Pupil premium strategy statement – St John's Upper Holloway

This statement details our school's use of pupil premium (and recovery 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	207
Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils	43.4%
Academic years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers	2024-2027
Date this statement was published	October 2024
Date on which it will be reviewed	September 2025
Statement authorised by	Nick Turpin, Head teacher
Pupil premium lead	Rebecca Ross Goobey, Deputy Head
Governor lead	Jane Airey, Chair of Governors

Funding overview

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year	£ 133,200
Recovery premium funding allocation this academic year	£ 3,262
Pupil premium funding carried forward from previous years (enter £0 if not applicable)	£0
Total budget for this academic year	£ 136,462

Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

Statement of intent

We employ strategies that we know will support our pupils increase their attainment, and 'narrow the gap'. In order to meet the above requirements, the Governing Body of St John's CE Primary will ensure that provision is made which secures the teaching and learning opportunities that meet the needs of all pupils.

Our priority in the academic year 2024-25 is to 'diminish the difference' so that our disadvantaged pupils are making at least good progress and achieving in line with non-disadvantaged pupils locally and nationally.

As part of the additional provision made for pupils who belong to vulnerable groups, the Governors of our school will ensure that the needs of socially disadvantaged pupils are adequately assessed and addressed through termly pupil progress meetings (sometimes twice a term in certain year groups) as well as more frequent meetings between the class teachers and leadership team.

In making provision for socially disadvantaged pupils, we recognise that not all pupils who receive free school meals will be socially disadvantaged. We also recognise that not all pupils who are socially disadvantaged are registered or qualify for free school meals and pupil premium.

The Governors reserve the right to allocate the Pupil Premium funding to support any pupil of groups of pupils the school has legitimately identified as being socially disadvantaged, including children who are supported by children's services.

Challenges

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

Challenge number	Detail of challenge
1	Low attendance levels and persistent absence
2	Language development – oracy skills and vocabulary
3	Development of phonics and early reading skills
4	Non-engagement with reading at home
5	Mathematical fluency
6	Low progress and attainment in reading, writing and maths

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 attendance for our pupil premium children.	Attendance for our PP children is in line with that of their peers. Reduced number of PA (persistently absent) pupil premium children
Improved oracy skills and extended vocabulary	Children are more confident using a range of vocabulary across all areas of the curriculum
Increased phonic skills and ability to apply them to reading and writing	Proportion of pupil premium children achieving the expected level in phonics assessment tasks broadly in line with their peers and local/national averages
Continued development of reading for pleasure and increased engagement with reading at home	Greater proportion of pupils reading at home each day. Children enjoy the core texts they study as part of literacy units. Class teachers to have a class book unrelated to literacy text.
Children are more confident recalling and applying their times tables and number bonds	Tracking sheets show an increasing proportion of pupils are confident using their bonds and times tables
Children are supported in addressing their mental health and wellbeing concerns	Targeted support planned for focus children

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: £12,904

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Ongoing training and subscription for new phonics scheme (Little	DfE – the reading framework	3 4 6

Wandle) and training new staff		
Training and subscription for CLPE	EEF – Effective professional development recommendations	2 6
Training and subscription for VIPERS	EEF – Effective professional development recommendations	2 4 6
Training for writing through Grow (planning and assessment)	EEF – Effective professional development recommendations	6
Subscription to Maths hub (Maths mastery) and training class teachers	EEF – Effective professional development recommendations	5 6
TLR for literacy and maths leaders		2 3 4 5 6

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

Budgeted cost: £136,462

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
After-school tutoring for Y6 PP pupils 2 evenings a week for 20 weeks	DfE guidance	2 6
TAs for delivery of wide range of interventions and support within class	EEF - Effective professional development recommendations	2 3 5 6
Use of dyslexia tutor 1 day a week	EEF - Effective professional development recommendations	6
Use of art therapist 1 day a week	EEF - Effective professional development recommendations	6

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

Budgeted cost: £ 11,745

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s)
		addressed
	Activity	

Employing an attendance officer one day a week	DfE - Review of best practice in parental engagement	1
Mental health and wellbeing – School Wellbeing Service		7
Additional Educational Psychology time – top up payments		6 7

Total budgeted cost: £ 161,111

Part B: Review of the previous academic year

Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils

EYFSP outcomes:

72% of FSM children had a Good Level of Development, set against 58% for the Local Authority (LA)

52% of non-FSM children had a Good Level of Development, set against 70.7% for the LA.

Year 1 Phonics

92.3% of disadvantaged children were working at the expected level (71.9% LA) 71.4% of non-disadvantaged were working at the expected level (84.1% LA)

Year 4 Multiplication Tables Check

Average score of disadvantaged children was 23.4 (out of 25). LA was 19.9 av score. Average score of non-disadvantaged children was 23.6. LA was 22.1.

KS2 SATS

Disadvantaged results:

RWM combined 72.7% (LA 59.5%) at expected level Reading 81.8% (LA 73.8%) at expected level Writing 72.7% (LA 68.4%) at expected level Maths 90.9% (LA 70.7%) at expected level GPS 90.9% (LA 70.9%) at expected level

Non-disadvantaged results:

RWM combined 85.7% (LA 75.8%) at expected level Reading 85.7% (LA 83.1%) at expected level Writing 100% (LA 83.5%) at expected level Maths 92.9% (LA 84.5%) at expected level GPS 100% (LA 83.1%) at expected level

All classes undertook termly summative assessments to support their teacher judgements about pupil attainment. These assessments included PIRA (reading) and PUMA (maths) as well as White Rose maths units and termly assessments. This baseline data showed that the 'gaps' that had widened during lockdown and home learning had started to narrow but had not closed.

The outcomes of the previous pupil premium strategy plan (21-24), faced the challenge of the widening gap caused by Covid. Since normal school resumed, the gap has started to narrow but it has not closed. Challenges include disengagement by families

facing hardship and other societal issues (including housing pressures, low mental health and a lack of access to diagnostic services for neurodevelopmental issues)

Attendance

Attendance for PP children in 23-24 was 95.1%, as against 95.3% for non-PP children.

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
n/a	

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
n/a
The impact of that spending on service pupil premium eligible pupils
n/a

Further information (optional)