

Pupil premium strategy statement – 2025/26

John Masefield High 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 (Oct census) | 844 (Y7–13) 758 (Y7 – 11) |
| Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils | 26.1% (198 students) (above national average) |
| Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers | 2024 - 2027 |
| Date this statement was published | November 2025 |
| Date on which it will be reviewed | December 2026 |
| Statement authorised by | John Holmes Headteacher |
| Pupil premium lead | Chloe Limbrick |
| Governor / Trustee lead | Kate Harper |

Funding overview

| Detail | Amount |
|--|-----------------|
| Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year | £175,024 |
| Pupil premium funding carried forward from previous years (enter £0 if not applicable) | £ nil |
| Total budget for this academic year | £175,024 |
| <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> | |

Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

Statement of intent

We believe that all pupils should be able to benefit from excellent and enjoyable learning and a supportive community that, together, help them achieve their individual best. Our pupil premium strategy is designed to support students eligible for the pupil premium achieve these goals, and achieve the same successes as their peers. The focus of our strategy is to provide high-quality teaching across the curriculum whilst building a community of connection and belonging. These two strands, together, will have the greatest impact on key outcomes.

The key elements of our strategy are as follows:

- Diagnose pupils' needs. We understand that there is no single 'disadvantage gap', and that children eligible for the pupil premium have varied experiences and needs. Therefore, understanding our pupils, their families, and barriers to learning is at the heart of our strategy to support disadvantaged pupils.
- Develop our strategy. Our strategy is based on strong evidence, drawing especially from the Evidence Endowment Foundation (EEF) and the EEF-supported Research Schools Network. We carefully consider how research evidence might be applied in our specific context and ensure that our strategy aligns with other key school improvement priorities.
- Implementation. Implementation of our PP Strategy is not a one-off event, and we are careful to make use of the [EEF's Guide to Effective Implementation](#).
- Monitoring and evaluation. We make sure there is an ongoing programme of rigorous evaluation of the impact of our strategy on pupils' attainment as well as wider barriers to learning.

Challenges

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

| Challenge number | Detail of challenge |
|-------------------------|--|
| 1 | Data from exams analysis, lesson observation and pupil voice, when triangulated, suggest that a key barrier to PP progress is the extent to which children are able to fluently combine the component parts of the curriculum into complex composites. |
| 2 | Disadvantaged students' reading ages are below that of their non-disadvantaged peers. This can limit their ability to access the curriculum. |
| 3 | Barriers to attendance. Our root cause analysis of attendance data suggests that some disadvantaged students face distinct and sometimes unique barriers to attending school. Many of these barriers are related to mental health. |

Intended outcomes

This explains the outcomes we are aiming for **by the end of our current strategy plan (2027)**, and how we will measure whether they have been achieved.

| Intended outcome | Success criteria |
|--|---|
| 1 Improved academic progress for students who are eligible for the pupil premium | <p>By the end of our current plan, the progress of eligible students will have improved and the gap between them and their peers will have narrowed.</p> <p>Key measure:</p> <p>P8 score for disadvantaged pupils > -0.19</p> <p>(this is 2024 P8 score of <u>non-disadvantaged</u> students in the local authority)</p> |
| 2 Improved reading ages for students who are eligible for the pupil premium | <p>By the end of our current plan, the mean reading age of eligible students will have improved and the gap between them and their peers will have narrowed.</p> <p>Key measures:</p> <p>ARTi score for disadvantaged pupils > 101</p> <p>The disadvantage gap in ARTi score < 6</p> <p>(This represents an improvement on both measures, compared to 2024)</p> |
| 3 Improved attendance for students who are eligible for the pupil premium | <p>By the end of our current plan, the mean attendance of eligible students will have improved, and the proportion of persistent absentees will have fallen</p> <p>Key measure:</p> <p>PP attendance >90%</p> <p>(this is the attendance of <u>all</u> secondary students in the local authority in 2023/24)</p> |
| 4 Improved behaviour for students who are eligible for the pupil premium | <p>By the end of our current plan, the suspension rate for eligible students will have fallen</p> <p>Key measure:</p> <p>PP suspension rate < 5.59</p> <p>(vs national suspension rate for <u>all</u> of 9.33, and JMHS suspension rate for <u>all</u> of 5.5.9 in 2023/24)</p> |

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: £89,400

| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|--|---|-------------------------------|
| <p>Professional development for the whole of the school's teaching and academic support staff on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Managing cognitive load to support transfer of new content to long term memory2) Combining curriculum components into composites3) Responsive teaching and feedback4) Explicitly teaching metacognition independence <p>Budgeted cost includes expanding the Curriculum, Assessment and Teaching Team to deliver this training, and the cost of staff time involved in training and follow-up activities</p> | <p>"Evidence indicates that high quality teaching is the most important lever schools have to improve pupil attainment, including for disadvantaged pupils" (EEF Pupil Premium Menu)</p> <p>The delivery of this professional development is based upon the EEF's Effective Professional Development Guidance Report.</p> <p>The knowledge and the techniques within the training are drawn from the EEF's Five a Day for SEND, the EEF's Teacher Feedback to Improve Pupil Learning Guidance Report, and the EEF's Metacognition and Self-Regulated Learning Guidance Report</p> | 1, 2 |

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

Budgeted cost: £ 38,500

| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|---|--|-------------------------------|
| Reading and numeracy interventions, including handwriting and RECALL interventions (Budgeted cost includes staffing for these interventions) | <p>The EEF's Teaching and Learning Toolkit identifies Reading Comprehension Strategies as having very high impact.</p> <p>We have used advice from the EEF for choosing literacy interventions and identified Rapid Reading. The Dyslexia-SpLD Trust rates the effectiveness of this intervention as 'remarkable'</p> <p>The EEF's Teaching and Learning Toolkit identifies Catch up Numeracy interventions as having a strong impact.</p> | 2 |
| One-to-one and small group tutoring | https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/one-to-one-tuition | 1 |
| Peer tutoring, including the use of Sixth Formers | https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/peer-tutoring#:~:text=Peer%20tutoring%20approaches%20have%20been,wide%20range%20of%20age%20groups. | 1 |

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

Budgeted cost: £46,700

| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
|--|--|-------------------------------|
| Hiring additional people to support attendance, including family support workers, Deputy Designated Safeguarding Lead and Senior Leader (Safeguarding) | The EEF advises that “there is no one-size-fits-all approach to attendance because the root cause of poor attendance can stem from unique and individual barriers. Knowing and understanding your pupils, their families, their influences, and their specific challenges can help you diagnose some of the underlying causes of absence and more clearly define the problem. It can also help to understand individual barriers to attendance and learning and help choose effective targeted approaches” | 3 |
| Additional time for Year Leaders to engage families and provide bespoke support for students | | 3 |
| Funding one-to-one mentoring for students, including additional IAG and additional SSA support | | 3 |
| Employing a Mental Health Lead and enhancing ‘The Haven’ to address students’ mental health and emotional needs | Our approach is, therefore, built on the key themes identified in the EEF’s Supporting School Attendance Resource . | 3 |
| Additional funding to enable students to access enrichment opportunities and to support with practical subjects, or additional educational resources | | 3 |
| Funding for homework club to support disadvantaged students | The EEF note that children eligible for FSM are both more likely to benefit from homework, and more likely to face barriers to completing homework at home | |

Total budgeted cost: £174,600

Part B: Review of the previous academic year (2024-25)

Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils

Last year (2024-25) was the first year of this 3 year Pupil Premium strategy.

1. Improved academic progress for students who are eligible for the pupil premium. By the end of our current plan, the progress of eligible students will have improved and the gap between them and their peers will have narrowed.

Key measure:

P8 score for disadvantaged pupils > -0.19

(this is 2024 P8 score of non-disadvantaged students in the local authority)

2024-25 Review: Progress 8 scores are not available for cohort.

| | | Attainment 8 % | Grade 5+ in Ma & Eng % | Grade 4+ in Ma & Eng % |
|--------------|------------|----------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| 2024 results | All pupils | 44.54 | 46.1 | 63.8 |
| | PP | 34.03 | 25 | 47.2 |
| | Non-PP | 47.8 | 52.6 | 69 |
| 2025 results | All pupils | 45.96 | 38.7 | 68.7 |
| | PP | 35.81 | 10.5 | 55.3 |
| | Non-PP | 49.4 | 48.2 | 73.2 |

Attainment 8 shows an improvement from the previous year (23/24), however progress is not increasing quickly enough after 1 year of this strategy.

Outcome 1 is not met.

2. Improved reading ages for students who are eligible for the pupil premium. By the end of our current plan, the mean reading age of eligible students will have improved and the gap between them and their peers will have narrowed.

Key measures:

ARTi score for disadvantaged pupils > 101

The disadvantage gap in ARTi score < 6

(This represents an improvement on both measures, compared to 2024)

2024-25 Review: To be completed once Y9 have been tested towards end of term.

3. Improved attendance for students who are eligible for the pupil premium.
By the end of our current plan, the mean attendance of eligible students will have improved, and the proportion of persistent absentees will have fallen.

Key measure:

PP attendance >90%

(this is the attendance of all secondary students in the local authority in 2023/24)

2024-25 Review: PP attendance 88% (until end of HT5), shows a 3.2% improvement from 23/24. The PP gap has closed by 2%.

Outcome 3 is partially met.

4. Improved behaviour for students who are eligible for the pupil premium.
By the end of our current plan, the suspension rate for eligible students will have fallen.

Key measure:

PP suspension rate < 5.59

(vs national suspension rate for all of 9.33, and JMHS suspension rate for all of 5.59 in 2023/24)

2024-25 Review:

ALL - 17 students served a suspension = 2.22% of all students Y7-11

Non PP - 8 students = 1.05%

PP – 9 students = 1.18%

Outcome 4 is met.

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 |
|-----------|----------|
| NA | NA |
| | |