

Pupil premium strategy statement – Mayflower 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. It is recommended that this document is read in conjunction with our strategy statement for 2023-2024, and also our PPG Policy, which is updated on an annual basis. Copies of both documents have been added to the school's website.

School overview

Detail	Data
Number of pupils in school	464
Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils	47 of 464: 10.1%
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)	2023-2024
Date this statement was published	December 2024
Date on which it will be reviewed	December 2025
Statement authorised by	Luke Whitney (HT)
Pupil premium lead	Luke Whitney (HT)
Governor / Trustee lead	Imtiaz Patel (VCOG)

Funding overview

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year	£84,180
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>	£84,180

Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

Statement of intent

At Mayflower Primary School, we recognise that some of our pupils have the capacity to experience disadvantage due to their economic circumstances. As a school with a passionate commitment to inclusion and equal opportunities, we welcome the fact that additional funding is provided to ensure that these disadvantages can be successfully mitigated. By knowing our children, our community, and school, we will ensure that this funding is targeted towards those areas of greatest need, giving children an opportunity to make progress in-line with or above the cohort average for each year group in school.

We also recognise that some sensitivity is required in the way our policy is implemented. PPG children should be viewed in the same way as all of the children that attend our school, and given some of the prevailing cultural expectations, great care needs to be exercised in all spending decisions that are taken. These will also have an impact on the number of children who receive PPG funding, suggesting that the number who receive PPG is lower than the actual level of need in this part of the City of Leicester.

As with Special Educational Needs, we apply the same core principles to PPG, in that every teacher is a teacher of PPG children. Through good knowledge of the barriers that our children face, access to additional funding, and a strong commitment to equality of opportunity for all, we expect our policy and procedures to allow us to achieve the following aspirations:

- Our PPG eligible children will match or exceed rates of progress, on an aggregated basis, over and above the cohort average for each year group in school (F1-Y6)
- There is a narrowing gap in achievement between children in receipt of PPG and their peers
- Where any gap has been identified, it follows a narrowing trend over time, in all areas of the core curriculum

Finally, it needs to be acknowledged that during the academic year 2023-2024, the contextual factors at school were impacted significantly by the national RAAC-crisis. In April 2023, the school received a closure notice from the Department for Education, with just 24-hours for us to vacate the existing premises. This provided a huge logistical, educational, psychological, physical, and emotional challenge to our children, families, wider community and staff. Leaders and managers recognised at the time that some of our PPG children were likely to experience more profound challenges than others across the school, therefore our statement of intent and strategy were both amended to reflect the extraordinary circumstances we found ourselves in.

Challenges

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

Challenge number	Detail of challenge
1	83% of our pupils have English as an Additional Language (EAL), and these challenges tend to be more profound for those children who are disadvantaged (see IDSR, 2023-2024). This also impacts on parents' capacity to engage with the school, and support their children's learning at home, given that all of our lessons are conducted in English. As children move through our school, their proficiency increases, as evidenced by termly NASSEA assessments, and termly PPM meetings (F1-Y6).
2	With 97% of our children being from Muslim backgrounds, there can be a cultural reluctance to seek or accept additional financial support, in terms of support in school, extra resources for the classroom, subsidies for trips, and other related matters. Although difficult to prove, we believe that these barriers prevent other families from gaining access to PPG funding at the application stage, which has the capacity to mask disadvantage across the wider school population.
3	Of all children who have an eligibility to PPG funding (100%), (11.1%) are also in receipt of SEN support as Element 3, or an EHCP. As a consequence, their SEND needs may mask the fact that economic disadvantage is potentially impacting on their outcomes overall. Care thus needs to be taken to ensure that SEND <u>and</u> PPG discussions take place with teachers, leaders, and managers in relation to this cohort of children in the school.
4	Related to Key Challenge 3, (31.1%) of our PPG children will also gain regular access to Nurture Provision. While some of this is related to internal referral, some children also self-refer, suggesting that there is a link between potential disadvantage, and some of the emotional challenges that this may bring. Our ELSA is well-known to this group of children, and it has been strategically determined that this will continue as a core priority for the school, especially in relation to the additional challenges that the RAAC-crisis has brought to Mayflower Primary School since April 2023.
5	Aggregate attendance data for the academic year 2023-2024 suggests that PPG children experience lower rates of attendance than their peers (comparative analysis), and as a school, this has been significantly exacerbated by the RAAC-crisis, where for a proportion of the year, our children were being taught across split sites. This also had implications in respect of wellbeing, given the fact that the majority of our PPG children were accommodated in the middle of a local secondary school. PPG is 0.3% below the aggregated outcome for all pupils, and school recognises the strong link between attendance and education progress/attainment.

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 competence in the use of oral language for all our PPG pupils who also have English as an Additional Language (EAL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Termly tracking assessments confirm that EAL children with an entitlement to PPG are making progress that is better than the cohort average for all pupils (based on 83% of the school population)
PPG and others who the school determines as being vulnerable make better than expected progress in the core areas of English and Mathematics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Aggregated outcomes for all pupils will be less than similar outcomes for pupils who received additional support through PPG ▪ Subsidies for school uniform and trips (including enrichment provision), are taken up by the majority of parents
The needs of disadvantaged children will be considered separately to SEND across all three Pupil Progress Meetings that take place each year (all classes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Disadvantage is recognised by all staff as being a separate strand, and supported by provision mapping that takes eligible children beyond SEND support ▪ SEND children with PPG eligibility will make better progress than all PPG pupils on an aggregated basis
Nurture provision will be available to all children in school, with targeted work towards those children that either self-referred or were referred by a member of staff. This will also include targeted work for this cohort of children, including those that are deemed to be vulnerable, but do not receive PPG.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All children are aware of Nurture Provision, and the mechanism of self-referral at playtimes and lunchtimes ▪ Teaching staff can refer any child they are concerned about to the ELSA, with strategy being agreed across termly Pupil Progress Meetings (HT/SENDCo) ▪ ELSA tracking outcomes confirm the impact of provision, with diminishing numbers of pupils accessing it
Sustainable gains are made in attendance for all pupils, with aggregated outcomes for PPG pupils being in excess of those for the cohort of children, as a whole (based on 464 pupils)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Eligible pupils will make better than expected gains in their overall rates of attendance, from relatively low starting points ▪ Engagement from parents, both in terms of pupil attendance and other aspects of the school show a significant increase over time ▪ Reduced need for Parent Support Arvisor involvement (all pupils)

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: £42,500

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
EAL leadership role embedded across the school, with responsibility for tracking, CPD, and teaching specialist resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ https://www.bell-foundation.org.uk/resources/guidance/schools-and-leaders/learners-with-special-educational-needs-or-disabilities/ ▪ EAL and SEND are separate challenges that children may face, but targeted and differentiated actions are required for those children that have EAL, SEND and face disadvantage 	1
ELSA training, supervision, and provision, and accessible to all children in school	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ https://www.elsanetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/ELSA-Report-Investigation-into-the-Effectiveness-of-ELSA-in-Schools_Plymouth.pdf ▪ Addressing the social, emotional, and communication needs of our children will aid their learning in the classroom and beyond 	4
Additional teaching in Year 6, reducing ratios from 1:30 to 1:20 (PAN of 60 to be maintained)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Although there is limited evidence of impact overall (see EEF Report: Reducing Class Size), positive impacts can be identified when teachers are allowed to teach differently, and the impact of teacher wellbeing and workload are not always part of the research base. ▪ Staff deployment remains critical to this approach, and is supported by the MOBILISE Project (Sheffield Hallam University) 	1, 3, and 4
Additional teaching hours across all year groups, which equates to 9-extra days per week (aggregated across the school)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ https://epi.org.uk/events/enrichment-for-all-what-does-the-evidence-tell-us-about-access-impact-and-opportunities-for-improvement/ ▪ All forms of curriculum enrichment have the capacity to positively impact on confidence, social skills, and self-esteem, and provides children with new skills and abilities 	1, 3, and 4

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

Budgeted cost: £20,500

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Phonics interventions in Y1/Y2 to ensure that all children, including those that are disadvantaged, have a secure phonetic basis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ EEF research confirms a positive impact of up to 5-months, based on effective early intervention, consistent provision, linked back to a whole-school and accredited phonics scheme ▪ Outcomes at Mayflower are very strong in Year 1, improved outcomes (GLD) in Foundation 2, and above national 	1, 3, and 4
ELSA sessions and programmes for improving confidence/self-esteem	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See previously cited evidence in support of the school's strategic decision to train and appoint an ELSA, who will work across all year groups in school 	1, 3, and 4
PSA roles in Key Stage 1 and 2, linked to parental engagement in EYFS, ensuring that all children are well-prepared for school	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/id/eprint/10821/1/DCSF-RR151.pdf ▪ At Mayflower, strong parental links are essential, and they are celebrated as a child's primary educator ▪ Some families benefit from wider support, especially those that are alone or isolated 	2 and 5
Intervention Lead roles in KS1/KS2, overseeing interventions for all pupils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ EEF research again highlights the primary impact of TA deployment, freeing teachers up to offer QFT to all pupils. At Mayflower, QFT is recognised as an Element 1 intervention that benefits all pupils. 	1, 3, and 4
Targeted interventions in Y6, recapping on prior learning and preparing them for the SATs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See above ▪ Some of our interventions do not detract from QFT because they are offered before and after school, and led by well-qualified staff with proven impact over time 	1, 3, and 4
Targeted interventions for all pupils who slip below target, with a focus on those that have SEND, disadvantage, and wider intelligence that the school has access to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See above, although the impact of the RAAC-crisis had a significant impact on the capacity of the school to offer interventions to all pupils 	1, 3, and 4

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

Budgeted cost: £21,180

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
School uniform, winter coat, and sturdy shoes bursary for all pupils who have an entitlement to PPG (£120.00 per pupil)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Written evidence submitted by the Schoolwear Association to The Children's Wellbeing and Schools' Bill Committee (CWSB20) highlights the importance of reducing the impact of visible inequalities, thus supporting the Mayflower inclusion agenda 	1, 2, 3, 4, and 5
School trip subsidy, so all trips can be paid for, with an additional allowance in Year 6 to fund the annual residential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As detailed above, and will also ensure that all of our children can be included in the creative curriculum that is offered at school 	1, 2, 3, 4, and 5
Termly allowance to each class for engagement resources, tied back to PPG pupils, that will motivate and engage them, and other children in the class	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are many scholarly articles that support the development of creative curricula in schools, and this also links back to our work for the Artsmark Equally, our focus on Leuven will ensure that levels of involvement and wellbeing remain high 	1, 2, 3, 4, and 5
AO focus on the attendance of PPG children, with targeted support for those families that need it e.g. taxi travel to enrichment activities outside of school hours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The link between good rates of attendance and academic progress and attainment is well-established. We want all of our children to reach the challenge targets that have been set for attendance 	5
Positive representation for all our PPG children, including Young Consultants, Creativity Council, and other positions of responsibility across the school	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representation is a powerful tool in shaping students' perceptions of equality and diversity. The portrayal of individuals from different backgrounds in textbooks, classroom materials and educational media has a significant impact on how students view themselves and others. 	1, 2, 3, 4, and 5

Total budgeted cost: £84, 180

Part B: Review of the previous academic year

Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils

Outcomes in the Key Stage 2 National Assessments were very secure, as follows:

	GPS		Reading		Maths	
	EXS	GDS	EXS	GDS	EXS	GDS
School	89%	37%	81%	32%	90%	24%
PPG	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%
National	72%	32%	74%	28%	73%	24%

Outcomes in the MTC were also secure, as follows:

	Aggregated Outcomes	Percentage Getting 25/25
School	21.5	36%
PPG	22.3	33%
National	20.6	29%

Finally, outcomes in the Year 1 Phonics Screening Check are equally secure:

	Met the Expected Standard	Aggregated Outcomes	Percentage Getting 40/40
School	91%*	34.5	10.5%
PPG	75%	37	0%
National	79%	N/A	N/A

*Excluding SEND children, 88% when SEND children are included in the analysis

From a data monitoring perspective, outcomes would suggest that our PPG children are doing very well against the wider cohort, with specific areas of strength in mathematics, in Year 4. Phonics outcomes are also secure, although it should be noted that one of the children in receipt of PPG also falls into the SEND category. When this analysis is removed from consideration, comparative data confirms the impact of our phonics interventions with an aggregate outcome of 100% meeting the expected standard, an aggregated outcome of 37 although disparity remains in respect of those children who scored 40 out of 40.

Internal School Data indicates the following outcomes across the core curriculum areas (years 1-6):

	Reading	Writing	Maths	Science	Computing
School	2.7	2.5	2.7	2.6	2.5
PPG	2.7	2.5	2.7	2.7	2.6

The data analysis confirms that our PPG pupils are making good progress that is in-line with all other children in the school, with early gains in science and computing. For the strategy to be deemed a success, attainment, and therefore progress in reading, writing, and mathematics needs to rise above the aggregated outcomes for all children in school. This will remain our focus for the year ahead, and beyond, as we seek to use PPG funding to fully eliminate the attainment and progress gaps for pupils who experience disadvantage at our school.

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
Forest School for pupils in Year 5	3 of our staff are trained and qualified Forest School Leaders, and deliver these programmes on behalf of the school on a Wednesday afternoon.
Allotment provision (enrichment) in Key Stage 1	One of our Forest School's Leaders also delivers ecology-based education to the children in Key Stage 1, with links to the Golden Thread of Outdoor Learning.

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>
Not applicable. We have no children at Mayflower who are from services families.
The impact of that spending on service pupil premium eligible pupils
Not applicable. We have no children at Mayflower who are from services families.

Report prepared by: Mr. Luke Whitney
 Designation: Head Teacher and PPG Champion
 Date: December 2024

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.