

Pupil premium strategy statement 2024-2027

Wingrove 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
School Name	Wingrove Primary School
Number of pupils in school	472 including Nursery (52)
Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils	41.6%
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)	2024-2027
Date this statement was published	December 2025
Date on which it will be reviewed	November 2026
Statement authorised by	Full Governing Body
Pupil premium lead	Jane Mullarkey
Governor / Trustee lead	Anne Laws

Funding overview

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year	184 pupils x£1515 pp
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>	£278, 760

Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

Statement of intent

Our intention is that all pupils, irrespective of their background or the challenges they face, make good progress and achieve high attainment across all subject areas. The focus of our pupil premium strategy is to support disadvantaged pupils to achieve that goal, including progress for those who are already high attainers.

We will consider the challenges faced by vulnerable pupils, such as those who have a social worker and young carers. The activity we have outlined in this statement is also intended to support their needs, regardless of whether they are disadvantaged or not.

Quality First 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 disadvantage attainment gap and at the same time will benefit the non-disadvantaged pupils in our school. Implicit in the intended outcomes detailed below, is the intention that non-disadvantaged pupils' attainment will be sustained and improved alongside progress for their disadvantaged peers.

Our strategy is also integral to wider school plans for education recovery. For example, we have created three smaller classes for all of our Y6 pupils to support them with their SATs at the end of the year.

Our approach will be responsive to common challenges and individual needs, rooted in robust diagnostic assessment, not assumptions about the impact of disadvantage. The approaches we have adopted complement each other to help pupils excel. To ensure they are effective we will:

- ensure disadvantaged pupils are challenged in the work that they are set;
- act early to intervene at the point need is identified;
- adopt a whole school approach in which all staff take responsibility for disadvantaged pupils' outcomes and raise expectations of what they can achieve;
- ensure the key principle of our strategy is to provide quality first teaching for all children.

Challenges

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

Challenge number	Detail of challenge
1	Assessments, observations, and discussions with pupils indicate underdeveloped oral language skills and vocabulary gaps among many disadvantaged pupils. These are evident from Reception through to KS2 and in general, are more prevalent among our disadvantaged pupils than their peers.
2	Speech and language delay on entry. Impoverished language, limited vocabulary, English not always the first language - affects writing outcomes particularly.
3	Limited access to resources and experiences to develop cultural capital. This is assessed through observations and discussions.
4	Many parents require support to help their children with learning.
5	A significant proportion of children with SEND needs. The national figure is 18.2% whilst ours is 21%, and we have 21 children in receipt of or awaiting an EHCP and a significant proportion are also pupil premium, 42.8%.
6	Nationally, attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP are low compared to non-PP pupils. This reduces their school hours and causes them to fall behind. A huge amount of resource is needed to ensure our attendance is above average, last year it was 94.4% for disadvantaged pupils and 94.8% for non-disadvantaged pupils (national expectation is 95%+) – Perspective Lite.

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
Progress in communication and language Achievement for majority of pupils in line with ARE	<p>*All children can communicate effectively at an age appropriate level and understand a wealth of vocabulary relevant to their learning.</p> <p>*Children demonstrate very good oracy skills and can communicate with confidence.</p>
Progress in writing Achievement for majority of pupils in line with ARE	*All disadvantaged children can access and make sense of the curriculum through a well-planned curriculum offer and quality first teaching.

No gap between PP and non-PP children All pupils achieve in line with national average	<p>*Progress across the curriculum is good or better, from their starting points, for disadvantaged children.</p> <p>*Increased % for disadvantaged children in meeting national expectations at the end of EYFS, Phonics and KS2.</p> <p>*Children who have been identified as both PP and SEND make strong progress and are fully prepared for the next stage in their education.</p>
<p>All pupils make strong progress and achieve above average progress</p> <p>Improved attendance At least 95% attendance, low PA</p>	<p>*Disadvantaged children improve their attendance so that their attendance is in line with non-disadvantaged children nationally.</p> <p>*Persistent Absentees continues to decrease for PP and PP&SEND.</p> <p>*Parental engagement increases to raise the profile of the importance of education.</p>
Children are safe, happy, healthy (both physically and mentally) to enable them to become confident learners. They develop positive relationships and learn to manage their emotions to overcome challenging situations.	<p>*Progress is good or better, from the child's starting point, across the curriculum for all disadvantaged children.</p> <p>*Disadvantaged children fully engage in school life and are happy, confident and independent learners.</p> <p>*All children are fully prepared to transition to the next stage of their school life at the end of the academic year.</p> <p>*Children are happy and positive citizens who impact positively within their environments</p>
Parents feel supported and empowered to support their children	Early intervention: needs identified and addressed

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: £ 155, 448

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Quality First Teaching	"Great teaching is the most important lever schools have to improve pupil attainment."	1,2,3,6

<p>Develop subject knowledge and pedagogy</p> <p>All teaching staff given release time to work in coaching triads to support areas for development</p> <p>Use Lyfta programme – as a gateway to the world – allowing children to understand global issues and develop cultural capital</p> <p>Training delivered by Tom Sherrington</p> <p>All staff have access to Walk Thrus for CPD</p> <p>Introduction of triads with support teams for CPD</p> <p>NPQ for all middle leaders: leading teaching, leading behaviour and culture, leading literacy, leading mathematics, senior leader, SENCO</p> <p>Additional 1:1 staff to enable teaching staff to focus on delivery of QFT</p> <p>Additional staff deployed in EYFS to support the early acquisition of basic skills</p> <p>Extension of pastoral team to focus on</p>	<p>1. High-quality teaching EEF</p>	
--	---	--

emotional and social needs of pupils and further work with parents		
<p>Oracy</p> <p>Voice 21 (4th year on the project – Embedding Oracy across the curriculum)</p> <p>Full staff external training day with Voice 21 team</p> <p>TLR3 created to lead oracy across the curriculum</p> <p>Embedding dialogic activities across the curriculum will support children to articulate key ideas, consolidate understanding and extend vocabulary</p> <p>Children read fluently and foster a love of reading. Effective phonics teaching – Little Wandle – all staff across school trained, and TLR introduced for staff to lead on delivery and monitoring progress of the scheme. High quality reading texts across the curriculum</p>	<p>Waldfoegel and Washbrook's research (2010) found a significant vocabulary gap between children from the wealthiest and poorest families at age 5, with the wealthiest children having a vocabulary that's, on average, around 8 months ahead of their low-income peers. This vocabulary gap can have long-term implications for children's academic achievement and overall development.</p> <p>Another key message that Marc Rowland (working with DfE and Surrey schools) emphasises through his hugely impactful work is that 'the language gap is the disadvantaged gap'. By this Marc means the chasm that exists in vocabulary between the lowest income quintile and the highest – a 27% gap exists at aged five – a challenge that is brought into our schools and a divide then tends to grow. To narrow the gap therefore means to proactively develop speaking and listening skills and to then build on language development.</p> <p>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/oral-language-interventions</p> <p>Reading comprehension strategies are high impact on average (+6 month), a crucial component of early reading instruction.</p> <p>Reading comprehension strategies EEF</p> <p>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/evidence-summaries/teaching-learning-toolkit/phonics/</p> <p>We will ensure consistency and high-quality teaching of phonics across school (Including KS2) based on robust assessments. Ensure explicit teaching of reading using high quality texts.</p>	<p>1,2,3</p> <p>2,3,6</p>

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

Budgeted cost: £ 52,610

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
<p>To provide specific targeted support to many disadvantaged children across school</p> <p>To ensure there are opportunities to train teaching assistants in delivering interventions – use of professionals in school to support with this eg SALT, OT, EP, SEMH</p> <p>TA employed this year to manage all of the SALT specific interventions</p>	<p>We appreciate that targeted interventions have the greatest positive impact if the teaching assistant is trained to deliver.</p> <p>We also recognise deploying teaching assistants in classrooms does not necessarily ensure positive outcomes.</p> <p>Teaching Assistant Interventions EEF</p>	2,3,5,6
<p>Enhance the Early Years environment to ensure a language rich environment. Staff to have further training in language development</p>	<p>On average, oral language approaches have a high impact on pupil outcomes of 6 months' additional progress. It is important that spoken language activities are matched to learners' current stage of development, so that it extends their learning and connects with the curriculum.</p> <p>Oral language interventions EEF</p>	1,2,3,5,6
<p>To provide extra time for inclusion manager to work with staff and children to ensure needs are identified early, effective communication with parents and high- quality interventions are in place (Additional support from pastoral lead – to run interventions – Lego, Talking and Drawing, Social Skills,</p>	<p>'Evidence consistently shows the positive impact that targeted academic support can have, including for those not making good progress across the spectrum of achievement.'</p> <p>2. Targeted academic support EEF</p>	6

Gardening, Dog Squad)		
-----------------------	--	--

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

Budgeted cost: £ 70,702

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
<p>Ensure attendance increases, especially for disadvantaged children</p> <p>Pastoral Lead/attendance and welfare officer employed</p> <p>Robust systems in place to address poor attendance</p>	<p>There is a clear link between poor attendance and lower academic achievement (DFE)</p> <p>The link between attendance and attainment in an assessment year</p>	4,6
<p>Increase parental engagement and support to further support their children – parent weekly coffee morning, parent and toddler weekly sessions – with support from pastoral lead and HLTA and other external professionals eg NAPI, St John Ambulance, SALT...</p>	<p>Parental engagement EEF</p>	2,3,4,5
<p>Continue to develop outdoor play and learning to improve physical and PSHE development – PE team to support with this</p>	<p>Social and emotional skills are essential for children's development – they support effective learning and are linked to positive outcomes in later life. An outdoor area which promotes, resilience, physical development etc will support children in developing these skills.</p> <p>3. Wider strategies EEF</p>	3,5,6
<p>Breakfast Club and after school clubs/</p>	<p>We provide a range of high-quality clubs, free of charge, to enable disadvantaged children to attend. This is important for them</p>	1,3,5

<p>coaches/enrichment opportunities linked to curriculum</p> <p>Bespoke financial support eg, bus fares, pick up/drop off, food banks, educational visits, residential (including overseas), uniform and vouchers.</p>	<p>to develop a range of skills, socially, emotionally and physically. It also gives them the opportunities to experience new activities.</p> <p>Extending school time EEF</p> <p>Free school breakfast provision EEF</p>	
--	---	--

Total budgeted cost: £ 278,760

Part B: Review of the previous academic year 2025

Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils

We have analysed the performance of our school's disadvantaged pupils during the previous academic year, drawing on national assessment data and our own internal summative and formative assessments. To help us gauge the performance of our disadvantaged pupils we compared their results to those for disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils at national and local level (though these comparisons are to be considered with caution given ongoing pandemic impacts, particularly for pupils in Years 4, 5 and 6 who had the most disruption) and to results achieved by our non-disadvantaged pupils.

EYFS – GLD Outcomes

Below are the outcomes for disadvantaged pupils in EYFS at the end of Reception 2025. We have compared the outcomes to the disadvantaged cohort at LA and National levels.

Wingrove Primary School (2960)

Indicator	Eligible Cohort ¹	Disadvantaged Pupils: Disadvantaged				
		School	LA		NCER National	
		9	799	89,450		
		Value	Gap	Value	Gap	Value
Good level of development ² ●		44.4%	-9.0%	53.4%	-7.1%	51.5%
Average no. ELGs at expected level		11.6	-1.2	12.8	-0.6	12.2
All: At least expected		44.4%	-8.7%	53.1%	-5.5%	49.9%
Prime: At least expected		66.7%	+2.0%	64.7%	+5.7%	61.0%
COM: At least expected ●		66.7%	-4.4%	71.1%	-0.7%	67.4%
PSE: At least expected ●		66.7%	-10.8%	77.5%	-5.5%	72.2%
PHY: At least expected ●		77.8%	-0.9%	78.7%	+3.7%	74.1%
Specific: At least expected		44.4%	-9.3%	53.7%	-6.6%	51.0%
LIT: At least expected ●		44.4%	-10.4%	54.8%	-9.2%	53.6%
MAT: At least expected ●		66.7%	+2.5%	64.2%	+3.9%	62.8%
UTW: At least expected		66.7%	-6.5%	73.2%	-1.1%	67.8%
EXP: At least expected		77.8%	-3.1%	80.9%	+2.2%	75.6%

The second table shows the results for children who are not known to be disadvantaged.

Wingrove Primary School (2960)

Indicator	Eligible Cohort ¹	Disadvantaged Pupils: Not Disadvantaged			
		School	LA	NCER National	
		51	2,213	470,890	
		Value	Gap	Value	Gap
Good level of development ² ●		52.9%	-18.3%	71.2%	-18.4%
Average no. ELGs at expected level		13.6	-0.9	14.5	-0.8
All: At least expected		52.9%	-17.3%	70.2%	-17.0%
Prime: At least expected		68.6%	-9.9%	78.5%	-9.2%
COM: At least expected ●		70.6%	-11.3%	81.9%	-11.1%
PSE: At least expected ●		88.2%	+2.1%	86.1%	+3.2%
PHY: At least expected ●		86.3%	-0.7%	87.0%	-0.3%
Specific: At least expected		56.9%	-14.3%	71.2%	-14.3%
LIT: At least expected ●		58.8%	-14.2%	73.0%	-14.7%
MAT: At least expected ●		70.6%	-10.1%	80.7%	-9.7%
UTW: At least expected		72.5%	-10.0%	82.5%	-10.1%
EXP: At least expected		94.1%	+7.1%	87.0%	+7.3%

The first table above displays the outcomes for all the pupils who are eligible for FSM in Reception (9). The second table shows all pupils who are not disadvantaged (51). There is a 9% and 7% difference between our FSM eligible group and the Newcastle and National figures. The gap between the school's non-disadvantaged and local and national outcomes are greater than the disadvantaged gaps. The outcomes were further analysed and there is a close correlation between the pupils entitled to FSM and those identified with SEND.

Y1 Phonics

Below is the table showing the outcomes pupil groups achieving 32+ result in the phonics test. We have drawn comparisons with National outcomes.

Estab. No.	Estab. Name	Cohort	No Score	Mark						Outcome				
				0-15	16-23	24-31	32-36	37-40	APS	Q	A	D	WT	WA
-	NCER National	601,000	3.6%	8.1%	3.7%	4.7%	30.1%	49.8%	33.3	-	0.2%	3.4%	16.5%	79.9%
	FSM Eligible	128,080	5.8%	15.6%	5.9%	6.0%	30.6%	36.0%	29.8	-	-	5.4%	27.5%	66.6%
	Not FSM Eligible	465,060	2.8%	5.9%	3.1%	4.3%	30.0%	53.9%	34.3	-	-	2.7%	13.2%	83.9%
	Unknown	7,870	14.5%	21.0%	5.5%	5.2%	22.2%	31.6%	27.2	-	-	13.9%	31.6%	53.9%
-	Local Authority	3,091	4.4%	11.2%	4.4%	4.1%	30.3%	45.6%	32.1	0.0%	0.1%	4.2%	19.7%	75.9%
	FSM Eligible	1,079	6.8%	17.7%	6.7%	4.7%	30.4%	33.7%	29.0	0.0%	0.3%	6.5%	29.1%	64.1%
	Not FSM Eligible	1,956	2.9%	7.3%	3.0%	3.6%	30.6%	52.7%	34.0	0.0%	0.1%	2.8%	13.8%	83.3%
	Unknown	56	10.7%	25.0%	12.5%	8.9%	19.6%	23.2%	24.0	0.0%	0.0%	10.7%	46.4%	42.9%
2960	Wingrove Primary School	59	0.0%	20.3%	8.5%	6.8%	27.1%	37.3%	28.4	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	35.6%	64.4%
	FSM Eligible	24	0.0%	25.0%	12.5%	8.3%	37.5%	16.7%	25.6	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	45.8%	54.2%
	Not FSM Eligible	34	0.0%	14.7%	5.9%	5.9%	20.6%	52.9%	31.2	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	26.5%	73.5%
	Unknown	1	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%

The gap between Wingrove disadvantaged and not known to be disadvantaged pupils for phonics outcomes is 19.3%, compared to the LA and NCER gaps of 19.2% and 17.3%. The outcomes for both groups differ from the LA and NCER outcomes by about 10%. The gap between the two groups at Wingrove is in line with LA and National. EAL and SEND affect the outcomes for all pupils.

Y4 Multiplication Tables Check (MTC)

MTC – score out of 25 – average score for all pupils 22.42 (national for all=21)					
FSM		NFSM		Difference	
Wingrove	National	Wingrove	National	Wingrove	National
21.59	19.3	23.12	21.7	1.53	2.4



The outcomes for MTC show that they are above national for both FSM and NFSM. The gap between them is closer at Wingrove compared with national norms.

KS2 Y6 Outcomes

Contextual Picture





Below are tables showing the outcomes for Wingrove compared to LA and National outcomes:

Combined Reading, Writing and Maths (figures are out of 59 where 35 are disadvantaged and 24 are not known to be disadvantaged):

School	RWM*	
	 ≥Exp	 High
NCER National	62.8%	8.5%
Disadvantaged	47.8%	3.6%
Non Disadvantaged	69.6%	10.7%
Unknown	68.1%	10.3%
LA	65.8%	11.0%
Disadvantaged	54.1%	5.4%
Non Disadvantaged	77.1%	16.3%
Wingrove Primary School	59.3%	5.1%
Disadvantaged	57.1%	2.9%
Non Disadvantaged	62.5%	8.3%



The combined score for Wingrove for disadvantaged group is better than the national outcome and LA figure, which means that the disadvantaged group at Wingrove have outperformed their peers both locally (3%) and nationally (9.3%).

Reading:

School	READING			
	Avg. SS	 <Exp	  ≥Exp	 High
NCER National	105.7	23.6%	75.8%	33.7%
Disadvantaged	103.1	35.2%	63.8%	21.5%
Non Disadvantaged	106.8	18.3%	81.3%	39.4%
Unknown	106.4	19.7%	79.8%	37.0%
LA	106.0	21.9%	77.4%	34.5%
Disadvantaged	103.9	30.4%	68.6%	24.7%
Non Disadvantaged	107.8	13.9%	85.8%	43.8%
Wingrove Primary School	107.0	25.4%	74.6%	32.2%
Disadvantaged	106.9	25.7%	74.3%	34.3%
Non Disadvantaged	107.2	25.0%	75.0%	29.2%





In reading the average point score for disadvantaged group at Wingrove is higher than both local and national scores which is positive. This group at Wingrove also outperformed their local (4.8%) and national peers (10%) in achieving at least expected outcomes.

Writing: teacher assessment as there is no standardised test for writing in Y6

School	WRITING TA	
	 ≥Exp	 GDS
NCER National	72.7%	12.9%
Disadvantaged	59.7%	6.6%
Non Disadvantaged	78.7%	15.8%
Unknown	78.7%	15.9%
LA	73.8%	18.1%
Disadvantaged	64.3%	10.4%
Non Disadvantaged	83.0%	25.4%
Wingrove Primary School	67.8%	5.1%
Disadvantaged	65.7%	2.9%
Non Disadvantaged	70.8%	8.3%





The disadvantaged group at Wingrove also outperformed their local (1.4%) and national (6%) peers.

Maths:

School	MATHS			
	Avg. SS	 <Exp	  ≥Exp	 High
NCER National	104.8	24.8%	74.5%	26.6%
Disadvantaged	101.9	38.0%	60.9%	15.2%
Non Disadvantaged	106.1	18.7%	80.8%	31.8%
Unknown	105.4	20.2%	79.3%	27.8%
LA	105.2	22.9%	76.4%	26.8%
Disadvantaged	102.7	32.7%	66.3%	16.3%
Non Disadvantaged	107.4	13.6%	86.1%	36.9%
Wingrove Primary School	105.4	30.5%	69.5%	16.9%
Disadvantaged	104.5	31.4%	68.6%	14.3%
Non Disadvantaged	106.8	29.2%	70.8%	20.8%

Again, the disadvantaged cohort at Wingrove outperformed their local (2.3%) and national (7.7%) peers for expected and above outcomes.

Grammar Punctuation and Spelling (GPS or SPAG):

School	GPS			
	Avg. SS	 <Exp	  ≥Exp	 High
NCER National	105.4	26.2%	73.2%	29.9%
Disadvantaged	102.7	38.7%	60.2%	18.8%
Non Disadvantaged	106.7	20.4%	79.1%	35.1%
Unknown	105.8	22.2%	77.3%	30.1%
LA	105.8	25.0%	74.4%	31.5%
Disadvantaged	103.1	34.3%	64.7%	18.4%
Non Disadvantaged	108.3	16.0%	83.7%	44.0%
Wingrove Primary School	106.0	32.2%	67.8%	25.4%
Disadvantaged	105.9	31.4%	68.6%	17.1%
Non Disadvantaged	106.3	33.3%	66.7%	37.5%

Again, the disadvantaged cohort at Wingrove outperformed their local (3.9%) and national (8.4%) peers.

This shows that the disadvantaged cohort at Wingrove are leaving their primary education at a higher level than their local and national peers in all of the subject areas in the SAT tests, which would support a strong pupil premium strategy.

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
Voice 21 – 3 year programme – funded by PP for Y1 and Y2, funded by NECA for Y3. TLR funded by PP	Voice 21
Mastering Number	NCETM