

Pupil premium strategy statement – The Lantern Community 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	412
Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils	12%
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)	2025-2026 2026-2027
Date this statement was published	12/12/2025
Date on which it will be reviewed	12/12/2026
Statement authorised by	CAxten-Higgs
Pupil premium lead	CAxten-Higgs
Governor / Trustee lead	Becky Frewin

Funding overview

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year	£65019
Pupil premium funding carried forward from previous years (<i>enter £0 if not applicable</i>)	£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>	£65019

Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

Statement of intent

At The Lantern Community Primary School we are passionate about delivering equity of opportunity for all our children. We believe that children who have a range of experiences, support and, essentially, language skill development (including reading, writing, speaking and listening and vocabulary development), during their formative years have the greatest chance of educational success throughout their lives. Since educational outcome is one of the most significant determiners of social mobility in Britain, it is imperative that everything that can be done is done to give all children the chance at this success. In the case of our most disadvantaged children, this imperative rests with us, as in many cases the children's families lack the resources, cultural capital, skills and language required to deliver those opportunities alone.

As a school we work closely with all our families to celebrate success, but try to pay especially close attention to those families from disadvantaged backgrounds where our careful support and guidance can help them to give their children opportunities to gain experiences and successes that they would not have had otherwise.

Our strategy then is simple. Firstly we identify and monitor the children who are in receipt of Pupil Premium. We get to know them and the challenges that they and their families are facing. Then we support them, with a package of provision ranging in nature from the academic, to the financial, taking account of social, emotional and mental health issues as they occur along the way. This strategy document aims to identify the specific challenges faced by the children of The Lantern Community Primary School who are from disadvantaged backgrounds. It then outlines the specific intended outcomes and how we will measure our successes. We will use these to further identify our next steps.

Challenges

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

Challenge number	Detail of challenge
------------------	---------------------

1	Aspiration
2a	Gaps in Early Years Development – vocab; social skills; school readiness
2b	Ongoing gaps between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged children over time
3	Poor or irregular attendance
4	SEMH needs
5	Financial and Family Stressors (including housing, food insecurity and parental mental health challenges)

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
Early Reading and Phonics: - At end of Year 1 (2025 – 2026), maintain and continue to reduce the gap between disadvantaged and others nationally in Phonics. - At end of Year 2 (2026 – 2027), maintain and continue to reduce the gap between disadvantaged and others nationally in Reading.	Disadvantaged children progress in phonics monitored through regular Little Wandle assessments. Phonics screening check results will show parity between disadvantaged children and non-disadvantaged children within the cohort. It should be noted that there are very small numbers of disadvantaged children within this cohort, meaning 'parity' cannot be demonstrated using percentages. Disadvantaged children will achieve parity with others nationally in Reading, at the end of KS1.
SEMH: Support the developing needs of children from Year 1 – 3 and the ongoing needs of children in Years 4 – 6.	Fewer children will move through into upper KS2 with SEMH needs undiagnosed, supported or addressed. Children currently in upper KS2 will have their SEMH needs supported and addressed such that it does not impact their ability to learn in the classroom.
Overall attainment and progress in Reading: At the end of KS2, continue to reduce the gap between disadvantaged and others nationally in Reading.	Non-SEND Disadvantaged children will achieve parity with other non-SEND children nationally in Reading, at the end of KS2.
Overall attainment and progress in Writing: At the end of KS2, continue to reduce the gap between disadvantaged and others nationally in Writing.	Non-SEND Disadvantaged children will achieve parity with other non-SEND children nationally in Writing, at the end of KS2.
Overall attainment and progress in Maths: At the end of KS2, continue to reduce the gap between disadvantaged and others nationally in Maths	Non-SEND Disadvantaged children will achieve parity with other non-SEND children nationally in Maths, at the end of KS2.
Most able and higher achieving pupils across the school: Increase the percentage of disadvantaged children achieving higher standards in Reading, Writing or Maths across KS2.	The percentage of disadvantaged pupils who achieve higher standard in reading, writing or mathematics, at the end of each key stage, more closely reflects the non-disadvantaged national average.

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: £26000

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
CPD and ongoing support for Little Wandle.	EEF : "1. Phonics has a positive impact overall (+5 months) with very extensive evidence and is an important component in the development of early reading skills, particularly for children from disadvantaged backgrounds."	2a
<i>Classroom Teaching Assistant Hours</i> <i>Teachers have increased capacity to support disadvantaged pupils because time is freed up through additional adult support (either teacher is freed from class responsibility to deliver short interventions or specific feedback to pupils, OR Teaching Assistant is skilled enough to deliver interventions and/or specific feedback to pupils).</i> <i>This leads to improved academic outcomes.</i>	EEF : "Previous research had shown that in many English schools teaching assistants are not being used in ways that improve pupil outcomes. However, research funded by the EEF demonstrates that when they are well trained and used in structured settings with high-quality support and training, they can boost learning by as much as an extra term."	2b

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

Budgeted cost: £ 32500

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
<i>Year 1 and 2 – to support Little Wandle and specific interventions for individual children's phonics Targeted support: Communication and Language and Early</i>	EEF : "1. Phonics has a positive impact overall (+5 months) with very extensive evidence and is an important component in the development of early reading skills, particularly for children from disadvantaged backgrounds."	2a

Reading. Improved phonic understanding, decoding speed (fluency) and improved comprehension leading to greater levels of understanding what is being read and therefore improved academic outcomes. This intervention is targeted to support all disadvantaged children who need support in Year 1 and 2		
Year 3 – Literacy Interventions Targeted support: ensure all children have good phonic awareness and can convert this into good levels of comprehension, basic writing skills (including sentence structure, punctuation and spelling skills)	<u>EEF</u>: use of structured interventions to provide additional support: - "Selection should be guided by pupil assessment. - Interventions should start early, be evidencebased and be carefully planned. - Interventions should include explicit and systematic instruction. - Even the best designed intervention will not work if implementation is poor. - Support pupils to understand how interventions are connected to whole class instruction. - Interventions should motivate pupils – not bore them or cause them to be anxious. - If interventions cause pupils to miss activities they enjoy, or content they need to learn, teachers should ask if the interventions are really necessary. - Avoid 'intervention fatigue'. Interventions do not always need to be time consuming or intensive to be effective."	2b
Year 5 & 6 – support for specific children working at lower than ARE especially in Reading, Writing and Maths Targeted support: Supporting continuing development of comprehension skills, composition and fluency skills for targeted children. Support development of age appropriate skills leading to improved academic outcome.	<u>EEF</u>: use of structured interventions to provide additional support: - "Selection should be guided by pupil assessment. - Interventions should start early, be evidencebased and be carefully planned. - Interventions should include explicit and systematic instruction. - Even the best designed intervention will not work if implementation is poor. - Support pupils to understand how interventions are connected to whole class instruction. - Interventions should motivate pupils – not bore them or cause them to be anxious. - If interventions cause pupils to miss activities they enjoy, or content they need to learn, teachers should ask if the interventions are really necessary. - Avoid 'intervention fatigue'. Interventions do not always need to be time consuming or intensive to be effective."	2b

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

Budgeted cost: £ £2500

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Access to Breakfast Club Social and Emotional Support Children are fed before they enter the classroom learning environment meaning higher levels of concentration and therefore improved academic outcomes. Children feel nurtured by the school and care about it more. This leads to improved relationships with staff and peers.	EEF : "A previous EEF impact evaluation showed that offering pupils in primary schools a free and nutritious meal before school can boost their reading, writing, and maths results by an average of two months' additional progress in Key Stage 1, this result had low to moderate security. Interestingly, it appears that it was not whether more pupils ate breakfast at all that made the difference, but whether more were going to the school breakfast club. It may be that school breakfasts are more nutritious than what pupils would otherwise have, or that attending the club effectively prepares pupils for learning. Breakfast club schools also saw an improvement in pupil behaviour."	1, 2a, 3, 4, 5
Subsidised educational visits Costs of educational visits are partially borne by the school in order to ensure that disadvantaged children are able to access the full range of experiences their peers do.	Class Trips Website citing 'new' OFSTED inspection Framework: "Starting in September 2019, Ofsted will inspect schools under a new framework. This framework will give "more emphasis than the current one on the substance of education: the curriculum." While details of the framework are yet to be confirmed, we do know that the curriculum will have more of a central focus than exam results. Exam results will still be an important snapshot of a school's effectiveness, but teaching a rich curriculum will come to the fore. Curriculum-relevant school trips are a great way of deepening pupils' understanding of a subject , enhancing skills such as communication, collaboration and problem-solving, and increasing motivation and engagement. The change in the Ofsted framework should give schools a renewed focus on learning outside the classroom, giving pupils direct experience rather than theoretical, classroom-based learning. In short, it will serve to enrich the curriculum that pupils are learning.	1, 2a, 4, 5

	According to the Council for Learning Outside the Classroom, curriculum-relevant school trips: • Give pupils experiences which help them realise their full potential • Motivate and engage pupils who are less suited to classroombased learning • Raise standards when you're back in the classroom • Improve social, personal and emotional development □ Equip pupils with skills they'll need in the future"	
<i>Subsidised After School Clubs and Activities Costs of extra-curricular clubs and activities are partially borne by the school in order to ensure that disadvantaged children are able to access the full range of experiences their peers do.</i>	Social Mobility Commission Report: An Unequal Playing Field: Extra-Curricular Activities, Soft Skills and Social Mobility. "...our research shows too many young people from disadvantaged backgrounds never get the chance. As a result, they lose out on the benefits – increased confidence which helps social interaction, a real aspiration to go onto higher or further education, more soft skills and a sense of wellbeing and belonging. Playing team sports, doing voluntary work, joining a youth club or singing in a band are also vital in developing networks – which those from affluent backgrounds often have ready-made." Children are encouraged to take part in after school clubs by advertising them to these children in advance of the rest of the school. Their parents are also reminded of the fact that their clubs are subsidised in order to encourage them to take up the offer.	1, 2a, 4, 5
Subsidised Musical Opportunities (Overture Project) Costs of extra-curricular music tuition are fully borne by the school in order to ensure that disadvantaged children are able to access the full range of experiences their peers do.	Social Mobility Commission Report: An Unequal Playing Field: Extra-Curricular Activities, Soft Skills and Social Mobility. "Children from the poorest households were much less likely to take part in any extra-curricular activity, but particularly music and sport."	1, 2b, 4, 5

Total budgeted cost: £ 65,000

Part B: Review of the previous academic year

Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils

The school's pupil premium strategy focused on improving outcomes through high-quality teaching, strengthened early language and reading provision, assessment-led intervention, adaptive teaching, attendance support and provision for pupils experiencing SEND or SEMH. Staff used pupil progress meetings, frequent assessment, feedback-led planning, work scrutiny, moderation and structured review to identify gaps and adapt provision. School development work also included Little Wandle training and coaching, targeted phonics and fluency support, NELI in Reception, writing and mathematics interventions in Year 6, and a wider range of adaptive teaching and behaviour-support strategies.

In Reception, two of the three disadvantaged children achieved a Good Level of Development. Both disadvantaged children without SEND met all 12 Early Learning Goals contributing to GLD, including the expectations in Communication and Language, PSED, Literacy and Mathematics. The third disadvantaged child had identified SEMH needs and did not achieve GLD. The successful outcomes for the two non-SEND children are consistent with a positive impact from baseline-informed planning, language-rich continuous provision, NELI and high-quality interactions. However, the strategy had not yet overcome the broader developmental barriers experienced by the child with SEMH. As each child represented one third of the disadvantaged group, outcomes have been interpreted using pupil numbers rather than percentages alone.

The strongest evidence of impact was in Year 1 phonics. All five disadvantaged pupils achieved the expected standard in the Phonics Screening Check, with an average mark of 36.4 out of 40. Four pupils had an earlier practice score, and their average increased from 18.8 at Practice 1 to 35.5 in the statutory check. Pupils who scored 9, 12 and 18 at the first practice point subsequently achieved 32, 34 and 36. Although Practice 1 was not a formal baseline, the evidence shows that pupils identified as at risk during the year subsequently met the statutory standard. These outcomes are consistent with positive impact from strengthened Little Wandle implementation, phonics-lead coaching, regular assessment and targeted keep-up provision.

At the end of KS1, three of the five disadvantaged pupils achieved the expected standard in reading and mathematics, two achieved it in writing, and two achieved the combined reading, writing and mathematics measure. Three of the

five pupils had SEND. Both non-SEND disadvantaged pupils achieved the expected standard in all three subjects, while the pupils below the combined standard all had identified SEND. Writing was the weakest area and no disadvantaged pupil achieved Greater Depth. The results indicate that provision secured age-related outcomes for the non-SEND disadvantaged pupils, but did not yet secure comparable outcomes for pupils experiencing the combined barriers of disadvantage and SEND. Termly marksheets judgements were teachers' predictions of likely end-of-year outcomes rather than current working-at assessments, so stability between terms was expected and is not interpreted as an absence of progress.

At the end of KS2, five of the nine disadvantaged pupils achieved the expected standard in reading, five achieved EXS in writing, four achieved the expected standard in mathematics, and three achieved the combined measure. Two of the nine had SEND and were working below the standard of the statutory tests. Among non-SEND disadvantaged pupils included in the progress measures, average reading progress was close to zero and average writing progress was positive at +0.82. These outcomes are consistent with targeted reading support and writing approaches including feedback-led planning, in-lesson intervention, grammar and SPaG retrieval and moderation having supported appropriate progress. Mathematics remained the weakest area: attainment and progress were lower, combined outcomes were limited, and no disadvantaged pupil achieved the higher standard in mathematics. No disadvantaged pupil achieved GDS in writing, and only one achieved a higher reading scaled score. Mathematics and higher-standard attainment therefore remain priorities.

Attendance remained a significant barrier. Two exceptional, non-comparable cases were considered separately because one pupil was on a formally agreed part-time timetable and one was permanently excluded in October 2025. Excluding these cases, mean disadvantaged attendance was 92.3% in autumn, 92.9% in spring and 87.1% in summer, with a full-year mean of 91.9%. Fourteen of the remaining 53 disadvantaged pupils had full-year attendance below 90%. Term-specific analysis showed positive impact for some pupils that was not visible in cumulative percentages, including pupils who moved from persistent-absence levels in autumn to above 90% in later terms. However, improvement was not sustained consistently across the group and summer attendance deteriorated for a number of pupils. Attendance support therefore had a positive or partially positive impact in individual cases, but persistent absence remained a significant barrier for a concentrated group.

Overall, the strategy was partially successful. It achieved particularly strong impact in phonics and positive outcomes for many non-SEND disadvantaged

pupils at GLD, KS1 and KS2. Progress evidence was strongest in KS2 writing. However, the school did not consistently close attainment gaps at KS2, secure higher-standard outcomes or overcome mathematics, persistent attendance and complex-needs barriers for all pupils. Future provision will retain the successful early reading model while sharpening mathematics intervention, challenge for higher-attaining disadvantaged pupils, provision for pupils facing overlapping disadvantage and SEND or SEMH, and the measurement of attendance and intervention impact over defined periods.