

# Pupil premium strategy statement – Elizabeth Woodville 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	997 (Y7 to Y11)
Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils	15.9%
Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers.	2022-23 2023-24 <b>2024-25</b>
Date this statement was published	December 2024
Date on which it will be reviewed	December 2025
Statement authorised by	Emma Reed Hannah Jones
Pupil premium lead	Flavie Lemert Ben Jones
Governor / Trustee lead	Greg Godwin

## Funding overview

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year	£168,525
Pupil premium funding carried forward from previous years (enter £0 if not applicable)	£ 0
<b>Total budget for this academic year</b>	£ 168,525

# Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

## Statement of intent

Our intention is that all pupils, irrespective of their background, make increasingly good progress year on year and achieve high attainment across the curriculum. To achieve this goal, we aim to ensure that pupil premium students participate in the wider curriculum to the same extent as their peers, whilst increasingly addressing and removing any barriers faced by disadvantaged students (e.g. literacy, poor attendance, lack of confidence, attitudes to learning).

When creating our strategy, we recognise the importance of considering the context of the school and the subsequent challenges. We use evidence-based approaches and research conducted by the EEF and recognised literature (such as 'Addressing Educational Disadvantage' by Marc Rowland) to support decisions made around the usefulness and implementation of different strategies.

To achieve our objectives, the school has adopted the tiered approach recommended by the EEF, which places the greatest focus on promoting high quality teaching, supported by academic interventions and wider non-teaching strategies; however, we recognise that many elements of our strategy will overlap categories and the balance between them will change year on year as the schools' and students' priorities change.

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 disadvantaged attainment gap and at the same time will benefit the non-disadvantaged pupils in our school.

There is both internal data and academic literature that highlights the need for high quality pastoral support and attendance intervention to meet the needs of disadvantaged students; as such, funding is directed to ensuring that high quality pastoral care is available to all students.

Our approach will be responsive to common challenges and individual needs, rooted in robust diagnostic assessment, not assumptions about the impact of disadvantage.

The key principles of our strategy:

- Promote an ethos of 'Ambition, Confidence, Curiosity, Leadership and Respect' for all students regardless of disadvantage or need.
- An individualised approach to address barriers and specific interventions based on need.
- The most effective method of addressing disadvantage is through a strong focus on high quality teaching, rather than bolt-on strategies.
- Use of a robust monitoring system to focus on outcomes and effectively inform and evaluate interventions based on need. Decisions and interventions are based on research and data.
- Developing literacy of students, especially where literacy is below the chronological age, so that students can access the wider curriculum.
- Providing high quality pastoral support which meets the wider needs of all students

## Challenges

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

Challenge number	Detail of challenge
1	The progress and outcomes of disadvantaged pupils continues to be lower than that of their peers with an Attainment 8 (average grade received by students) of 4.65 for DS students and 5 for non-DS students in English, 4.24 for DS students and 4.68 for non-DS students in English Literature and 4.28 for DS students and 4.75 for non-DS students in Maths. EWS will focus staff CPD and quality first teaching to ensure that the gap in progress and attainment narrows between pupil premium students and their peers.
2	The attendance of disadvantaged pupils continues to be lower than that of their peers, with attendance in 2023-2024 at 81.7%. EWS will have structures and systems in place to reduce absence and reduce barriers to support pupil premium students in attending school.
3	National data shows that disadvantaged students continue to have higher rates of suspension than their peers. EWS will focus on carefully planned strategies and interventions to support pupil premium students using the pastoral care and Ethos support that exists within the school structures to reduce suspension rates.
4	Ensure disadvantaged students engage with wider-curricular opportunities and experience cultural capital.

## Intended outcomes

This explains the outcomes we are aiming for **by the end of our current strategy plan**, and how we will measure whether they have been achieved.

Intended outcome	Success criteria
<p>The progress and attainment of disadvantaged students will improve to at least be in line with the National Average.</p>	<p>The gap between DS and Non-DS students will close to be the same or better than National results. Progress data for Years 10 and 11 show a narrowing gap.</p> <p>The difference between DS KS3 student's attainment compared to targets is comparable to non-DS students.</p> <p>Progress 8/ A8, score of DS students to be in line with Non-DS students and close to 0 for P8.</p>
<p>There will be sustained and improved attendance of DS students to be at least in line with the National Average.</p>	<p>Disadvantaged student attendance to be at least in line with the national average. Attendance gap to close</p>
<p>There will be reduced suspensions for DS students</p>	<p>Quality first teaching ensures that all students are planned for and supported in their learning.</p> <p>Attitudes to learning and class observations suggest disadvantaged students are more able to monitor and regulate their own learning and this supports a reduction in suspensions.</p> <p>Attitudes to learning and behaviour for learning improves through positive learning experiences.</p> <p>Targeted interventions and early help support students in self-regulation and modifying their behaviours.</p> <p>There will be no gap in rates of suspension between disadvantaged pupils and their peers.</p>
<p>Disadvantaged students to participate in a wider range of enrichment activities offered at EWS.</p>	<p>Tracking of extra-curricular activities used to prioritise and direct DS students to engage with enrichment activities. DS students will have socioeconomic barriers removed to support the development of skills essential for the curriculum on offer. DS students have excellent careers programmes including access to HE institutions/experiences.</p>

## 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: £ 151,025

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
<p>Teaching and learning development to focus on evidence-based strategies to support quality first teaching incorporated in the EWS Expert Teaching model.</p>	<p>“Supporting the Attainment of Disadvantaged Pupils” (DFE, 2015) suggests high quality teaching as a key aspect of successful schools. Wider educational literature e.g. Lemov (2010) &amp; Sherrington (2019) suggests that selected methodologies are most effective at improving student outcomes. This is further supported by the EEF toolkit (2021) which claims significant improvement in learning e.g. Interleaving and questioning (EEF + 7 months ) Assessment for learning/feedback (EEF +6 months)</p> <p><a href="#">Feedback / EEF</a></p> <p><a href="https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching%20learning-toolkit">https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching%20learning-toolkit</a></p>	<p>1,2,3</p>
<p>CPD and T&amp;L briefings on the 5 pillars of our Expert Teaching. Focus on Adaptive Teaching and Students Practice.</p> <p>This follows on from previous work around feedback, questioning, checking for understanding and retrieval practice.</p> <p>PM targets focus around individual and faculty teaching and learning priorities</p>	<p>A study published by the Education Policy Institute (Fletcher-Wood &amp; Zuccollo, 2020) concluded that the impact of high-quality CPD on pupil outcomes is comparable to the impact of having a teacher with 10 years’ experience in front of a class instead of a graduate teacher.</p> <p>High-quality CPD improves teacher retention, particularly for early-career teachers and can also lead to increased student self-efficacy and confidence.</p> <p>Feedback (EEF+ 6 months) Metacognition (EEF+ 6 months)</p> <p><a href="#">Metacognition and Self-Regulation / EEF</a></p>	<p>1,3</p>
<p>Senior Leader to oversee PPM strategy</p>	<p>Successful schools “have clear, responsive leadership.” DFE ‘Supporting the Attainment of Disadvantaged pupils: articulating success and good practice’ EEF Implementation Guide states that ‘school leaders play a central role in improving education practices through</p>	<p>3</p>

	high-quality implementation' by 'defining both a vision for, and standards of, desirable implementation'.	
QI led by ALT, LLs and Expert Teachers to provide developmental feedback, identify training needs and to share best practice	DFE teacher standards state that systems of appraisal and monitoring of teaching are necessary and can help to determine starting points for professional development. Collected teacher efficacy is highlighted by Hattie (2016) as the most effective influence on student achievement (+1.57) and therefore supports the strategy of sharing good practice .	1,2,3,4
Purchase and use of standardised diagnostic assessments	Standardised tests can provide reliable insights into the specific strengths and weaknesses of each pupil to help ensure they receive the correct additional support through interventions or teacher instruction	1,3,4

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

Budgeted cost: £15,000

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
EWS reads to be utilised in two tutor times per week in KS3 (Y7-9) to raise reading comprehension	Reading Comprehension strategies (EEF +6 months) Oral language interventions (EEF +6 months)  <a href="#">Small Group Tuition</a>  <a href="#">Reading Comprehension Strategies / EEF</a>	1,4
Online Education platforms (Sparx Maths, Sparx Reader, Tassomai)	We have found that online platforms are an accessible way for our pupils to access resources easily at home. The effect of homework has been rated as having an impact of +5 months by the EEF toolkit.  <a href="#">Homework / EEF</a>	1
Targeted in school KS3 Maths and English intervention in school	Small group tuition (EEF +4 months) DFE, 'School Led Tutoring Guidance' (+4 months impact)  <a href="#">Small Group Tuition</a>	1,4
Provision of specific revision material for examined year groups.	Where revision/homework requires specific materials this can be a barrier. Therefore, subsidising the cost has proven effective in increasing access to the necessary resources. The subsidising of resources supports our strategies relating to meta-cognition and self-regulation because our teachers instruct and teach pupils how to use them effectively, which in turn helps the pupils become more independent and lead their own learning.  <a href="#">Homework / EEF</a>	1,3,4

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

Budgeted cost: £2,500

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
<p>Increased parental engagement through regular contact by form tutors. An active Friends of EWS. Opportunities throughout the year for parents to visit the school and embrace the community through various activities such as productions.</p>	<p><a href="#">Parental engagement / EEF</a></p>	<p>2,3</p>
<p>Provide high quality pastoral care by pastoral support workers and Ethos team. Increase the number of support staff that deliver pastoral care. TLR positions for HOY to support and guide students</p>	<p>EEF toolkit states that ‘Evidence suggests that, on average, behaviour interventions can produce moderate improvements in academic performance along with a decrease in problematic behaviours.’ ‘Impacts are larger for targeted interventions matched to specific students with particular needs or behavioural issues than for universal interventions or whole school strategies. School-level behaviour approaches are often related to improvements in attainment, but there is a lack of evidence to show that the improvements are actually caused by the behaviour interventions, rather than other school interventions happening at the same time.  <a href="https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit">https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit</a></p> <p>Parental and community involvement programmes are often associated with reported improvements in school ethos or discipline and so are worth considering as alternatives to direct behaviour interventions.’</p>	<p>1.2.3.4</p>
<p>One-to-one mentoring/coaching for all Year 11 DA students and a number of students in Y7-10</p>	<p>Mentoring (EEF +2 months) Behaviour interventions (EEF +4 months) Effect sizes reported by Hattie (2016) show that behavioural intervention programmes have an effect size of</p>	<p>2,3,4</p>

identified by their HOY and other key staff.	0.62 and specific interventions linked to needs has an effect size of 0.77.  <a href="#">behaviour interventions / EEF</a>	
Regular tutor meetings to identify student needs, concerns and signpost interventions	Mentoring (EEF +2 months) Behaviour interventions (EEF +4 months) Effect sizes reported by Hattie (2016) show that behavioural intervention programmes have an effect size of 0.62 and specific interventions linked to needs has an effect size of 0.77.  <a href="#">mentoring / EEF</a>	2.3
Attendance officer and Family support worker to closely together to monitor the attendance of DA students, build relationships with families and implement support strategies where needed	DFE (2016) found that the higher the overall absence rate across KS4 the lower the likely level of attainment at the end of KS4. "Overall absence had a statistically negative link to attainment."  DFE Guidance on attendance Mentoring / EEF	2
PPM hardship fund accessible through requests to prevent PPM students from being unable to access enrichment opportunities, have resources and equipment required for learning (e.g. uniform, food etc)	Arts Participation (EEF +3 months) Physical Activity (EEF +1 month)	4

**Total budgeted cost: £ : 168,525**



## Part B: Review of the previous academic year

### Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils

Pupil premium funds were utilised across various academic, pastoral, broader curriculum, and enhancement focal points. The overall budget amounted to £178020 including a recovery premium funding of £49128 for 2022-23, with : £ 101,968 dedicated to staff Continuous Professional Development (CPD), Recruitment and Retention and the dissemination of best practices. A portion of the £42,128 recovery funding, in addition to £4,377, was allocated for specific academic support initiatives, while £22,547 went towards implementing wider strategies pertaining to pastoral care, attendance, behaviour and well-being.

#### Challenge 1: Outcomes

Initial unvalidated data indicates that Progress 8 estimates (generated by Go4schools) show that disadvantaged (DA) students achieved -0.79 in the 23-24 academic year. This is in comparison to a national average of -0.60 for DA students in 2022-23. However, the small cohort size makes it difficult to draw year-on-year comparisons or identify trends relative to school or national benchmarks. The IDSR further underscores this challenge, noting that the proportion of students eligible for free school meals (FSM6) at EWS is significantly below the national average, with only 13 students in the Year 11 cohort for 2024.

Unvalidated Attainment 8 data, which provides a more reliable measure given the small cohort size, highlights the school's influence on student outcomes. However, the performance of disadvantaged (DA) students continues to lag behind that of their non-DA peers, underscoring a key area for ongoing improvement.

Specifically:

- In English Language, DA students achieved an Attainment 8 (A8) score of 4.65 compared to 5.0 for non-DA students.
- In English Literature, DA students achieved an A8 score of 4.24, compared to 4.68 their non -DA counterparts.
- In Maths, DA students achieved an A8 score of 4.25, compared to 4.75 for non-DA students.

Contributory factors to improve disadvantaged students' outcomes in 23/24 included:

- A sharp focus on a coherent and well-planned curriculum that scaffolds learning for all students.
- High quality teaching in lessons that implements the whole school teaching and learning structure: the EWS Expert Teaching Model.
- Use of google classroom: staff provide learning materials from classwork via google classroom to aid revision and catch up. Homework provided through google classroom. Students and staff access google classrooms regularly and communicate more frequently regarding learning and have access to a wide range of resources to support them.
- All staff are aware of the Pupil Premium strategy allowing for stronger relationships, improved support and understanding and therefore better learners.

- Ensuring any barriers to learning are removed. This includes implementing strategies such as purchasing of material items including revision books, laptops, internet access.

## **Challenge 2: Attendance**

Attendance remains a paramount concern at EWS, particularly in the aftermath of the pandemic. In 2023/24 funding was strategically deployed to enhance the attendance of disadvantaged students, aiming to secure their access to a consistently high-quality curriculum, effective teaching, and improved learning outcomes as previously discussed.

According to FFT national analysis, disadvantaged students in the last academic year-maintained attendance levels consistent with their national counterparts. However, addressing the existing gap between our disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students remains a top priority. To ensure that national trends of higher rates of PA and non-attendance to school from disadvantaged students were addressed, there was a sharp focus on their attendance. Moving forwards, EWS has recruited Attendance Officers on both sites and reverted to a Year Group system, with the Head of Year for each year group focusing on attendance as one of their priorities.

Substantial efforts were undertaken with Year 11 students in 23/24, involving activities such as career guidance, mentoring, and cohort-wide incentives to underscore the significance of regular attendance.

## **Challenge 3: Reduce suspension for disadvantaged students**

National data indicates that disadvantaged pupils are more likely to face suspensions than their non-disadvantaged peers, which can disrupt their learning and widen the attainment gap. At EWS, pupil premium funding is directed towards interventions supporting pupils' social, emotional, behavioural, and wellbeing needs. This includes collaboration with our partner, 'The Grace Foundation,' and integrating the Ethos team's work into the core of the school community. These efforts have contributed to reducing suspensions among disadvantaged pupils, with no permanent exclusions recorded in the last academic year. Despite this progress, further development in this area remains a key priority for the upcoming academic year.

## **Challenge 4: Cultural Capital**

Pupil premium students were able to have socioeconomic barriers removed to support the development of skills essential for the curriculum on offer. Disadvantaged students had excellent careers programmes, including access to HE institutions/experiences. The PPM hardship fund was accessible through requests to prevent PPM students from being unable to access enrichment opportunities, have resources and equipment required for learning (e.g. uniform, food etc, curriculum trips (such as Macbeth).

## Further information (optional)

### **Additional activity**

Free breakfasts on offer every day in the school canteens-for all students to support attendance and engagement of students.

### **Planning, implementation, and evaluation**

Each year as part of the cycle of the pupil premium strategy, we evaluate all activities/interventions that are used to support DA students. These are reviewed and successful interventions that show strong impact are continued.

Throughout the review a variety of evidence is triangulated from sources such as in-school data, departmental learning reviews, school action plans, student assessments, engagement and work scrutiny, to identify the challenges faced by disadvantaged students.

We looked at several reports and studies 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 and will continue to use it through the implementation of our activities.

We have put a robust evaluation framework in place for the duration of our three-year approach which is also reviewed annually and will be adjusted when needed based on regular evaluation to secure better outcomes for students.