Pupil premium strategy statement – Great Leighs 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	200
Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils	16.5%
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)**	2026-2027
Date this statement was published	November 2026
Date on which it will be reviewed	September 2027 (termly monitoring)
Statement authorised by	Headteacher
Pupil premium lead	Suzanne Chamberlain
Governor / Trustee lead	Andrew Jacobs

Funding overview

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year	£49,102
Pupil premium funding carried forward from previous years *(enter £0 if not applicable)*	£0
Total budget for this academic year *If your school is an academy in a trust that pools this funding, state the amount available to your school this academic year*	£49,102

Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

Statement of intent

At Great Leighs Primary School, our ambition is that disadvantage never limits a child's entitlement to excellent teaching, ambitious learning, belonging or enrichment. Every child belongs, participates and succeeds. We prioritise high-quality inclusive teaching, followed by carefully diagnosed, time-limited academic support and wider strategies that remove barriers to attendance, wellbeing and participation. This is a whole-school responsibility, aligned with our 2026–27 SDP priorities and six Golden Threads: Strong Foundations, Consistency, Inclusion, High Expectations, Evidence-Informed Practice and Equity for All.

Our context includes a relatively small disadvantaged cohort, substantial overlap with SEND, and individual circumstances including care experience, Traveller heritage, language needs, SEMH needs and barriers to family engagement. The school does not assume that all disadvantaged pupils have the same needs. Decisions are made from assessment, attendance, pupil/family voice and teacher knowledge. Eligible pupils remain the focus, while DfE guidance permits support for other pupils with identified need. Looked-after pupil premium is managed with the Virtual School through individual Personal Education Plans where applicable.

Our 2026 IDSR shows the importance of sustained improvement: in the 2026 KS2 cohort, none of the three disadvantaged pupils met the combined expected standard in reading, writing and mathematics. Because numbers are very small, we will analyse individual starting points and progress, not percentages alone. We will build oral language, phonics, reading fluency, writing and mathematical understanding; strengthen adaptive teaching and independence; support regulation and attendance; and secure full participation in school life. Staff and governors will evaluate implementation and pupil outcomes termly, retaining, adapting or stopping provision on the evidence.

Challenges

Challenge number	Detail of challenge
1	Readiness to learn and attendance: some pupils experience unmet basic needs, disrupted routines, tiredness, dysregulation or reduced attendance, limiting access to teaching.
2	Reading and literacy: variable home-reading engagement, gaps in phonics/fluency and writing attainment; low combined KS2 attainment for disadvantaged pupils.
3	Speech, language and oracy: receptive/expressive language, vocabulary and communication needs affect comprehension, participation and achievement.
4	SEMH, SEND and inclusion: overlapping disadvantage and additional needs; anxiety, regulation and variable access to effective adaptations affect time in learning and independence.
5	Equity of opportunity and family partnership: financial, practical and emotional barriers to trips, clubs and enrichment, and to sustained school–home engagement.

Intended outcomes

Intended outcome	Success criteria
Attainment in reading, writing and mathematics	By July 2027, disadvantaged pupils make demonstrable progress from September baselines in reading, writing

	and mathematics; termly pupil-level tracking identifies and addresses gaps. Review KS2 combined attainment and writing alongside individual starting points, especially in small cohorts.
Language, oracy and early literacy	Language Link baseline and review assessments show improvement against individual targets for pupils receiving support; phonics/reading assessment shows increased accuracy, fluency and comprehension.
High-quality inclusive teaching	Termly sampling demonstrates consistent adaptive teaching, modelling, checks for understanding and independence-promoting support; barriers identified in pupil reviews are acted on.
Readiness, attendance and wellbeing	Disadvantaged attendance and persistent-absence gaps reduce from Autumn 2026 baselines; identified pupils show improved engagement and fewer repeat dysregulation incidents, measured through school records.
Pupil voice, belonging and participation	Pupils can explain what helps them learn and feel heard; disadvantaged participation in clubs, trips and enrichment is tracked termly, with individual barriers addressed.
Family partnership and evaluation	Staff understand barriers linked to disadvantage; parent/carer engagement is reviewed sensitively, and governors receive termly outcome-focused analysis of provision and its impact.

Activity in this academic year

Teaching (for example, CPD, recruitment and retention)

Budgeted cost: £37,412

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Adaptive teaching CPD, modelling, mentoring and monitoring; independence-promoting teaching-assistant deployment.	DfE menu: high-quality teaching; professional development and mentoring/coaching. EEF evidence emphasises responsive teaching, feedback and effective implementation. Linked to approved Inclusion Strategy universal offer.	1, 2, 3, 4
Infant and Junior Language Link staff training; oral-language teaching, vocabulary and structured classroom talk.	DfE menu: professional development, assessment and teaching responsive to need; EEF oral-language and diagnostic-assessment evidence.	2, 3, 4
Phonics training for new support staff; consistent	DfE menu: professional development and high-quality teaching; EEF phonics and reading-	2, 3

phonics, reading and Faster Read implementation across classes.	comprehension evidence. School 2026 phonics baseline: 77% Year 1 and 100% by end of Year 2.	
Whole-staff Addressing Disadvantage project; shared understanding of barriers, high expectations and pupil-level planning.	DfE menu: high-quality teaching and professional development; EEF implementation guidance stresses whole-school responsibility, diagnosis and sustained monitoring.	1, 2, 4, 5
Structured pupil voice and curriculum review to identify barriers and improve teaching.	DfE menu: diagnostic assessment and responsive high-quality teaching. Triangulate pupil voice with work, assessment, attendance and teacher dialogue.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5

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

Budgeted cost: £5,450

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Infant and Junior Language Link screening and structured intervention.	DfE menu: targeted language interventions and diagnostic assessment; EEF oral-language evidence. Entry and exit measures used to evaluate impact.	3
Paired reading: trained Year 5/6 pupils supporting identified Year 3/4 readers, with adult oversight.	DfE menu: peer tutoring and targeted literacy support; EEF peer-tutoring evidence. Monitor reading fluency/comprehension, fidelity and participation.	2, 5
Targeted phonics intervention with frequent assessment and review.	DfE menu: targeted literacy interventions; EEF phonics evidence. Short cycles with clear exit criteria.	2, 3
Speech and language therapist input for assessed needs, staff advice and targeted provision.	DfE menu: targeted interventions to support language and disadvantaged pupils with SEND. Link recommendations to classroom teaching and evaluate pupil outcomes.	3, 4
Additional Nessy Spelling subscriptions for assessed literacy needs.	DfE menu: targeted literacy/SEND interventions and resources; evaluate progress against spelling assessments rather than software usage alone.	2, 4

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

Budgeted cost: £6,240

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Financial and practical support for curriculum trips, clubs and enrichment; monitor take-up and remove barriers.	DfE menu: enrichment and wider life skills; participation can support belonging, motivation and engagement. Evaluate equitable take-up and pupil feedback.	1, 5
Targeted YMCA/pastoral or wellbeing support where identified as appropriate.	DfE menu: support for social, emotional and behavioural needs. Use referral criteria, agreed outcomes and entry/exit reviews; confirm the specific provider and provision.	1, 4, 5
Attendance and family-engagement support, including sensitive contact and practical readiness-to-learn support where necessary.	DfE menu: attendance support; communicating with and supporting parents; breakfast/meal provision where appropriate. Review attendance, punctuality and barriers for identified pupils.	1, 2, 4, 5

Total budgeted cost: £49,102

Part B: Review of the previous academic year

Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils

Review of 2025–26 (evidence available at October 2026). The 2026 Ofsted IDSR reports that 0 of 3 disadvantaged pupils at the end of KS2 (0%) met the combined expected standard in reading, writing and mathematics, compared with 49% nationally for disadvantaged pupils. The 2025 cohort was also 0 of 4; in 2024 it was 1 of 3 (33%). The three-year aggregate was 1 of 10 (10%), compared with 47% nationally for disadvantaged pupils. This represents a material attainment concern, but each annual cohort is very small and the figures must be interpreted alongside pupils' prior attainment, SEND, attendance and individual progress. The IDSR suppresses some school-level subject comparisons for small cohorts. No reliable conclusion about intervention effectiveness can be drawn from the combined measure alone.

Whole-school and inclusion evidence offers a mixed picture. The approved Inclusion Strategy records 77% of pupils meeting the Year 1 phonics standard in 2026 and 100% by the end of Year 2, indicating strength in catch-up, while writing at the expected standard (55%) and combined reading, writing and mathematics (52%) remain whole-school priorities. These are whole-school figures, not disadvantaged-only outcomes. The strategy also records strong relationships, trauma-perceptive practice, early identification and broad participation, but identifies inconsistent adaptive teaching, SEND/disadvantaged attendance gaps and insufficient longitudinal evidence of impact. The 2026 IDSR records 11 pupils with SEN who were also FSM6 and/or children looked after; this supports a joined-up response, but does not imply that every disadvantaged pupil has SEND.

Evaluation against the previous strategy: high-quality teaching and inclusive culture remain appropriate priorities, but the published evidence does not yet demonstrate that disadvantaged attainment gaps have narrowed. Language Link, targeted phonics, paired reading, speech and language support, Nessy, Faster Read, wellbeing and enrichment approaches should be retained or adapted only after review of reach, baseline-to-exit progress, fidelity and pupil participation. For 2026–27 we will strengthen termly pupil-level assessment, the inclusion dashboard and governors' scrutiny; prioritise reading/writing/mathematics, language and attendance; and record explicit continue/adapt/stop decisions.

Before publication, the PP lead should add: 2025–26 disadvantaged versus non-disadvantaged internal reading/writing/maths outcomes and progress by year group; disadvantaged attendance and persistent absence; intervention entry/exit outcomes; behaviour/wellbeing measures; enrichment take-up; family/pupil voice; actual 2025–26 spending and programme usage. These figures are not supplied in the three source documents and have not been invented.

Externally provided programmes

Programme	Provider
Nessy Spelling Programme- 30 subscriptions	Nessy Learning
YMCA provision	YMCA
Easy Read	David Morgan Education