Pupil premium strategy statement 2023-25

This statement details our school's use of pupil premium (and recovery premium for the 2023 to 2025 academic year) 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 | Ravensfield Primary School |
| Number of pupils in school | 429 including nursery |
| Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils | 43.8% |
| Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers (3 year plans are recommended) | 2023-25 |
| Date on which it will be reviewed | 2025 |
| Statement authorised by | Karen Leyland |
| Pupil premium lead | Karen Leyland |
| Governor / Trustee lead | Jaci Nelson |

Funding overview

| Detail | Amount |
|--|----------------------------|
| Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year | £230,880 |
| Recovery premium funding allocation this academic year | £5,691 – Covid Recovery |
| Pupil premium funding carried forward from previous years (enter £0 if not applicable) | £0 |
| Total budget for this academic year | £236,571 |

Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

Statement of Intent

The pupil premium strategy is to tackle gaps in attainment and progress between the pupil premium cohort and our non-pupil premium cohort. Our approach will be responsive to common challenges and individual needs, rooted in robust diagnostic assessment, not assumptions about the impact of disadvantage.

At the heart of the strategy is high quality teaching, both in the classroom and in other areas of school life. This is taken seriously, and a programme of professional development for all staff linked to teaching and learning is always a high priority. Focus on literacy (in particularly reading and oral language) is also a focus utilising *Read*, *Write*, *Inc* training and quality assurance across school. Early identification of delays and barriers to learning has led to early access to the speech and language team and intervention.

Staff throughout school are deployed to effectively teach and challenge all our pupils including those in receipt of pupil premium.

Targeted academic support is also key. Evidence consistently shows the positive impact that targeted academic support can have, including on those who are not making good progress. Intervention is targeted, delivered effectively by high quality staff and impact is consistently monitored. The intervention strategy is also integral to wider school plans for education recovery, notably the catch-up funding programme to support pupils whose education has been worst affected, including non-disadvantaged pupils.

Wider strategies will also play a key role; attendance which underpins all of the above. If pupils are not in school the strategy is simply words on a page. Therefore, attendance will always be a focus for our strategies to work. This includes 'active attendance' as simply being in school isn't enough, are pupils need to be in the right place, with the right mindset each day to ensure they are making progress.

Demography and School Context

Ravensfield Primary School is a two-form entry school in Tameside, on the outskirts of Greater Manchester. The statistics for the region and school are as follows:

- Tameside is ranked 28th (out of 309) in the index of Multiple Deprivations 2019, placing it in the most deprived 10% of boroughs in the country
- The community that the school serves is an area of high deprivation. The vast majority of pupils live in the top 3 most deprived IDACI deciles, with 43% in decile 3.
- The proportion of pupils known to be eligible for the pupil premium is above aver-age, 39.7 % of children are eligible for Free School Meals (FSM), compared to 23.5% nationally.
- The proportion of pupils from minority ethnic groups is below the national average as is the proportion of pupils reported to have English as an additional language. However, the number of languages spoken by children in school now totals 23.
- The percentage of children receiving SEN support is 25.4%, compared to 18% nationally. The percentage of children with an EHCP is 4% compared to 4.8% nationally.
- The school currently has a significant number of children and families working with Children's Social Care: 6 children under child protection, 3 children are looked after or in receipt of an SGO, 12 children are classed as Child in Need and 15 further children are receiving or have recently received support under the Early Help framework.

Challenges

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

| Challenge number | Detail of challenge |
|------------------|--|
| 1 | Attendance monitoring tells us that children in receipt of pupil premium are more likely to have low attendance and more likely to have very low attendance (persistent absence) |
| 2 | Low attainment on entry to the Early Years Foundation Stage in all areas. Data shows us that while there is low data across the cohort, it is acute for those in receipt of pupil premium. |
| 3 | Attainment data tells us there is a significant gap in 'Communication and Language' attainment and ability between those children who are in receipt of Pupil premium and those who are not. This means many children struggle to make the gains expected from the teaching and learning environment and routines as they fall outside of age-related developmental stages. This not only impacts on their academic development but also on their social and emotional development which if not identified and improved early in the school career has negative impact on social communication skills. |
| 4 | Attainment data tells us that pupils in receipt of pupil premium generally have greater difficulties with phonics than their peers. This negatively impacts their development as readers. Children who do not learn to read quickly, struggle to access learning especially in KS2 which can impact on their well-being, self-esteem and behaviour. |
| 5 | Many families in receipt of pupil premium are also working within the CSC framework and many of these are at highest level of need. This impacts on pupil welfare and wellbeing and directly affects their educational and wider experience. |
| 6 | Triangulated evidence shows us that pupil stamina for learning is not yet recovered to pre Covid levels. This is compounded by poor automaticity of writing skills such as handwriting and spelling. Data tells us this is more acutely shown in by those in receipt of pupil premium. |
| 7 | Decoding and numerical fluency are gaps which must be plugged in order for children to go onto future success. Data tells us this is more acutely shown in by those in receipt of pupil premium. |

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 |
|--|--|
| Improve attendance for all groups | To get 97% by the end of 2025. Clear values led policy consistently promoting the reasons for good attendance. Work alongside the EWO. Use of penalty notices as required. Work towards a gap of around 2% between PP and non-PP |
| To ensure pupils make good progress made across all areas of EYFS from their starting point, especially the area of communication and language skills for all pupils, particularly our disadvantaged pupils. | Impact of staff training on SHREC, RWI, and 'Tales Toolkit' seen in improved data for all groups of children. This is evident when triangulated with other sources of evidence, including Wellcomm data, engagement in speaking and listening in lessons, book scrutiny and ongoing formative assessment. As well as work on Early Maths through <i>Learning Trajectories</i> and <i>Storytime Maths</i> . Internal progress measures show all children making good progress from their starting points and more disadvantaged pupils achieving the Early Learning Goals. |
| To encourage teachers to 'keep children up', providing on the day interventions when learning is not secure. | Teachers will craft lessons with a secure understanding of potential errors in understanding and misconceptions; checking for understanding within lessons and planning to meet those identified needs without delay. |
| To improve reading attainment for disadvantaged pupils. | Monitor internal tracking and outcomes at the end of KS2 show an improving trend for the % of disadvantaged children achieving at least age-related expectations in reading. |
| To improve maths attainment for disadvantaged pupils. | Monitor internal tracking and outcomes at the end of KS2 show an improving trend for the % of disadvantaged children achieving at least age-related expectations in reading. |
| To improve writing attainment for disadvantaged pupils. | Monitor internal tracking and outcomes at the end of KS2 show an improving trend for the % of disadvantaged children achieving at least age-related expectations in reading. |

| To support children to manage their behaviour and reduces the number of suspensions over the academic year. | Improved behaviour with the implementation of Behaviour Curriculum. |
|--|--|
| To achieve and sustain improved wellbeing for all pupils in our school, particularly our disadvantaged pupils. | Data from nurture interventions show significant improvement in emotional wellbeing which is having an impact on pupils learning back in class. Targeted support for children with SEMH need will enable children to learn and have resilience in their learning. targeted pupils will make good progress. |
| To support our children and families in the CSC framework ensuring their needs are met and they can continue to learn effectively. | All children in the CSC framework have targeted support through LAC/pastoral interventions. Their progress is monitored as part of inclusion processes and pupil progress meetings. Barriers to learning are addressed through effective interventions and pastoral support. Identified families have early help processes in place and referrals are made to support families where needed. Children in CSC framework have good attendance and make good progress in line with 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 £ 75,250

| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|--|---|-------------------------------|
| High quality CPD that insists on a culture of high expectations through: • Creation of very clear mental models for learning; pedagogy and subject discipline • INSET • Training sessions • Coaching (subject specific and instructional coaching) • Support: Pixl; RWI; WhiteRose; Steplab NCETM Lexia | EEF evidence shows that high quality CPD has a lasting effect on the way teachers practice. This is shown through EEF studies on CPD and implementation. | 2,3,4,6,7 |
| Processes to support this: Appraisal and access to external training by quality providers | | |
| A clear model for TA support in class, enabling independence and academic progress | StepLab Specific coaching <u>EEF Teaching Assistant interventions</u> | 2,3,4,6,7 |

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

Budgeted Cost £90,881

| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|----------|--|-------------------------------------|
| | Principles of cognitive science shows the necessity of building secure foundations for learning. | 4,6,7, |

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

Budgeted cost: £157,914

| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| Embedding principles of good practice set out in the DfE's Improving School Attendance advice. | The DfE guidance has been informed by engagement with schools that have significantly reduced levels of absence and persistent absence. | 1 |
| Family Liaison Officer works closely with the families of Pupil premium children, monitoring and providing support to ensure attendance is an acceptable level. | Both targeted interventions and universal approaches can have positive overall effects: | 2,3,4,6,7, |
| Whole staff training on behaviour management approaches with the aim of developing our school ethos, improving behaviour | Behaviour interventions EEF (educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk) EEF Teaching Assistant interventions | |

across school and support children with complex behaviour needs.

Educational psychologist assessments to support individuals.

Direct, individualised pastoral interventions using the Thrive Approach.

Wellbeing sessions through the targeted nurture group interventions and additional pastoral support for pupils struggling with issues that directly impact on learning.

Evidence suggests that children from disadvantaged backgrounds have, on average, weaker emotional literacy skills at all ages than their more affluent peers. These skills are likely to influence a range of outcomes for pupils: lower social and emotional literacy skills are linked with poorer mental health and lower academic attainment.

Social and emotional interventions in education are shown to improve these skills and are therefore likely to support disadvantaged pupils to understand and engage in healthy relationships with peers and emotional self-regulation, both of which may subsequently increase academic attainment.

EEF Social and Emotional Learning

The number of children in the children's social care framework is significant in our school and the children's family circumstances have a huge impact on theirs and often others learning in class.

As a school we have always had high need due to the community context. Support for these children and working alongside other professionals is vital to enable the children to be happy and successful in school.

Safeguarding team to address the needs of pupils in the social care system. This includes regular pastoral support, meetings with professionals and parents and planned interventions as a

1,5

5

| result of issues arisen. | |
|--|--|
| Use of UK Military Mentors for disadvantaged pupils at risk of exclusion, | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

Part B: Review of the previous academic year

Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils

| NCER | KS2 Attainment Summary List Df | E (July) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | DfE (Jul | y) 2023 |
|-------|--------------------------------|----------|-------|------|------------|--|-------|-------|--------------------|-------|-------|---|-------------|-------|------------|---|--------------------|---------|
| | | | RWN | //* | | REA | DING | | WRITIN | G TA | | M | ATHS | | GPS | | | |
| stab. | School | Cohort | ≥Exp | High | Avg. SS | • <exp< th=""><th>≥Exp</th><th>High</th><th>● ● ≥Exp</th><th>GDS</th><th>Avg.</th><th>• <exp< th=""><th>● ● ≥Exp</th><th>High</th><th>Avg. SS</th><th>• <exp< th=""><th>● ● ≥Exp</th><th>High</th></exp<></th></exp<></th></exp<> | ≥Exp | High | ● ● ≥Exp | GDS | Avg. | • <exp< th=""><th>● ● ≥Exp</th><th>High</th><th>Avg. SS</th><th>• <exp< th=""><th>● ● ≥Exp</th><th>High</th></exp<></th></exp<> | ● ● ≥Exp | High | Avg. SS | • <exp< th=""><th>● ● ≥Exp</th><th>High</th></exp<> | ● ● ≥Exp | High |
| | NCER National | 650,570 | 59.4% | 8.0% | 105.1 | 26.7% | 72.6% | 28.9% | 71.5% | 13.3% | 104.2 | 26.3% | 72.8% | 23.8% | 104.9 | 27.0% | 72.3% | 30.0% |
| | FSM Eligible | 175,680 | 43.3% | 3.0% | 102.3 | 39.5% | 59.3% | 16.9% | 57.5% | 6.4% | 101.2 | 40.5% | 58.2% | 12.5% | 101.9 | 40.6% | 58.2% | 18.0% |
| | Not FSM Eligible | 467,410 | 65.8% | 9.9% | 106.1 | 21.6% | 77.9% | 33.7% | 77.1% | 16.0% | 105.3 | 20.7% | 78.7% | 28.2% | 106.0 | 21.6% | 77.9% | 34.7% |
| | Unknown | 7,490 | 38.3% | 3.6% | 102.6 | 40.3% | 51.9% | 17.1% | 49.9% | 7.3% | 101.6 | 41.1% | 51.4% | 13.4% | 102.3 | 40.7% | 51.8% | 17.6% |
| | LA | 3,118 | 56.8% | 4.2% | 104.5 | 27.8% | 71.7% | 25.4% | 68.7% | 7.7% | 103.7 | 27.3% | 72.0% | 19.5% | 104.5 | 27.3% | 72.2% | 27.6% |
| | FSM Eligible | 1,148 | 44.4% | 1.3% | 102.8 | 37.4% | 61.8% | 18.3% | 57.1% | 4.3% | 101.7 | 37.2% | 61.7% | 13.2% | 102.4 | 37.5% | 61.6% | 20.5% |
| | Not FSM Eligible | 1,956 | 64.3% | 6.0% | 105.6 | 22.1% | 77.6% | 29.8% | 75.9% | 9.8% | 104.8 | 21.4% | 78.2% | 23.2% | 105.7 | 21.1% | 78.7% | 31.9% |
| | Unknown | 14 | 14.3% | 0.0% | 101.2 | 42.9% | 57.1% | 0.0% | 14.3% | 0.0% | 98.5 | 35.7% | 57.1% | 14.3% | 100.0 | 50.0% | 42.9% | 7.1% |
| 081 | Ravensfield Primary School | 57 | 49.1% | 1.8% | 101.2 | 36.8% | 63.2% | 14.0% | 66.7% | 3.5% | 101.1 | 38.6% | 61.4% | 15.8% | 101.4 | 42.1% | 57.9% | 19.3% |
| | FSM Eligible | 24 | 41.7% | 4.2% | 99.1 | 50.0% | 50.0% | 12.5% | 54.2% | 4.2% | 100.0 | 41.7% | 58.3% | 12.5% | 98.7 | 54.2% | 45.8% | 12.5% |
| | Not FSM Eligible | 33 | 54.5% | 0.0% | 102.7 | 27.3% | 72.7% | 15.2% | 75.8% | 3.0% | 102.0 | 36.4% | 63.6% | 18.2% | 103.4 | 33.3% | 66.7% | 24.2% |



| | | | | | | Ma | rk | | | | C | utcome | ð | |
|---------------|----------------------------|---------|-------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|------|--------|--------|-------|
| Estab. No. | Estab. Name | Cohort | No Score | 0-15 | 16-23 | 24-31 | 32-36 | 37-40 | APS | Q | A | D | WT | W |
| | NCER National | 617,310 | 2.7% | 8.2% | 4.4% | 5.7% | 30.3% | 48.7% | 33.0 | | 0.3% | 2.4% | 18.3% | 79.0% |
| | FSM Eligible | 134,460 | 3.9% | 15.3% | 6.8% | 7.3% | 30.8% | 35.9% | 29.8 | - | - | 3.4% | 29.4% | 66.7% |
| | Not FSM Eligible | 469,020 | 2.1% | 5.8% | 3.7% | 5.2% | 30.4% | 52.9% | 34.1 | 0.0% | 0.2% | 1.8% | 14.7% | 83.2% |
| | Unknown | 13,840 | 11.8% | 21.0% | 6.8% | 6.8% | 22.7% | 30.9% | 27.1 | | | 11.0% | 34.5% | 53.6% |
| | Local Authority | 2,866 | 3.3% | 9.7% | 4.8% | 6.9% | 30.6% | 44.7% | 32.2 | 0.0% | 0.5% | 2.8% | 21.4% | 75.3% |
| | FSM Eligible | 855 | 4.0% | 15.4% | 6.2% | 10.3% | 31.2% | 32.9% | 29.3 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 3.3% | 31.9% | 64.1% |
| | Not FSM Eligible | 1,982 | 2.7% | 6.8% | 4.2% | 5.5% | 30.6% | 50.2% | 33.6 | 0.0% | 0.4% | 2.4% | 16.5% | 80.8% |
| | Unknown | 29 | 24.1% | 41.4% | 3.4% | 0.0% | 17.2% | 13.8% | 19.1 | 0.0% | 6.9% | 17.2% | 44.8% | 31.0% |
| 2081 | Ravensfield Primary School | 58 | 0.0% | 10.3% | 6.9% | 13.8% | 27.6% | 41.4% | 32.0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 31.0% | 69.0% |
| | FSM Eligible | 25 | 0.0% | 12.0% | 4.0% | 32.0% | 28.0% | 24.0% | 30.3 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 48.0% | 52.0% |
| | Not FSM Eligible | 32 | 0.0% | 6.3% | 9.4% | 0.0% | 28.1% | 56.3% | 33.9 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 15.6% | 84.49 |
| | Unknown | 1 | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 13.0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.09 |





| | | | | | | Ма | rk | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|----------------------------|---------|-------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|------|------|------|--------|-------|--------|-------|------------------|
| Estab. No. | Estab. Name | Cohort | No Score | 0-15 | 16-23 | 24-31 | 32-36 | 37-40 | APS | Q | A | o D | WT | WA | | Passed Year 2 |
| | NCER National | 760,710 | 4.3% | 8.8% | 4.9% | 6.6% | 31.7% | 43.7% | 32.5 | | 0.4% | 3.9% | 20.3% | 75.4% | 65.1% | 10.3% |
| | FSM Eligible | 182,000 | 6.0% | 15.2% | 7.4% | 8.6% | 31.9% | 30.8% | 29.3 | - | | 5.4% | 31.2% | 62.8% | 49.2% | 13.6% |
| | Not FSM Eligible | 562,470 | 3.4% | 6.3% | 4.0% | 6.0% | 31.9% | 48.5% | 33.7 | 0.0% | 0.3% | 3.1% | 16.2% | 80.4% | 71.3% | 9.1% |
| | Unknown | 16,240 | 14.7% | 24.4% | 8.3% | 8.1% | 21.9% | 22.7% | 24.9 | | | 13.7% | 40.7% | 44.5% | 27.9% | 16.6% |
| | Local Authority | 3,517 | 4.5% | 11.2% | 5.2% | 7.3% | 33.1% | 38.7% | 31.4 | 0.0% | 0.5% | 4.0% | 23.7% | 71.8% | 61.5% | 10.3% |
| | FSM Eligible | 1,159 | 5.6% | 15.4% | 6.7% | 8.1% | 34.9% | 29.2% | 29.4 | 0.0% | 0.9% | 4.7% | 30.3% | 64.1% | 49.8% | 14.3% |
| | Not FSM Eligible | 2,205 | 3.8% | 8.8% | 4.4% | 6.4% | 32.3% | 44.2% | 32.5 | 0.0% | 0.3% | 3.5% | 19.7% | 76.5% | 68.7% | 7.8% |
| | Unknown | 153 | 5.2% | 14.4% | 5.2% | 12.4% | 30.7% | 32.0% | 29.6 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 5.2% | 32.0% | 62.7% | 46.4% | 16.3% |
| 2081 | Ravensfield Primary School | 70 | 1.4% | 1.4% | 5.7% | 15.7% | 32.9% | 42.9% | 33.8 | 0.0% | 1.4% | 0.0% | 22.9% | 75.7% | 64.3% | 11.4% |
| | FSM Eligible | 33 | 3.0% | 3.0% | 0.0% | 18.2% | 33.3% | 42.4% | 33.7 | 0.0% | 3.0% | 0.0% | 21.2% | 75.8% | 57.6% | 18.2% |
| | Not FSM Eligible | 36 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 11.1% | 13.9% | 30.6% | 44.4% | 33.8 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 25.0% | 75.0% | 72.2% | 2.8% |
| | Unknown | 1 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 35.0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| NCER | KS2 Attainment Summary List D | fE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | D | ofE 2024 |
|---------------|-------------------------------|---------|-------------|------|---------|--|-------------|-------|------------|-------|-------|---|-------|-------|-------|--|-------------|----------|
| | | | RWM* | | READING | | | | WRITING TA | | MATHS | | | | GPS | | | |
| Estab. No. | School | Cohort | ● ● ≥Exp | High | Avg. | <exp< th=""><th>● ● ≥Exp</th><th>High</th><th>≥Exp</th><th>GDS</th><th>Avg.</th><th>• <exp< th=""><th>≥Exp</th><th>High</th><th></th><th>• <exp< th=""><th>● ● ≥Exp</th><th>High</th></exp<></th></exp<></th></exp<> | ● ● ≥Exp | High | ≥Exp | GDS | Avg. | • <exp< th=""><th>≥Exp</th><th>High</th><th></th><th>• <exp< th=""><th>● ● ≥Exp</th><th>High</th></exp<></th></exp<> | ≥Exp | High | | • <exp< th=""><th>● ● ≥Exp</th><th>High</th></exp<> | ● ● ≥Exp | High |
| | - NCER National | 628,770 | 61.1% | 7.7% | 105.3 | 24.4% | 74.9% | 28.8% | 72.2% | 13.0% | 104.4 | 4 25.7% | 73.6% | 24.1% | 105.4 | 26.5% | 72.8% | 32.3% |
| | FSM Eligible | 181,770 | 45.8% | 3.1% | 102.8 | 36.1% | 62.8% | 18.2% | 58.8% | 6.4% | 101. | 39.3% | 59.4% | 13.0% | 102.4 | 39.6% | 59.3% | 20.0% |
| | Not FSM Eligible | 447,010 | 67.4% | 9.6% | 106.2 | 19.6% | 79.8% | 33.2% | 77.7% | 15.7% | 105. | 20.1% | 79.3% | 28.7% | 106.5 | 21.3% | 78.2% | 37.3% |
| | - LA | 3,059 | 59.7% | 4.8% | 104.9 | 26.1% | 73.4% | 24.2% | 70.4% | 7.7% | 104. | 3 25.7% | 73.6% | 20.9% | 105.2 | 26.6% | 72.8% | 29.8% |
| | FSM Eligible | 1,140 | 48.9% | 2.5% | 103.2 | 34.8% | 64.6% | 18.0% | 61.1% | 4.1% | 102. | 35.4% | 63.4% | 14.3% | 103.1 | 36.8% | 62.4% | 21.1% |
| | Not FSM Eligible | 1,919 | 66.1% | 6.1% | 105.8 | 20.9% | 78.5% | 27.8% | 76.0% | 9.8% | 105.3 | 20.0% | 79.6% | 24.8% | 106.4 | 20.6% | 79.0% | 35.0% |
| 2081 | Ravensfield Primary School | 59 | 45.8% | 5.1% | 101.8 | 39.0% | 61.0% | 15.3% | 71.2% | 5.1% | 102.0 | 39.0% | 61.0% | 16.9% | 100.7 | 40.7% | 59.3% | 16.9% |

20 35.0% 5.0% 101.8 40.0% 60.0% 10.0% 60.0% 5.0% 99.5 55.0% 45.0% 15.0% 98.4 55.0% 45.0% 15.0%

39 51.3% 5.1% 101.8 38.5% 61.5% 17.9% 76.9% 5.1% 103.2 30.8% 69.2% 17.9% 102.0 33.3% 66.7% 17.9%

| | | | RWN | / 1* | READING | | | WRITING TA | | MATHS | | | GPS | | | | | |
|---------------|----------------------------|---------|-------------|-------------|---------|--|-------------|------------|-------|-------|-------|--|--------------------|-------|-------|---|-------|-------|
| Estab. No. | School | Cohort | ● ● ≥Exp | High | Avg. | • <exp< th=""><th>● ● ≥Exp</th><th>High</th><th>≥Exp</th><th>GDS</th><th>Avg.</th><th>• <exp< th=""><th>● ● ≥Exp</th><th>High</th><th>Avg.</th><th><exp< th=""><th>≥Exp</th><th>High</th></exp<></th></exp<></th></exp<> | ● ● ≥Exp | High | ≥Exp | GDS | Avg. | • <exp< th=""><th>● ● ≥Exp</th><th>High</th><th>Avg.</th><th><exp< th=""><th>≥Exp</th><th>High</th></exp<></th></exp<> | ● ● ≥Exp | High | Avg. | <exp< th=""><th>≥Exp</th><th>High</th></exp<> | ≥Exp | High |
| , | - NCER National | 628,770 | 61.1% | 7.7% | 105.3 | 24.4% | 74.9% | 28.8% | 72.2% | 13.0% | 104.4 | 25.7% | 73.6% | 24.1% | 105.4 | 26.5% | 72.8% | 32.3% |
| | Disadvantaged | 191,570 | 45.9% | 3.1% | 102.8 | 36.0% | 62.9% | 18.3% | 58.9% | 6.4% | 101.5 | 39.3% | 59.4% | 13.0% | 102.4 | 39.5% | 59.4% | 20.1% |
| | Non Disadvantaged | 429,630 | 67.8% | 9.7% | 106.3 | 19.3% | 80.2% | 33.4% | 78.0% | 15.8% | 105.6 | 19.7% | 79.7% | 28.9% | 106.6 | 20.9% | 78.6% | 37.59 |
| | Unknown | 7,580 | 70.4% | 13.5% | 106.7 | 19.9% | 79.3% | 36.2% | 79.2% | 21.3% | 106.7 | 17.4% | 81.8% | 34.6% | 107.9 | 18.7% | 80.5% | 44.49 |
| | - LA | 3,059 | 59.7% | 4.8% | 104.9 | 26.1% | 73.4% | 24.2% | 70.4% | 7.7% | 104.3 | 25.7% | 73.6% | 20.9% | 105.2 | 26.6% | 72.8% | 29.8% |
| | Disadvantaged | 1,191 | 49.2% | 2.4% | 103.3 | 34.4% | 65.1% | 18.1% | 61.3% | 4.1% | 102.5 | 35.2% | 63.7% | 14.4% | 103.2 | 36.6% | 62.6% | 21.7% |
| | Non Disadvantaged | 1,868 | 66.3% | 6.3% | 105.9 | 20.8% | 78.6% | 28.0% | 76.2% | 10.0% | 105.4 | 19.7% | 79.8% | 25.1% | 106.4 | 20.3% | 79.3% | 35.1% |
| 2081 | Ravensfield Primary School | 59 | 45.8% | 5.1% | 101.8 | 39.0% | 61.0% | 15.3% | 71.2% | 5.1% | 102.0 | 39.0% | 61.0% | 16.9% | 100.7 | 40.7% | 59.3% | 16.9% |
| | Disadvantaged | 25 | 40.0% | 4.0% | 102.5 | 36.0% | 64.0% | 12.0% | 64.0% | 4.0% | 100.3 | 48.0% | 52.0% | 16.0% | 98.7 | 52.0% | 48.0% | 12.0% |
| | Non Disadvantaged | 34 | 50.0% | 5.9% | 101.3 | 41.2% | 58.8% | 17.6% | 76.5% | 5.9% | 103.3 | 32.4% | 67.6% | 17.6% | 102.2 | 32.4% | 67.6% | 20.6% |

Data indicates:

FSM Eligible
Not FSM Eligible

2024

Reading-Disadvantaged pupils attained slightly higher average standardised scores than Non-Disadvantaged pupils.

Writing-Disadvantaged pupils attained less well than non-disadvantaged pupils.

Maths- Disadvantaged pupils attained the same standardised scores as non-Disadvantaged pupils.

GPS-Disadvantaged pupils achieved lower standardised score than Non-Disadvantaged pupils.

Data suggests that disadvantaged children are not yet on track to achieve in line with Nondisadvantaged pupils in writing, and GPS

Writing will be the priority area for future school improvement

| Assessment | Statistic | Cohort | School Result | National Comparison | National Result | School Percentile Rank |
|---------------------------------------|--|--------|------------------|------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| KS2 Reading, Writing & Maths combined | % of pupils achieving the expected standard | 59 | 46% | ■ Below (significant) | 61% | 18t |
| KS2 Reading, Writing & Maths combined | % of pupils achieving the higher standard | 59 | 5% | Below | ~ 7% | 471 |
| Multiplication Tables Check (MTC) | % of pupils scoring full marks (25/25) | 55 | 62% | • Above (significant) | ~ 34% | 92n |
| Phonics Screening Check | % of pupils passing in Year 1 | 54 | 83% | At or above | ~ 80% | 56t |
| Early Years Foundation Stage | % of pupils achieving a Good Level of Development | 59 | 54% | Below (significant) | ~ 68% | 12t |

Sat indicated that the % of children achieving age related in all areas is significantly below national. This will include disadvantaged pupils.

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 |
|---------------------|--------------------------|
| UK Military Mentors | UKMM Reset and Re-engage |
| RWI | |

Service pupil premium funding (optional)

| 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 |
|---|
| |
| 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, implementation and evaluation, or other activity that you are delivering to support disadvantaged pupils, that is not dependent on pupil premium or recovery premium funding.