

Pupil premium strategy statement – St. Edmund's CofE Primary and Nursery 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.

School overview

Detail	Data
Number of pupils in school	210
Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils	27%
Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers	2025–2028
Date this statement was published	31 December 2025
Date on which it will be reviewed	July 2026
Statement authorised by	Anthony Bandy-Webb, Headteacher
Pupil premium lead	Jo Wells, Deputy Headteacher
Governor	Ashley Burton

Funding overview

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year	£85,555
Pupil premium funding carried forward from previous years	£0
Total budget for this academic year	£85,555

Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

Statement of intent

At St. Edmund's CofE Primary and Nursery School, we are committed to ensuring that all pupils, regardless of background or circumstance, achieve well and flourish academically, socially and emotionally. This strategy represents a clear evolution from the school's previous Pupil Premium strategy (2021–2024), moving from post-pandemic recovery to greater diagnostic precision.

The strategy is rooted in findings from the Internal School Data Review (ISDR), national and local assessment outcomes, and ongoing formative and summative assessment. High-quality teaching sits at the heart of the strategy, supported by targeted academic interventions and carefully chosen wider strategies, all aligned with the DfE Menu of Approaches and informed by EEF evidence.

Challenges

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

Challenge number	Detail of challenge
1	Early language and vocabulary gaps in EYFS and KS1.
2	Insecure reading fluency and comprehension.
3	Gaps in mathematical fluency and reasoning.
4	Lower attendance and persistent absence for a small cohort.
5	Social, emotional and behavioural needs impacting readiness to learn.
6	Lower proportion of disadvantaged pupils achieving Greater Depth.
7	Reduced access to enrichment and cultural capital.
8	Additional needs of service and previously looked-after children.

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
Improved early language and vocabulary	Accelerated progress in Communication and Language in EYFS. - By the end of Reception, the proportion of disadvantaged pupils achieving GLD in Communication & Language increases year-on-year. - Gap between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils in EYFS Communication & Language narrows annually. - Entry/Exit assessments for NELI/Drawing Club show accelerated progress for targeted pupils.
Improved reading attainment	Increased proportion of disadvantaged pupils meeting age-related expectations. - By the end of KS1 and KS2, the proportion of disadvantaged pupils meeting age-related expectations in reading increases year-on-year. - PiXL and standardised assessments show a reduction in identified reading gaps and misconceptions termly. - Reading fluency measures (e.g. words read correctly per minute where used) show improved accuracy and pace for targeted pupils.
Improved mathematical attainment	Narrowing attainment gaps between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils. - Termly PiXL and NFER data shows a reduction in the attainment gap between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils in maths. - An increasing proportion of disadvantaged pupils achieve age-related expectations in mathematics by the end of each key stage. - Intervention entry/exit data shows clear gains for pupils receiving targeted maths support.

Improved attendance	Year-on-year improvement and reduced persistent absence. - Attendance for disadvantaged pupils improves year-on-year and moves closer to whole-school attendance. - The proportion of disadvantaged pupils classified as persistently absent reduces annually. - Attendance data for identified pupils shows improvement following targeted parental engagement and support.
Improved wellbeing	Reduced behaviour incidents and improved pupil voice outcomes. - Behaviour incidents involving disadvantaged pupils reduce year-on-year. - Pupil voice and wellbeing monitoring indicates improved engagement, confidence and readiness to learn. - Case studies for pupils receiving ELSA/nurture support demonstrate improved self-regulation and classroom engagement.
Increased Greater Depth outcomes	Rising proportion of disadvantaged pupils achieving Greater Depth. - The proportion of disadvantaged pupils achieving Greater Depth in reading, writing and mathematics increases over the life of the strategy. - PiXL analysis shows improved performance for higher-attaining disadvantaged pupils compared to prior cohorts.
Improved access to enrichment	All disadvantaged pupils participate in enrichment activities - All disadvantaged pupils access at least one subsidised enrichment opportunity per year (e.g. trips, clubs, residential). - Participation data shows disadvantaged pupils are not under-represented in enrichment activities. - Pupil voice indicates increased confidence and aspiration linked to wider experiences.
Sustained wellbeing for vulnerable pupils	- Individual monitoring shows stable attendance, engagement and academic progress from starting points. - Wellbeing and pastoral records demonstrate positive emotional stability and successful transitions. - Review meetings confirm provision remains appropriate and responsive to need.

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: £36,000

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Professional development in reading, maths and adaptive teaching	EEF evidence shows high-quality teaching has the strongest impact on disadvantaged outcomes.	1, 2, 3
Instructional coaching and mentoring	EEF Effective Professional Development guidance.	1, 2, 3
Use of PiXL for diagnostic assessment and responsive planning	DfE Menu of Approaches – assessment and technology.	2, 3, 6

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

Budgeted cost: £27,000

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
One-to-one and small-group tuition informed by PiXL gap analysis	EEF evidence indicates tutoring can provide 4–5 months additional progress.	2, 3
Early language interventions (NELI, Drawing Club)	Strong evidence base for oral language development.	1
Structured TA-led interventions	EEF Teaching Assistant Deployment guidance.	2, 3

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

Budgeted cost: £22,555

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Attendance monitoring and parental engagement	DfE Working Together to Improve Attendance guidance.	4
ELSA and nurture provision	EEF Social and Emotional Learning evidence.	5
Enrichment activities and residential experiences	EEF evidence on enrichment and arts participation.	7

Total budgeted cost: £85,555

Part B: Review of the previous academic year

Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils

Intended outcome	Review:
Improved early language and vocabulary	The school prioritised early language and vocabulary development through high-quality adult interactions, a language-rich curriculum, targeted speech and language support and early intervention programmes. Impact The impact of this strategy was mixed for disadvantaged pupils. There were 7 disadvantaged pupils within the Reception cohort who did not achieve a Good Level of Development (GLD). Overall, 0 of the disadvantaged pupils achieved GLD, despite making progress from their individual starting points. Analysis of the Early Learning Goals demonstrated that communication and language were not the main barrier for the majority of pupils: • 1 of 7 pupils did not meet the expected standard in Listening, Attention and Understanding. • 1 of 7 pupils did not meet the expected standard in Speaking. The greatest barriers were instead within early literacy and mathematics: • 7 of 7 pupils did not meet the expected standard in Writing. • 7 of 7 pupils did not meet the expected standard in Number. • 5 of 7 pupils did not meet the expected standard in Comprehension. • 5 of 7 pupils did not meet the expected standard in Numerical Patterns. • 4 of 7 pupils did not meet the expected standard in Word Reading. Strengths were evident within pupils' personal, social and physical development, with all disadvantaged pupils meeting the expected standard in Managing Self, Building Relationships, Gross Motor Skills and Fine Motor Skills. Overall, 17 of the 30 Reception pupils (56.7%) achieved GLD, compared with approximately 68% nationally. Nationally, around 51.5% of disadvantaged pupils achieved GLD, compared with none of the disadvantaged pupils at St. Edmund's. Evaluation Although disadvantaged pupils made progress, they were unable to consistently apply their language skills to early reading, writing and mathematics. The analysis indicates that the principal barriers were early literacy and mathematical development rather than communication and language alone. As a result, the school's current Pupil Premium Strategy places greater emphasis on developing oral language alongside explicit teaching of early reading, writing and mathematical concepts through high-quality adaptive teaching, vocabulary instruction and targeted intervention.

Improved reading attainment

The school continued to prioritise reading through systematic synthetic phonics, guided reading, reading fluency development and targeted intervention programmes.

Impact

Outcomes in phonics were strong. There were 8 disadvantaged pupils within the Year 1 phonics cohort. Six disadvantaged pupils achieved the expected standard and two disadvantaged pupils did not achieve the expected standard.

Disadvantaged pupils achieved a phonics pass rate of 75%, compared with 64.4% for disadvantaged pupils across Nottinghamshire. The attainment gap between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils was 11.4 percentage points, significantly below the Nottinghamshire gap of 18.9%.

Overall, 25 of 30 pupils (83.3%) achieved the expected standard in the Year 1 Phonics Screening Check, exceeding both Nottinghamshire (79.7%) and national (79.9%) averages. Furthermore, 8 of the 9 pupils who undertook the Year 2 phonics re-check successfully met the expected standard.

At Key Stage 2, reading attainment was 79.3%, above national averages, demonstrating the long-term impact of the school's reading strategy.

Evaluation

The strategy had a positive impact on reading attainment and phonics outcomes. Disadvantaged pupils performed well compared with local disadvantaged cohorts. Continued focus is required on reading fluency, vocabulary acquisition and comprehension to ensure disadvantaged pupils sustain strong progress throughout Key Stage 2.

Improved mathematical attainment	The school invested in high-quality mathematics teaching, retrieval practice, multiplication fluency development and targeted intervention. Impact Mathematics outcomes were a significant strength. In the Year 4 Multiplication Tables Check, there were 7 disadvantaged pupils. Five disadvantaged pupils achieved full marks (25/25), whilst two disadvantaged pupils did not achieve full marks. Disadvantaged pupils achieved an average score of 23.9 out of 25, compared with 24.1 for non-disadvantaged pupils, demonstrating a negligible attainment gap. Overall, the school achieved an average MTC score of 24.0 compared with a national average of 21.0. Additionally, 76.7% of pupils achieved full marks compared with 37.0% nationally. At Key Stage 2, 79.3% of pupils achieved the expected standard in mathematics, exceeding both national and local authority averages. Evaluation The strategy was highly effective in improving mathematical fluency and attainment. Disadvantaged pupils performed broadly in line with their peers and outcomes significantly exceeded national averages. Future work will focus on increasing reasoning and Greater Depth attainment.
----------------------------------	---

Improved attendance

The school prioritised improving the attendance of disadvantaged pupils through rigorous monitoring, early identification of concerns, attendance meetings, home visits, pastoral support and close partnership working with families and external agencies.

Impact

Attendance remained a significant barrier to achievement for a minority of disadvantaged pupils.

There were **52 disadvantaged pupils** eligible for Pupil Premium across the school.

- **22 pupils (42.3%)** achieved attendance of **95% or above**.
- **30 pupils (57.7%)** had attendance below **95%**.
- **15 pupils (28.8%)** were persistently absent, with attendance below **90%**.
- **7 pupils (13.5%)** had attendance below **80%**, indicating the most significant barriers to accessing education.

The majority of disadvantaged pupils maintained regular attendance and benefited from the school's pastoral support and attendance procedures. However, a small group of pupils with complex and often overlapping needs - including SEND, social, emotional and mental health needs, family circumstances and medical issues - continued to experience high levels of absence.

Analysis of attainment data demonstrated a clear relationship between attendance and academic outcomes. Many disadvantaged pupils who did not achieve age-related expectations or the combined expected standard in Reading, Writing and Mathematics were also those with the lowest attendance.

Improved wellbeing	The school invested in pastoral support, ELSA provision, nurture approaches, emotional wellbeing programmes and wider safeguarding support. Impact Pupil voice, pastoral records and intervention evaluations demonstrated positive outcomes for disadvantaged pupils. Pupils receiving targeted support showed improved emotional regulation, engagement in learning and confidence. Behaviour incidents remained low and pupils reported feeling safe, supported and valued within school. Evaluation Pastoral provision remains a strength of the school. The strategy successfully supported pupils' emotional wellbeing and readiness to learn.
---------------------------	--

Increased Greater Depth outcomes	The strategy aimed to increase the proportion of disadvantaged pupils achieving Greater Depth standards. Impact Whilst some disadvantaged pupils achieved Greater Depth standards, disadvantaged pupils remained underrepresented within the Greater Depth cohort. Analysis showed that disadvantaged pupils were more likely to achieve age-related expectations than higher standards. At Key Stage 2, outcomes at the higher standard were strongest in Reading (27.6%) and Mathematics (24.1%), although disadvantaged pupils were less represented within these groups. Evaluation Increasing the proportion of disadvantaged pupils achieving Greater Depth remains a key area for development. This has informed the school's current focus on adaptive teaching, challenge, questioning and PiXL diagnostics.
---	---

Improved access to enrichment	Funding was used to ensure disadvantaged pupils could access educational visits, residential experiences, enrichment activities and wider curriculum opportunities. Impact Disadvantaged pupils participated in school visits, residential experiences, clubs and wider curriculum opportunities. Financial support reduced barriers to participation and ensured pupils could access the same opportunities as their peers. Pupil voice demonstrated positive impacts on confidence, engagement and aspirations. Evaluation The strategy was successful in reducing financial barriers and ensuring disadvantaged pupils benefitted from a broad and enriching curriculum experience.
-------------------------------	--

Sustained wellbeing for vulnerable pupils	The school provided targeted support for vulnerable pupils through pastoral intervention, SEND support, safeguarding provision, nurture approaches and multi-agency working. Impact Vulnerable pupils received timely intervention and support tailored to individual needs. Case studies demonstrated improved engagement, attendance, emotional wellbeing and readiness to learn for many pupils receiving additional support. Strong relationships with families and external agencies enabled barriers to learning to be identified and addressed quickly. Evaluation The school's support for vulnerable pupils remained effective and aligned with its inclusive ethos. However, attendance and complex needs continued to present barriers for a small number of pupils, informing the school's continued focus on inclusion and early intervention.
--	---

Externally provided programmes

PiXL (The PiXL Club)

Doodle Platforms

Service pupil premium funding (optional)

The school has one service child. Funding supports pastoral care, transitions and continuity of learning.

Narrative Justification for the Pupil Premium Strategy (2025–2028)

At St. Edmund's CofE Primary and Nursery School, our Pupil Premium strategy is rooted in a clear understanding of our pupils, our community and our responsibility to ensure that disadvantage does not determine outcomes.

The strategy for 2025–2028 represents a deliberate evolution from our previous Pupil Premium plan. Between 2021 and 2024, our focus was rightly on recovery following the disruption caused by the Covid-19 pandemic. During that period, we prioritised re-engagement with learning, early language development, phonics, attendance and wellbeing. Evaluation of that strategy shows that it was effective in stabilising routines, improving engagement and supporting pupils' emotional readiness to learn.

However, our Internal School Data Review (ISDR) highlighted that, while many disadvantaged pupils were making progress from their starting points, variability in outcomes remained. In particular, gaps persisted in reading fluency, mathematical reasoning and attendance for a small cohort of pupils. This analysis made it clear that the next phase of our work needed to move beyond recovery and towards greater diagnostic precision and sustainability.

As a result, the current strategy places high-quality teaching at its core, reflecting strong evidence from the Education Endowment Foundation that this is the most effective way to improve outcomes for disadvantaged pupils. Investment in professional development, instructional coaching and curriculum coherence ensures that pupils' first experience of learning is consistently strong, reducing reliance on intervention alone.

Alongside this, we have strengthened our approach to assessment and gap analysis, including the introduction of PiXL. This allows us to identify specific misconceptions and gaps in learning more precisely and ensures that targeted academic support is purposeful, time-limited and closely aligned with classroom teaching. Interventions are selected based on identified need rather than assumption, and their impact is evaluated using entry and exit data.

We also recognise that academic progress cannot be separated from wider factors such as attendance, behaviour and wellbeing. For this reason, the strategy includes carefully chosen wider approaches, including attendance monitoring, parental engagement, relational behaviour support, ELSA provision and access to enrichment. These approaches are not bolt-ons, but part of a coherent system designed to remove barriers that prevent pupils from engaging fully with learning.

Our strategy reflects the context and scale of our school. With a disadvantaged cohort representing approximately 27% of pupils, and with small numbers of pupils in specific categories such as service children and previously looked-after children, we have avoided a one-size-fits-all approach. Instead, support for these pupils is personalised, proportionate and focused on wellbeing, stability, transitions and sustained progress.

Success within this strategy is defined clearly and measured carefully. We evaluate impact through a triangulation of data, including statutory and standardised assessments, PiXL analysis, attendance figures, behaviour records, pupil voice and case studies. This allows us to report progress honestly to governors and parents and to adapt provision where strategies are not having the intended impact.

In summary, our Pupil Premium strategy is evidence-informed, contextually responsive and evaluative in nature. It demonstrates continuity with our previous work, while clearly articulating why our approach has evolved. Above all, it reflects our commitment to ensuring that every child at St. Edmund's is supported to flourish and achieve their potential.

Post Ofsted Review:

On reflection, the Ofsted report is actually very precise about what needs fixing. It isn't criticising the existence of the pupil premium strategy — it is criticising how it is implemented, analysed and communicated.

Three sentences in the report tell the whole story:

From the inspection:

"Leaders have not communicated their strategy for using the pupil premium funding well enough."

"Leaders do not monitor the implementation of the strategy or its impact properly."

"Leaders and governors do not scrutinise the school's information closely enough."

1. The real criticism: not the strategy, the analysis

Ofsted's wording:

Leaders do not monitor the implementation of the strategy or its impact properly.

In inspection language this means:

leaders cannot clearly show:

- which actions are working
- which pupils are improving
- which spending is having impact

This links directly to the EEF "Guide to the Pupil Premium", which stresses that schools must:

1. Diagnose need
2. Use evidence
3. Implement strategy
4. Monitor impact
5. Adapt provision

Ofsted basically judged us strong in steps 1–3, but weaker in steps 4–5.

2. The inclusion link (this is important)

Your first next step states:

Leaders should complete and embed the new systems and processes that support inclusion and communicate their pupil premium strategy effectively.

This reveals something deeper.

The inspectors see pupil premium as part of our inclusion system, not just a funding document.

So they are expecting:

- SEND
- Pupil Premium
- Attendance

- Behaviour
- Pastoral support

to operate as one coherent inclusion system.

Right now the report suggests these systems are still developing.

3. The governor issue

Another line from the report:

Leaders and governors do not scrutinise the school's information closely enough.

Translation:

Governors need clearer information such as:

- disadvantaged progress data
- attendance of disadvantaged pupils
- intervention impact
- spending evaluation

The EEF specifically recommends governors regularly challenge leaders on how funding is spent and what impact it has.

So the inspection is pushing toward stronger governor dashboards and analysis.

4. Communication problem

Leaders have not communicated their strategy for using the pupil premium funding well enough.

This often means one of three things:

Parents cannot easily understand:

- what the funding does
- how pupils benefit
- how success is measured

Remember, DfE guidance requires schools to publish a clear strategy annually and explain how funding improves outcomes.

Many schools solve this by producing:

- a visual summary
- a one-page explanation
- governor monitoring reports

5. The good news hidden in the report

The inspection actually says disadvantaged pupils are doing reasonably well.

Examples:

- Disadvantaged combined RWM: close to national average
- Disadvantaged reading: close to national average
- Writing: above national average in some years
- Maths: close to national average

So the criticism is not about poor outcomes. It's about strategic leadership and evaluation.
That is a very fixable problem.

What Ofsted actually expects us to do next (probably)!

If we convert their comments into practical leadership actions, it becomes this.

1. Sharper diagnosis of barriers

Example:

- attendance subgroup analysis
- SEND + PP overlap
- high prior attainers
- reading fluency gaps

2. Clear monitoring systems

Each term track:

- attainment
- progress
- attendance
- intervention impact

for disadvantaged pupils specifically.

3. Governor oversight

Governors should regularly review:

- spending breakdown
- impact evidence
- vulnerable groups

This is why the EEF produced specific discussion prompts for governors.

4. Communication

Strategy should be visible through:

- website strategy

- governor reports
- parent-friendly summaries
- staff understanding

We are already halfway there!

The work we are doing with:

- PiXL analysis
- vulnerable groups tracking
- governor dashboards

is exactly what inspectors are expecting next. These systems will directly address the inspection recommendation.