication 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 as well as working in conjunction with English Hub</p> | <p>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:</p> <p>Oral language interventions Teaching and Learning Toolkit EEF</p> | 1 |
| <p>Purchase of a DfE validated Systematic Synthetic Phonics programme to secure stronger phonics teaching for all pupils.</p> <p>Ongoing investment in associated resources.</p> | <p>Phonics approaches have a strong evidence base that indicates a positive impact on the accuracy of word reading, particularly for disadvantaged pupils:</p> <p>Phonics Teaching and Learning Toolkit EEF</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EEF (Education Endowment Foundation)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phonics has a +5 months average impact on progress, especially for disadvantaged pupils. • It is low cost and backed by very extensive evidence. • Explicit, systematic phonics instruction is particularly effective for younger learners and those who have fallen behind. [Phonics ...Foundation] <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ofsted Guidance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasises that catch-up is essential for pupils who fall behind in reading. • Recommends fidelity to a phonics programme and rigorous 'keep-up' to reduce the need for later catch-up. | 2 |

| | | |
|---|---|-------|
| <p>Enhancement of our maths teaching and curriculum planning in line with DfE and EEF guidance.</p> <p>We will fund teacher release time to embed key elements of guidance in school and to access Maths Hub resources and CPD (including Teaching for Mastery training).</p> | <p>The DfE non-statutory guidance has been produced in conjunction with the National Centre for Excellence in the Teaching of Mathematics, drawing on evidence-based approaches:</p> <p>Mathematics guidance: key stages 1 and 2</p> <p>The EEF guidance is based on a range of the best available evidence:</p> <p>Improving Mathematics in Key Stages 2 and 3</p> | 3 |
| <p>Continue to develop the strength of effective feedback in all classrooms across school. Allocate teacher training time and coaching time from senior leaders</p> | <p>Providing feedback is well-evidence and has high impact on learning outcomes. Different methods of feedback delivery can be effective and feedback should not be limited exclusively to written marking. Studies of effectively delivered verbal feedback show slightly higher impacts (+7 months in one academic year)</p> <p>Teaching and Learning Toolkit Feedback</p> | 1,2,3 |

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

Budgeted cost: £43,129

| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|---|---|-------------------------------|
| <p>Targeted Reading Fluency intervention including disadvantaged pupils who remain behind in their reading as they enter KS2. This is delivered in collaboration with our local English Hub</p> | <p>Reading intervention strategies have shown to have very high impact for very low cost, on children's progress, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds. Progress of an additional 6 months+ over the course of just one school year has been shown. Effective diagnosis of reading difficulties is important in identifying possible solutions, particularly for older struggling readers.</p> <p>EEF Toolkit Reading Intervention</p> | 1, 2 |
| <p>Additional phonics sessions targeted at disadvantaged pupils who require further phonics support. This will be delivered in collaboration with our local English hub.</p> | <p>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:</p> <p>Phonics Teaching and Learning Toolkit EEF</p> | 2 |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Targeted learning intervention support from Learning and Behaviour mentors for identified children | <p>Evidence indicates that one to one tuition and mentoring can be effective, providing approximately between two to five additional months' progress on average.</p> <p>Short, regular sessions (about 30 minutes, three to five times a week) over a set period of time (up to ten weeks) appear to result in optimum impact. Evidence also suggests tuition should be additional to, but explicitly linked with, normal teaching</p> <p>EEF toolkit One to one tuition</p> <p>EEF toolkit Behaviour Intervention</p> | 4 |
|--|---|---|

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

Budgeted cost: £ 77,590

| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|--|--|-------------------------------|
| <p>Continue to provide SEMH support via employment of on-site play therapist and regular engagement with Nottingham's MHST intervention (Mental Health Support Team)</p> <p>Continue to provide on-site Family Support Provision through employment of full-time family support worker</p> <p>Trauma-informed approaches will be embedded into routine educational practices and supported by professional development and training for staff. Dedicated leadership time and external CPD from Nottingham City will be sourced and time allocated to its implementation and monitoring of impact</p> | <p>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):</p> <p>Improving Social and Emotional Learning in Primary Schools EEF</p> <p>Improving parental engagement has shown to add 4+ months progress in one academic year when done in a variety of ways to engage different family dynamics</p> <p>EEF Toolkit - parental engagement</p> <p>Scale of the Problem</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 2024 survey by Action for Children found that 37% of pupils—equivalent to 9 in every class of 25—face external barriers to education. • Teachers in deprived areas are five times more likely to report that half their pupils face such barriers compared to those in affluent areas. <p>Action for Children Evidence</p> <p>Family Issues and Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs)</p> <p>Living in unstable family environments (e.g. domestic violence, neglect, parental mental health issues) is a major barrier. Exposure to ACEs is associated with poorer cognitive development, lower attainment, and higher exclusion rates.</p> | 4 |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>Attendance officer and wider attendance team (DHT, school business manager, FSW) to closely monitor attendance patterns and to support families to improve attendance/ punctuality in accordance with the school's attendance policy</p> <p>Attendance incentives to help raise the profile of attendance across school – proportionate costs</p> | <p>Key Findings:</p> <p>Attendance vs. Attainment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◊ Key Stage 2 (Year 6) • Pupils with 95–100% attendance were 1.3 times more likely to reach the expected standard in reading, writing, and maths than those with 90-95% attendance. • Missing just 10 days in Year 6 reduces the likelihood of reaching the expected standard by 25%. <p>Persistent Absence and Long-Term Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupils who are persistently absent (missing 10% or more of school days) are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◊ Less than half as likely to reach expected standards at KS2 or achieve grades 9–4 at GCSE. <p>Health Organisation Evidence</p> | 5 |
| <p>Continued Breakfast Club provision for disadvantaged pupils</p> | <p>EEF Foundation Report: Breakfast clubs found to boost primary pupils' reading and writing</p> <p>EEF Evidence Breakfast Clubs</p> <p>Schools that offer a breakfast club can boost the attainment of pupils by over 2 months during the academic year</p> | 4 |

Total budgeted cost: £199, 219

Part B: Review of the previous academic year

Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils

Last year marked the end of a previous pupil premium strategy plan. The intended outcomes mapped out in this new plan are therefore unrelated to this review. A note of caution is important to add alongside this review, as pupils included in the performance data will have experienced some disruption due to Covid-19 earlier in their schooling, which will have affected individual pupils and schools differently.

We have analysed the performance of our school's disadvantaged pupils during the previous academic year, drawing on national assessment data and our own internal summative and formative assessments. The data demonstrated that:

- In phonics, 56% of PP children, compared to 68% nationally, passed their phonics screening. A gap more than 20%. By the end of Year 2, in phonics, this gap closed to just 5% with 60% pupil premium children passing compared to 65% nationally.
- By the end of KS2, pupil premium children achieving EXP+ in reading was 57% compared to 75% of all children nationally. This was 48% in writing, compared to 72% of all children. In maths 48% compared to 74% of all children and similarly with combined outcomes, 42% of pupil premium children achieved combined EXP+ compared to 62% of all children.
- A consistent 20%+ gap exists with this cohort of KS2 children, however this specific cohort consisted of 50%+ pupil premium children and significant safeguarding and mobility complexities. 100% of these PP children made better than expected progress from starting points and were impacted significantly by the pandemic throughout their KS2 education. This is not a trend over time and prior to this specific cohort, pupil premium gaps have shown to reduce significantly the longer children at Walter Halls stay with us. In 2024, PP combined outcomes exceeded non PP by 1% with reading representing the only negative gap of just 3% compared to non-PP outcomes.

We have also drawn on school data and observations to assess wider issues impacting disadvantaged pupils' performance, including attendance, behaviour and wellbeing. The data demonstrated that:

- Attendance figures for PP children have improved year-on-year, rising steadily from 89% in 2022 up to 92.2% for PP children in 2024-25. Only a 1% gap exists between PP and non-PP attendance at the end of 2024/25 academic year and sits below national absence rates
- Persistent absenteeism for PP children has also improved at 20.9% for PP, compared to 15.9% for all children and 13.5% nationally. Of the 48 children who are persistently absent at the end of 2024/25, 25 of them are PP children which represents 52%. This remains a target for improvement during the span of this strategy
- Pupil and community surveys, as well as assessments and feedback from pastoral leaders, tells us that there is high engagement in all wider strategies that

we have implemented. Triangulation and specific case studies show a positive impact on persistent absenteeism as well as academic progress made in school

- 100% of children were able to access visits, experiences and enrichment activities this year

End of Key Stage 2 – Walter Halls Disadvantaged vs National

Cohort Specific – 2024/25 End of KS2

| Category | Walter Halls Disadvantaged | National Disadvantaged | Difference |
|---------------|----------------------------|------------------------|------------|
| Combined EXP+ | 42% | 47% | -5% |
| Combined GDS | 0 | 4% | -4% |
| Reading EXP+ | 57% | 63% | -6% |
| Reading GDS | 5% | 21% | -16% |
| Maths EXP+ | 48% | 61% | -13% |
| Maths GDS | 5% | 15% | -10% |
| Writing EXP+ | 48% | 59% | -11% |
| Writing GDS | 0 | 7% | -7% |
| SPaG EXP+ | 38% | 60% | -22% |
| SPaG GDS | 5% | 19% | -14% |

Our disadvantaged children are not yet achieving greater depth standards in reading and SPaG outcomes remain a key area of focus at Walter Halls

Year 4 MTC

| | <u>2021/22 –</u> 53 children | <u>2022/23 –</u> 51 children | <u>2023/24 –</u> 59 children | <u>2024-25 –</u> 56 children |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| <u>25/25 score</u> | 4 = 7% | 9=18% | 11 = 19% | 13 = 23% |
| <u>National %</u> <u>25/25</u> | 27% | 31% | 34% | 34% |
| <u>National</u> <u>mean vs WH</u> <u>mean</u> | Nat - 19.8 WH – 15.5 | Nat - 20.4 WH - 18.3 | Nat - 20.6 WH - 17.8 | Nat - 21.1 WH - 21.5 |
| <u>PP mean</u> | | | | 20.5 |
| <u>Non- PP mean</u> | | | | 22.1 |
| <u>Female mean</u> | | | | 22.1 |
| <u>Male mean</u> | | | | 20.9 |
| <u>20+</u> | 9 = 17% | 28 = 55% | 31 = 53% | 41 = 73% |
| <u>15-19</u> | 14 = 26% | 8 = 16% | 12 = 21% | 10 = 18% |
| <u>10-14</u> | 12 = 23% | 11 = 22% | 5 = 9% | 4 = 7% |
| <u>Below 10</u> | 18 = 34% | 4 = 7% | 10 = 17% | 1 – 1% |
| <u>Absent/left</u> | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 – 1% |

Year 1 Phonics

| Category | Walter Halls Disadvantaged | National Disadvantaged | Difference |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|------------|
| % passing phonics | 56% | 67% | -11% |
| Average words | 22 | 30 | -8 |

This remains a key target of improvement for our disadvantaged children at Walter Halls.

EYFS

| Category | Walter Halls Disadvantaged | National Disadvantaged | Difference |
|----------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|------------|
| GLD | 55% | 51% | +4% |
| Prime Goals | 66% | 61% | +5% |
| Specific Goals | 55% | 51% | +4% |

Walter Halls disadvantaged children exceeded national in Early Years for GLD. This was the case for both prime and specific goals.

ATTENDANCE – persistent absence and serious absence

OVERALL PA for 2024-25: 15.9%. 48 children

PP for PA for 2024: 25/48 PA children were pupil premium. 52% of all PA children are disadvantaged children.

| | F2 | Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | Y4 | Y5 | Y6 | TOTAL |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| No. PP | 9 | 17 | 15 | 21 | 22 | 26 | 21 | 131 |
| No. PP who are currently PA (%) | 3 out of 10 30% | 7 out of 11 63.6% | 2 out of 2 100% | 4 out of 7 57% | 2 out of 6 33.3% | 2 out of 3 66.6% | 5 out of 9 55.5% | 25 out of 48 52% |
| No. PP who are currently SA (%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 out of 1 100% | 0 | 1 out of 2 50% |

Based on all the information above, the performance of our disadvantaged pupils met expectations, particularly with regards to progress made, over and above national attainment. We are at present on course to achieve the outcomes we set out to achieve by 2026/27, as stated in the Intended Outcomes section above.

We have reviewed our strategy plan and made changes to how we intend to use some of our budget this academic year. The Further Information section below provides more details about our planning, implementation, and evaluation processes.

Externally provided programmes

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

| Programme | Provider |
|-----------------------|------------------|
| Times Table Rockstars | Maths Circle Ltd |
| NfER Assessment tools | NfER |

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> |
| N/A |
| The impact of that spending on service pupil premium eligible pupils |
| |

Further information (optional)

Additional activity

Our pupil premium strategy will be supplemented by additional activity that is not being funded by pupil premium. That will include:

- Secure and utilise a Nottingham City 'Achieve Well' grant, following the school being awarded this recognition for our work to improve wellbeing and ensure RSHE curriculum is strongly delivered across school. This grant will allow us to continue to grow this area of learning so that it is a strength of our overall provision
- Secure and utilise 'Edina Trust' grant that seeks to enhance science provision and resource across school. The grant can be used for: New equipment for hands-on science lessons for pupils, Science trips or visiting workshop, to improve the school's outdoor science provision, e.g. wildlife garden, growing vegetables etc
- Continuing to develop OPAL for an excellent play offer for all of our children. We will continue to allocate sports premium funding to enhance this existing provision and we will invest in a trained play worker to lead this provision
- Continue to work with Epic Sports Partners to deliver excellence in physical education for all children and to ensure that all of our children remain engaged in sporting activities both in school and after school
- Offering a wide range of high-quality extracurricular activities to boost wellbeing, behaviour, attendance, and aspiration. Activities will focus on building life skills such as confidence, resilience, and socialising. Disadvantaged pupils will be encouraged and supported to participate.

Planning, implementation, and evaluation

In planning our new pupil premium strategy, we evaluated why activity undertaken in previous years had not had the degree of impact that we had expected. We also commissioned a pupil premium review to get an external perspective.

We triangulated evidence from multiple sources of data including assessments, engagement in class book scrutiny, and conversations with parents, students and teachers, in order to identify the challenges faced by disadvantaged pupils. We also contacted schools local to us with high-performing disadvantaged pupils to learn from their approach.

We looked at several reports, studies and research papers about effective use of pupil premium, the impact of disadvantage on education outcomes and how to address challenges to learning presented by socio-economic disadvantage.

We used the [EEF's implementation guidance](#) to help us develop our strategy, particularly the 'explore' phase to help us diagnose specific pupil needs and work out which activities and approaches are likely to work in our school. We will continue to use it through the implementation of activities.

We have put a robust evaluation framework in place for the duration of our three-year approach and will adjust our plan over time to secure better outcomes for pupils.