

Pupil Premium Strategy Statement – Ingrow 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	368
Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils	42%
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)	2025/2026 2026/2027 2027/2028
Date this statement was published	
Date on which it will be reviewed	
Statement authorised by	Lauren Murphy Headteacher
Pupil premium lead	Daniel Paton Assistant Headteacher
Governor / Trustee lead	Emma Walters

Funding overview

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year	£259,230
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>	£259,230

Part A: Pupil Premium Strategy Plan

Statement of intent

At Ingrow Primary School, our aim is to ensure that all disadvantaged pupils, including those eligible for the Pupil Premium, achieve highly, make sustained progress, and access a rich, ambitious curriculum. Our strategy combines high-quality teaching, targeted academic support, and wider provision addressing attendance, wellbeing, and readiness to learn. We are committed to removing barriers linked to socio-economic disadvantage and enabling every child to thrive academically, socially, and emotionally.

Challenges

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

Challenge number	Detail of challenge
1a	Early language and communication gaps on entry Baseline assessment shows disadvantaged pupils enter EYFS significantly lower in listening and attention, and self-care skills than their peers, affecting early literacy, managing self, and readiness to learn.
1b	Early literacy foundations and low engagement in writing Disadvantaged pupils typically begin school with limited phonological awareness and word recognition, transcription skills, and early writing confidence. National data shows that the impact of this widens with each milestone – LKS2, UKS2 and then onto GCSEs.
2	Limited Enrichment Activities Many disadvantaged pupils have limited exposure to reading materials, cultural capital experiences, and learning resources outside school, affecting vocabulary, background knowledge, and engagement.
3	Attendance challenges Historically, persistent absence is high among disadvantaged pupils.
4	Parental engagement in early learning routines and school readiness Some families require additional support to establish consistent home learning habits, early self-care routines (e.g., toileting, organisation), self-regulation and engagement with school-led activities that underpin successful early education and academic support.
5	High levels of pastoral, SEMH, and therapeutic need A significant proportion of disadvantaged pupils require SEMH support, and wellbeing support due to ACEs, anxiety, regulation difficulties, or

	safeguarding vulnerabilities. These needs affect attendance, focus, and academic engagement.
--	--

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 language and communication outcomes in EYFS and KS1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline to end-of-year assessments show accelerated progress in language and communication for disadvantaged pupils. • Increased proportions of pupils achieving age-related expectations in Communication & Language and early literacy strands. • Identified pupils meet SALT and Launchpad for Literacy targets within expected timescales.
Increased proportion of disadvantaged pupils achieving expected standards in reading, writing, and maths.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The attainment gap between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils narrows year-on-year. • Inwriting, KS1 and KS2 outcomes for disadvantaged pupils move closer to or exceed national disadvantaged averages. • Disadvantaged pupils make strong progress from their starting points.
Improved wellbeing, resilience, and self-regulation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in SEMH-related incidents. • Continue to keep suspension rates low. • Increased engagement in learning, evidenced through pupil voice and lesson observations. • Effective completion of Thrive/SEMH interventions with demonstrable impact.
Strong parental engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased participation of disadvantaged families in Parent Partnership events • Improved self-care readiness on entry to Nursery/Reception.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased parental attendance at meetings, workshops, and support sessions. • Key families are supported, which improves outcomes for pupils.
Improved attendance for disadvantaged pupils, reducing persistent absence.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disadvantaged attendance increases each term and moves closer to whole-school attendance. • Reduction in rate of persistent absence (PA) among disadvantaged pupils. • Improved punctuality for identified pupils. • Early Help and attendance interventions demonstrate clear impact through case studies.

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: £32,000

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Staff CPD to continue to provide QFT. £12,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High-quality teaching has the greatest impact on pupil outcomes, particularly for disadvantaged pupils (EEF <i>Tiered Model</i> – Teaching is the top priority). • The EEF states that continuous professional development is most effective when it is sustained, subject-specific, and followed up over time — your model of using staff meetings and INSET aligns with this. • Distributed leadership improves curriculum effectiveness; releasing curriculum leaders once 	<p>1a: CPD strengthens spoken language strategies & modelling</p> <p>1b: Improves quality of writing instruction (transcription & composition)</p> <p>2: Enhances literacy-rich practice for pupils with low access to books</p>

	<p>per term allows monitoring, modelling, and coaching — all recommended in the EEF's <i>Effective Professional Development</i> guidance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructional coaching is identified by the EEF as a high-impact form of CPD that accelerates teacher improvement and reduces variability in classroom practice. 	5: Improves behaviour routines & SEMH-sensitive teaching
<p>Thrive CPD £6,000</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EEF's <i>Social and Emotional Learning (SEL)</i> guidance shows SEL approaches typically improve academic outcomes by +4 months, especially for pupils with SEMH needs. • Thrive gives staff structured approaches to emotional regulation, relationships, and behaviour support — matching EEF findings that explicit SEL teaching is more effective than informal or reactive approaches. • Consistent emotional regulation strategies reduce behaviour incidents and improve learning time, addressing core SEMH challenges. 	<p>3: SEMH improvements positively influence attendance</p> <p>5: Directly targets regulation, trauma, emotional needs</p>
<p>Coaching/CPD release time £8,000</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructional coaching is supported by EEF as a high-impact, cost-effective method for developing teaching, particularly when feedback is precise, sustained, and classroom-embedded. • Coaching enhances the effectiveness of early career teachers and supports staff retention — directly improving consistency of QFT. • Time allocation for coaching ensures implementation is high quality; EEF stresses that professional development requires protected time to be effective. 	Same logic as QFT CPD – 1a, 1b, 2 and 5
<p>Developing reading across school £6,000</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EEF <i>Reading Comprehension Strategies</i> guidance shows a high average impact of +6 months, particularly for disadvantaged pupils. • Access to high-quality texts increases reading volume, 	<p>1a: reinforces early language</p> <p>1b: improves writing through improved reading</p>

	<p>vocabulary acquisition, and background knowledge — all shown by research to narrow the attainment gap.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing reading spaces increases reading engagement (EEF <i>Motivation and Engagement</i>), particularly for pupils with limited book access at home. • Enhanced reading provision supports early language development, which the EEF identifies as foundational for long-term attainment. 	<p>comprehension & vocabulary</p> <p>2: access to books & reading capital</p>
--	--	---

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

Budgeted cost: £121,000

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
<p>Early Years Targeted Support (small group & 1:1)</p> <p>£18,000</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline assessments at Ingrow consistently show children enter Nursery/Reception significantly below age-related expectations in prime areas, especially speech, language, and communication. • The EEF states that high-quality early intervention (small-group or 1:1) has a strong impact when aligned with assessment (+4 months). • Structured early support accelerates progress for children with early developmental gaps, reducing the disadvantage gap before KS1. 	<p>1a and 5: language delay, social communication delay, SEMH/regulation</p>
<p>Learning Support Assistants delivering targeted interventions (Core subjects Y1–Y6)</p> <p>£70,000*</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the EEF, Teaching Assistants can have a +4 month impact when deployed effectively to deliver structured interventions. • Leaders use assessment information to deploy LSAs based on need, maximising learning time and targeting gaps. • LSAs support both classroom learning and targeted intervention 	<p>1a: supports language</p> <p>1b: supports early & developing writing skills (handwriting, sentence-level work)</p> <p>2: supports pupils lacking literacy exposure</p>

	— an approach supported by the EEF’s <i>Making Best Use of TAs</i> guidance.	5: SEMH-adjusted learning support
Launchpad for Literacy Intervention £5,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early language is the strongest predictor of later academic achievement; EEF Early Years Toolkit finds communication and language approaches add +6 months. • Launchpad supports identification of individual speech, language, fine motor, and sensory needs — all high-impact areas for disadvantaged children. • Embedding Launchpad strategies into Quality First Teaching strengthens the classroom environment for communication-rich learning. 	1b: supports <i>fine motor, mark-making, attention</i> → early writing foundations
Additional Phonics Support for Lowest 20% £6,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EEF <i>Phonics</i> interventions show very high impact (+5 months), particularly for younger disadvantaged pupils. • Intensive support for the bottom 20% in KS1 accelerates decoding, fluency, and readiness for KS2 reading demands. • Children with limited access to books at home (Challenge 2) benefit significantly from this structured early intervention. 	1b: phonics foundation influences transcription & spelling 2: close the home-reading access gaps
Purchase of Additional SALT Time £10,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oral Language Interventions have +6 months average impact (EEF). • Additional SALT time allows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • case-load assessments • target plans • parent support • specialist training for staff <p>This is especially needed due to high levels of early language delay and SEMH needs within the disadvantaged cohort.</p>	1a and 5: SALT supports communication & access to learning; SEMH needs often co-occurring
Purchase of Additional Educational Psychology (EP) Time £6,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EP assessments ensure staff receive high-quality advice to modify provision quickly, essential for children with complex needs. • 69% of SEND pupils at Ingrow are also disadvantaged, making EP 	1b and 5: writing barriers (fine motor, working memory, literacy skills) often

	<p>involvement critical in ensuring equity of access.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EEF notes that early identification and assessment underpins all successful targeted support. 	relate to underlying SEND
<p>PE Leader Coaching & Mentorship (small group work) £6,000</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Targeted small-group mentoring improves resilience, teamwork, attendance, and engagement. Supports pastoral needs of disadvantaged children, especially those with SEMH vulnerabilities (EEF SEL = +4 months). Provides enrichment opportunities normally limited for families with low income. 	2, 3 and 5

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

Budgeted cost: £106,230

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
<p>Therapeutic Provision & SEMH Support £55,000*</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EEF identifies Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) interventions as having a +4 months impact on academic outcomes. SEMH provision improves emotional regulation, relationships, and resilience — prerequisites for attendance and achievement. EEF guidance emphasises that structured programmes for pupils with emotional and social needs improve behaviour and readiness to learn. Metacognitive and self-regulation approaches (+7 months) complement SEMH provision by giving children tools to manage emotions and behaviour. 	3 and 5
<p>Emotional Support for Young People £6,000</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEL and wellbeing interventions help children develop self-management and coping strategies, particularly those facing instability or ACEs. 	3 and 5

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emotional support reduces the need for behaviour-based interventions and supports improved attendance and engagement. 	
<p>Family Liaison Support and Early Help. £33,000*</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EEF identifies Parental Engagement strategies as having a +4 months impact on learning outcomes. Effective parental engagement increases home–school consistency, improves routines, and strengthens family support networks — crucial for attendance. The Family Liaison Leader removes barriers such as safeguarding concerns, unmet basic needs, and family instability, all shown to disproportionately affect disadvantaged pupils. Strengthening relationships with families supports readiness for school, self-care routines, and long-term engagement. 	3, 4 and 5
<p>Learning Assistants delivering support for metacognition & self-regulation (e.g., ZONES, meet & greet,) £7,000</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EEF Metacognition and Self-Regulation strategies produce +7 months of additional progress. Self-regulation strategies reduce behaviour incidents and increase time-on-task — vital for children with SEMH needs. Meet-and-greet routines improve emotional readiness, consistency, and sense of belonging, which contributes to better attendance. 	2, 3 and 5
<p>After-school Sports Clubs (PE Leader with small groups) £5,230</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extra-curricular physical activity increases engagement, supports behaviour & social development; provides enrichment and increases school connection. 	2, 3 and 5

*This cost represents a proportion of staffing time directly allocated to disadvantaged pupils through targeted intervention, casework, attendance monitoring and bespoke SEMH support.

Total budgeted cost: £259,230

Part B: Review of the previous academic year

Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils

Disadvantaged Pupils' Performance at Ingrow Primary School

Disadvantaged pupils reaching the expected standard in reading, writing and maths.

Year	Ingrow Primary School	National Average	Compared to National Average
2022 to 2023	48%	44%	4%
2023 to 2024	55%	46%	9%

Disadvantaged pupils reaching the expected standard in reading.

Year	Ingrow Primary School	National Average	Compared to National Average
2022 to 2023	76%	60%	16%
2023 to 2024	79%	62%	17%

Disadvantaged pupils reaching the expected standard in writing.

Year	Ingrow Primary School	National Average	Compared to National Average
2022 to 2023	59%	58%	1%
2023 to 2024	55%	58%	-3%

Disadvantaged pupils reaching the expected standard in maths.

Year	Ingrow Primary School	National Average	Compared to National Average
2022 to 2023	72%	59%	13%
2023 to 2024	74%	59%	15%



2025

Disadvantaged pupils - Reading, writing and mathematics expected standard

Year	Cohort	School disadvantaged compared to national disadvantaged			School disadvantaged compared to national non-disadvantaged			Year group context
		School	National	National distribution banding	National (non dis)	Gap	Gap Trend	
3-year	94	49%	46%	Close to average (non-sig)	68%	-19	Not applicable	Not applicable
2025	27	41%	47%	Close to average (non-sig)	69%	-28	Widening	High - FSM, High - SEN

Disadvantaged pupils - Reading expected standard

Year	Cohort	School disadvantaged compared to national disadvantaged			School disadvantaged compared to national non-disadvantaged			Year group context
		School	National	National distribution banding	National (non dis)	Gap	Gap Trend	
3-year	94	78%	62%	Above (sig+)	80%	-2	Not applicable	Not applicable
2025	27	78%	63%	Above (non-sig)	81%	-3	Widening	High - FSM, High - SEN

Disadvantaged pupils - Writing expected standard

Year	Cohort	School disadvantaged compared to national disadvantaged			School disadvantaged compared to national non-disadvantaged			Year group context
		School	National	National distribution banding	National (non dis)	Gap	Gap Trend	
3-year	94	52%	59%	Close to average (non-sig)	78%	-26	Not applicable	Not applicable
2025	27	41%	59%	Below (non-sig)	78%	-38	Widening	High - FSM, High - SEN

Disadvantaged pupils - Mathematics expected standard

Year	Cohort	School disadvantaged compared to national disadvantaged			School disadvantaged compared to national non-disadvantaged			Year group context
		School	National	National distribution banding	National (non dis)	Gap	Gap Trend	
3-year	94	72%	60%	Above (sig+)	80%	-7	Not applicable	Not applicable
2025	27	70%	61%	Close to average (non-sig)	81%	-10	Widening	High - FSM, High - SEN

The previous strategy led to improvements in targeted intervention, SEMH provision, and progress for individual disadvantaged pupils.

- Targeted academic support led to improved progress for identified disadvantaged pupils in reading, writing and maths, particularly where early intervention was sustained.
- Pastoral and SEMH provision reduced the need for reactive interventions and improved pupils' emotional readiness for learning.
- Family liaison and attendance work resulted in individual case-level improvements, though persistent absence for disadvantaged pupils remains a significant barrier.

- Early language gaps on entry continue to impact attainment across EYFS and KS1, reinforcing the need for sustained SALT, Launchpad and early-literacy provision.
- Writing outcomes at KS2 remain below national averages, with early writing skill deficits identified as a key driver; strengthening writing across all phases is now a major priority.
- High levels of deprivation (42% PP) mean disadvantaged needs continue to be disproportionately high, and core approaches from the previous strategy must remain funded and central to the new plan.

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

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>
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 funding.