

Pupil premium strategy statement: Abbey Gates 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	209 children F2 – Y6 230 children F1 – Y6
Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils	Based on October 2025 census: 8% - 19 children Funding for 18 children (F2-Y6)
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 2027 – 2028
Date this statement was published	December 2025
Date on which it will be reviewed	December 2026
Statement authorised by	Abi Quant-Epps
Pupil premium lead	Samantha Taylor
Governor / Trustee lead	Colin Barnard

Funding overview

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year	£16,665 11 FSM x £1515 £13,150 5 PCIC x £2630 £700 2 Service children x £350
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>	£30,515

Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

Statement of intent

Our primary aim is to ensure that all pupils, regardless of background or barriers they may face, make strong progress and achieve excellent outcomes across all academic areas. Our Pupil Premium strategy is designed to support disadvantaged and academically vulnerable learners, including high-achieving students, in reaching this goal. The initiatives outlined in this statement are intended to meet pupils' needs irrespective of disadvantage.

A key element of our approach is the provision of high-quality teaching, with particular focus on the areas where disadvantaged pupils need the most support. Evidence shows that this significantly narrows the attainment gap while also benefiting non-disadvantaged pupils. The outcomes outlined below therefore include progress for all pupils as disadvantaged students achieve greater success.

Our approach is responsive to shared challenges and individual needs, and is based on robust diagnostic assessment rather than assumptions about disadvantage. The strategies we employ work together to maximise pupil achievement. To ensure effectiveness, we are committed to:

- Providing ambitious and challenging learning experiences for disadvantaged pupils.
- Intervening swiftly when emerging needs are identified.
- Raising standards for every child by investing time and resources so that each learner receives the support and challenge they need to thrive.

Pupil Premium funding is targeted specifically at enhancing the learning, development, and engagement of eligible pupils, as detailed below.

Challenges

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

Challenge number	Detail of challenge	How do we know?
1.	Poor speech, language and vocabulary acquisition on entry, leading to low early reading and writing skills <i>Assessments, observations and discussions with pupils indicate underdeveloped oral language skills and vocabulary gaps among many disadvantaged pupils.</i>	Wellcomm assessments demonstrate that a number of Pupil Premium pupils start F1 with underdeveloped oral language and gaps in vocabulary. This gap contributes to lower outcomes in early reading and writing and highlights the need for targeted early language and communication intervention.
2	Social, emotional and behavioural barriers, including limited self-regulation, resilience and behaviour for learning. <i>Difficulties with SEMH can reduce children's readiness to learn and hinder sustained engagement in lessons.</i>	Ongoing observations and feedback from parent and teachers demonstrate that the social, emotional and behavioural needs of some pupils are a significant barrier to sustained participation in lessons. The high proportion of Pupil Premium pupils requiring SEMH intervention (60% in 2024–25) provides clear evidence of a sustained need in this area.

3	<p>Attendance and punctuality <i>Attendance, lateness and number of persistent absentees (or children at risk of becoming persistently absent) leading to gaps in academic and personal development.</i></p>	<p>In 2024–25, 25% of Pupil Premium pupils were persistently absent (<90%), and a further 25% were at risk of meeting this threshold (<95%). This evidences that attendance remains a significant barrier for disadvantaged learners, and therefore attendance improvement forms a core part of our strategy.</p>
---	--	---

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
To improve oral language skills and vocabulary acquisition amongst disadvantaged pupils.	Assessments and observations indicate significantly improved oral language among disadvantaged pupils. This is evident when triangulated with other sources of evidence, including engagement in lessons, book scrutiny and ongoing formative assessment.
Improved phonics and reading attainment among disadvantaged pupils.	<p>Phonics and reading outcomes for disadvantaged children remain in line with other disadvantaged children nationally.</p> <p>Data analysis across all year groups shows expected or accelerated progress for disadvantaged pupils in reading and writing.</p>
Improved writing attainment amongst disadvantaged pupils.	<p>Writing outcomes for disadvantaged children remain in line with other disadvantaged children nationally.</p> <p>Data analysis across all year groups shows expected or accelerated progress for disadvantaged pupils in reading and writing.</p>
Improved SEMH and behaviour for learning, particularly for disadvantaged pupils, enabling better engagement and readiness for learning.	Success will be evidenced through improved SDQ scores, pre/post intervention records, a reduction in SEMH-related behaviour incidents, and positive feedback from pupil and staff voice demonstrating increased confidence, emotional regulation and behaviour for learning.
To achieve and sustain improved attendance and punctuality for all pupils, particularly our disadvantaged pupils	<p>Overall absence for all pupils remains >95%, and the attendance gap between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils continues to reduce over time.</p> <p>The percentage of all pupils who are persistently absent being below 3% with disadvantaged pupils performing in line with or better than the local average.</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: £15,258 (50%)

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
<p>To further develop classroom provision through a sustained cycle of CPD focused on Quality First Teaching, including professional development, practising and refining pedagogy, ECT mentoring, coaching, and regular review and evaluation of practice.</p>	<p>CPD is an effective way to improve pupil performance, increase staff retention, improve staff knowledge and develop a culture of excellence across the whole school. CPD helps teachers to continually improve and reflect on the quality of their teaching and sustains positive outcomes for all learners. EEF recommends that the content of CPD should be based on the best available evidence.</p> <p>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/guidance-reports/effective-professional-development</p>	<p>1, 2</p>
<p>To embed high-quality adaptive teaching for all pupils (including PP), supported by appropriate resources, so that intended learning is accessible to everyone.</p>	<p>The EEF defines adaptive teaching as a responsive, evidence-informed approach where teachers assess pupils' needs continuously, adapt their planning before lessons, and adjust teaching in real time during lessons. Their guidance — including the “Five-a-day” framework for supporting pupils with SEND — identifies practices such as explicit instruction, scaffolding, and flexible grouping as effective strategies that benefit all learners, while especially supporting pupils with additional needs or disadvantage.</p> <p>By embedding adaptive teaching universally, schools can ensure equity: all pupils follow the same ambitious curriculum, with support tailored via diagnostic assessment, targeted scaffolding, and ongoing review; this helps pupils access learning, build confidence and independence, and make sustained progress without lowering expectations.</p> <p>EEF Blog: Assess, adjust, adapt – what does adaptive teaching... EEF</p> <p>EEF blog: Moving from ‘differentiation’ to ‘adaptive teaching’ EEF</p> <p>EEF blog: Five-a-day for pupils with SEND – a cluster of... EEF</p>	<p>1, 2</p>

<p>To embed retrieval practice over time so that pupils know more and remember more within the academic year and across year groups in all subjects.</p> <p>This will be achieved through ongoing staff CPD and our coaching programme.</p>	<p>The EEF-backed review <i>Cognitive Science Approaches in the Classroom: A Review of the Evidence</i> highlights retrieval as one of the few evidence-based strategies showing real promise in classroom settings.</p> <p>Research consistently demonstrates that actively recalling information — via quizzes, low-stakes tests, or flash cards — leads to significantly stronger long-term retention than passive re-studying. Retrieval practice is therefore a practical and equitable method to enhance memory, learning, and achievement — especially for disadvantaged pupils, who often gain most from repeated opportunities to consolidate learning.</p> <p>EEF blog: Why bother with retrieval? EEF</p> <p>Cognitive science approaches in the classroom EEF</p>	1
<p>To ensure teaching assistants are deployed strategically to support high-quality provision and implement evidence-based, structured interventions.</p>	<p>EEF evidence shows that when teaching assistants are deployed in a planned and structured way to support high-quality classroom teaching and deliver targeted interventions, they can have a significant impact on the progress of disadvantaged pupils.</p> <p>By ensuring that TAs are well trained, their roles clearly defined, and their work complements rather than replaces teacher-led instruction, we can provide effective scaffolding that promotes independence, improves behaviour for learning, and strengthens engagement.</p> <p>This approach allows TAs to deliver pre-teaching, in-class support, and structured small-group work, enabling pupils to access the curriculum and make sustained progress. It is a cost-effective and evidence-informed strategy for raising attainment and reducing disadvantage.</p> <p>Deployment of Teaching Assistants EEF</p>	1, 2

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

Budgeted cost: £7,629 (25%)

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
<p>Deliver additional phonics support for disadvantaged pupils who need further help securing early reading skills.</p>	<p>Phonics approaches have a strong evidence base demonstrating a positive impact on pupils — especially those from disadvantaged backgrounds. Targeted phonics interventions are most effective when delivered regularly over a sustained period (up to 12 weeks).</p> <p>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/phonics</p>	1, 2
<p>Provide targeted interventions, including precision</p>	<p>Research shows that when teaching assistants (TAs) deliver high-quality, structured interventions in short, focused sessions over a limited period — linked closely</p>	1, 2, 3

teaching, to close gaps in oracy, phonics, reading and writing for disadvantaged pupils.	to classroom teaching — this can lead to positive effects on pupil attainment. There is also evidence that working with TAs in this way can improve pupils' attitudes to learning, while supporting teacher wellbeing by reducing workload and stress. Teaching Assistant Interventions EEF	
Develop and embed SEMH interventions that include clear individual targets which are consistently referenced and supported within classroom practice.	In the EEF's "Teaching & Learning Toolkit," the "Social and Emotional Learning (SEL)" strand is rated as having moderate impact for very low cost . On average, SEL interventions are associated with +3 months' additional progress over a year. Evidence suggests that a combined model of whole-class SEL and targeted intervention is most effective in improving pupils' social, emotional and behavioural outcomes. Social and emotional learning EEF Behaviour interventions EEF	2, 3

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

Budgeted cost: £7,629 (25%)

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Provide release time for key staff (attendance lead, pastoral team and class teachers) to carry out targeted attendance reviews and personalised support plans.	It is well established that regular monitoring and analysis of attendance data enables schools to intervene quickly to address emerging concerns. Current DfE guidance is informed by the approaches used in schools that have successfully reduced overall absence and persistent absence. https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/parental-engagement	3
Embed systems to track participation in enrichment activities and gather pupil voice in order to identify and overcome barriers to access and engagement for disadvantaged pupils.	The evidence from the EEF-funded trial of Children's University indicates that offering children structured, school-linked enrichment beyond the regular school day can yield modest academic benefits: participating pupils made, on average, around two extra months' progress in Key Stage 2 reading and maths compared with peers in similar schools. Children's University - first trial EEF	2, 3
Partner with Lifting Children's Hopes (LCH) to remove barriers and increase access to enrichment,	Research shows that access to extra-curricular and enrichment activities is unequally distributed: children from less affluent households are significantly less likely to participate. Because of this, enrichment opportunities beyond the school day remain out of reach for many disadvantaged	2, 3

<p>supporting pupils to enjoy school and develop vocabulary through wider experiences.</p>	<p>pupils — limiting their access to the broader social, cultural and developmental benefits these activities bring.</p> <p>By widening access — for example through partnership with a charity or third-party provider — we can help level the playing field, increase school engagement and enjoyment, support social and soft-skill development, and open up opportunities that might otherwise be unavailable.</p> <p>suttontrust.com+2GOV.UK+2 Extracurricular-inequality-1.pdf</p>	
<p>Continue to offer a wide range of support for parents and carers, including coffee mornings, EYFS Stay and Play sessions, open events and parent workshops, to strengthen engagement in their child's learning and build home-school relationships..</p>	<p>Levels of parental engagement are consistently associated with improved academic outcomes. Practical approaches, such as developing parental skills such as literacy or IT, for example, supporting shared book reading, or tailoring positive communications about learning, can prove actionable for schools.</p> <p>https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/parental-engagement</p>	<p>2, 3</p>

Total budgeted cost: £30,515

Part B: Review of the previous academic year

Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils

Academic Year Review 2024-2025														
<p>Due to the small number of disadvantaged pupils in our school, whole-school data trends can be misleading. Within school, each child's progress and barriers to learning are closely monitored, ensuring funding is targeted to specific needs. Our approach remains flexible and responsive, ensuring every disadvantaged pupil receives the right support to achieve their full potential.</p>														
<u>Intended Outcome</u>	<u>Success Criteria</u>	<u>Review/Impact</u>												
<p>Improved oral language skills and vocabulary among disadvantaged pupils.</p>	<p>Assessments and observations indicate significantly improved oral language among disadvantaged pupils. This is evident when triangulated with other sources of evidence, including engagement in lessons, book scrutiny and ongoing formative assessment.</p>	<p>The intended outcome has been partially met.</p> <p>A speech and language specialist has delivered CPD for teaching assistants, enabling them to lead regular speech and language interventions in school. Staff who deliver these interventions keep detailed pre- and post-intervention records. This academic year, two PP pupils have accessed SALT intervention. Qualitative evidence indicates progress in positional language (e.g. <i>under</i>), vocabulary relating to everyday objects, social interaction and conversation with peers, listening and attention skills, and accurate production of targeted letter sounds. Staff feedback also reports a positive impact on pupils' application of skills within the classroom.</p> <p>The Cherry Garden assessment is used to evidence progress in the strands of language and communication and reading..E.g.</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">Reading</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Spring</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Summer</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Language and Communication</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reading</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Observations triangulate with staff voice and ongoing classroom formative assessment to demonstrate improved oral language for these pupils</p> <p>Next steps</p> <p>While the qualitative evidence base is strong, systems for capturing consistent quantitative data need to be further embedded and expanded to ensure that impact can be measured more robustly. In addition, the use of WellComm assessments should be strengthened and extended into KS1 to support the ongoing identification of gaps and track progress over time.</p>		Reading	Spring	Summer	Language and Communication	5	6	8	Reading	7	8	10
	Reading	Spring	Summer											
Language and Communication	5	6	8											
Reading	7	8	10											
<p>Improved reading and writing attainment among disadvantaged pupils.</p>	<p><i>KS2 reading/writing outcomes in 2024/25 for disadvantaged children are in line with other</i></p>	<p>The intended outcome has been partially met.</p> <p>Whilst internal tracking evidences strong progress for FSM6 pupils in reading and writing across the school, the KS2 national comparison element cannot be fully met due to cohort size over the past three years.</p>												

disadvantaged children nationally.

Data analysis across all year groups shows expected or accelerated progress for disadvantaged pupils in reading and writing.

The data below shows positive impact, especially in relation to progress from starting points. However, whole-school analysis indicates that raising attainment in reading and writing must remain a priority, as a gap persists between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils in some year groups.

The data below shows positive impact. However, whole-school analysis indicates that raising attainment in reading and writing must remain a priority, as a gap persists between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils in some year groups.

When interpreting the data it is important to consider that small cohort sizes can significantly affect percentages, and that a significant number of the Pupil Premium cohort also receive SEND support, many with high levels of need.

FSM6 Analysis 2024–25

Three Year Analysis: FSM6									
	2022-23			2023-24			2024-25		
	School	LA	Gap	School	LA	Gap	School	LA	Gap
EYFS - GLD	8% (0/1)	52.2%	-52.7 (1 child)	N/A - 0 chd.	48.2%	N/A - 0 chd.	0% (0/1)	LA: 47% Gedling 48%	-47 (1 child)
Y1 Phonics	N/A - 0 chd.	67.8%	N/A - 0 chd.	50% (1/2)	66.4%	-16.4	N/A - 0 chd.	LA: 64.4% Gedling 64%	N/A - 0 chd.
Phonics - All pupils at end of Y2	100% (2/2)	83.0%	+17	0% (0/1)	82.9%	-82.9 (1 child)	0% (1/2)	LA: 80.3% Gedling 84.5%	-80.3
KS1 Reading	50% (1/2)	54.5%	-4/5	0% (1 child)	56.5%	-56.5 (1 child)	50% (1/2)	53.6%	-3.6
KS1 Writing	50% (1/2)	44.9%	+5.1	0% (1 child)	49.0%	-49 (1 child)	50% (1/2)	46.9%	+3.1
KS1 Maths	50% (1/2)	57.4%	-7/4	0% (1 child)	58.3%	-58.3 (1 child)	50% (1/2)	57.4%	-7.4
KS2 Reading	N/A - 0 chd.	58.5%	N/A	100% (1 child)	60%	+40	N/A - 0 chd.	LA: 61.2% Gedling: 65%	N/A - 0 chd.
KS2 Writing	N/A - 0 chd.	57.1%	N/A	100% (1 child)	57.4%	+42.6	N/A - 0 chd.	LA: 57.5% Gedling 61.5%	N/A - 0 chd.
KS2 Maths	N/A - 0 chd.	59.4%	N/A	100% (1 child)	58.8%	+42.2	N/A - 0 chd.	LA: 60.2% Gedling 62%	N/A - 0 chd.
KS2 GPS	N/A - 0 chd.	56.6%	N/A	100% (1 child)	57.4%	+42.6	N/A - 0 chd.	LA: 57.5%	N/A - 0 chd.

FSM6 Analysis – 2024-25

Attainment:

EYFS: 0% (1/1) child did not reach GLD

Y1 phonics: 0 children – N/A

Y2 phonics: 50% (1/2) children achieved the pass mark.

KS1: 50% (1/2) children reached the expected standard in reading and writing.

This is in line with other FSM6 locally

KS2: 0 children – N/A

Whole school overview:

- 40% of FSM6 children are working at the expected standard in reading and 20% of children are working at the expected standard in writing. This evidences that there is currently a -21.2 gap in reading and -37.4 gap in writing against other FSM6 children locally.
- Across the wider PP cohort, 60% of children are working at the expected standard with 40% working at the expected standard in writing.

Progress:

Internal tracking evidences that pupils are making good progress from their starting points in reading and writing. In reading, 5 out of 10 pupils in KS1/2 are making expected progress and 5 are making accelerated progress. In writing, 9 pupils are making expected progress and 1 is making accelerated progress. This shows that gaps are beginning to close for FSM6 pupils, particularly in reading.

Next steps

- Maintain the focus on reading and writing in order to further narrow gaps with non-disadvantaged pupils across all year groups.
- Continue to strengthen early identification and targeted intervention, particularly in KS1, to prevent gaps from widening over time.
- Further embed the monitoring and evaluation of PP progress to ensure the impact of provision continues to be measured and sustained.

To achieve and sustain improved wellbeing for all pupils in our school, particularly our disadvantaged pupils.

Sustained high levels of wellbeing demonstrated by: Qualitative data from SDQs, student voice, student and parent surveys, teacher observations and enrichment tracking data.

Data below evidences that the intended outcomes have been met. as SDQ scores show that all pupils have maintained or made progress in their SEMH development over time. SEMH provision is now embedded across school, with 60% of Pupil Premium pupils accessing interventions this year. Enrichment participation has also increased for PP pupils, and both pupil voice and behaviour data indicate improved wellbeing, enjoyment and engagement with school.

Over the past three years, SDQs have been embedded as a key tool for assessing and measuring pupils' SEMH development. The use of pre- and post-intervention SDQs allows leaders to monitor whether scores are sustained or improved, and SDQs are completed termly for all pupils. This year's outcomes indicate that scores have either been sustained or improved for every pupil.

KS	Child	SEMH Intervention received in 2024-25	SDQ Score Autumn					SDQ Score Spring					SDQ Score Summer				
			Emotional	Conduct	Hyper-activity	Peer	Prosocial	Emotional	Conduct	Hyper-activity	Peer	Prosocial	Emotional	Conduct	Hyper-activity	Peer	Prosocial
KS2	Child A	Forest School, funfit	0	2	3	2	10	0	2	5	2	10	0	2	5	2	10
	Child B	funfit	0	2	5	2	10	0	2	5	2	10	0	2	5	2	10
	Child C	Lego Therapy, funfit	1	1	2	2	10	1	1	2	3	10	0	5	3	10	
	Child D	-	0	6	2	2	10	0	6	2	10	0	6	2	10		
	Child E	-	1	0	5	2	9	1	0	5	2	9	1	0	5	2	9
	Child F	Forest School, ELSA session	1	2	7	2	7	1	2	2	8	1	2	2	8		
	Child G	Lego Therapy	0	0	4	2	10	0	0	4	2	10	0	0	3	2	10
	Child H	ATTEND framework,	3	3	2	3	9	3	3	2	3	9	2	2	3	3	9
	Child I	Lego Therapy	1	1	2	2	6	1	2	2	6	1	2	2	6		
	Child J	Lego Therapy, ELSA, funfit,	3	3	3	3	5	3	3	3	5	3	3	3	5		
KS1	Child K	Funfit, ELSA	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	4	7	1	2	4	7		
	Child L	-	1	2	5	4	9	0	5	4	10	0	5	3	10		
	Child M	Forest school, lego therapy, funfit	1	2	5	4	7	3	3	4	5	3	3	4	5		
	Child N	-	0	0	3	10	1	0	2	10	1	0	2	9			
	Child O	Forest school, lego therapy	3	1	2	6	3	1	2	6	3	1	2	6			
	Child P	-	1	0	2	2	10	3	0	2	2	10	0	0	2	2	10
FS	Child Q	Social groups	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	4	1		
	Child R	Social groups	3	4	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	3		
	Child S	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	3	3	7	3	2	5	3	6	
	Child T	-	4	0	3	4	7	4	0	3	4	7	0	3	2	7	

Enrichment: As part of our whole-school SEMH approach, an enrichment tracking system has also been introduced to monitor participation. Data shows an increase in Pupil Premium pupils engaging in enrichment activities (FSM: Autumn 27% → Summer 55%, PCIC: 60% → 100%, Service: 50% maintained). Pupil voice and case studies, including those from PP pupils, indicate that the enrichment offer has had a positive impact on enjoyment of school. Behaviour data for vulnerable pupils further evidences reduced disruption to learning and improved behaviour across school.

Enrichment – F2-Y6			
*Only dance club is available for F2 therefore percentages have been calculated for F2 – Y6 and Y1 - Y6			
	By end of Autumn Term	By end of Spring Term	By end of Summer Term
Whole School F2 -Y6 – (210)	62 (30%)	101 (48%)	130 (62%)
Whole School Y1- Y6 (180)	59 (33%)	98 (54%)	123 (68%)
No factor F2 – Y6 (97)	42 (43%)	70 (72%)	75 (77%)
EAL (26)	8 (31%)	11 (42%)	12 (46%)
SEND (EHC or AFN) (18)	3 (17%)	7 (39%)	7 (39%)
Pupil Premium – FSM (11)	3 (27%)	5 (45%)	6 (55%)
Pupil Premium – Service (2)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)
Pupil Premium – PCIC (5)	3 (60%)	5 (100%)	5 (100%)
Medical (9)	3 (33%)	4 (44%)	4 (44%)

Next steps

- Continue to monitor the uptake and impact of SEMH and enrichment interventions for disadvantaged pupils.
- Broaden enrichment opportunities further to ensure ongoing equitable access for Pupil Premium pupils.

To achieve and sustain improved attendance for all pupils, particularly our disadvantaged pupils

Sustained high attendance from 2024/25 demonstrated by:

the overall absence rate for all pupils being no more than 5%, and the attendance gap between disadvantaged pupils and their non-disadvantaged peers being reduced by 5%.

The percentage of all pupils who are persistently absent being below 3% and the figure among disadvantaged pupils being no more than 2%

The intended outcome has been partially met. While whole-school attendance and persistent absence rates are very strong and well above national averages, the success criteria for disadvantaged pupils have not yet been fully achieved. Supporting attendance for PP pupils will therefore remain a priority in the next strategy.

PP vs Whole-School Data

PP vs whole-school data shows that there is still a small but consistent gap in attendance between PP and non-PP pupils at Abbey Gates:

	2022-23			2023-24			2024-25		
	PP	Non-PP	Gap	PP	Non-PP	Gap	PP	Non-PP	Gap
Abbey Gates	94.38 %	95.22 %	-0.84	94.41 %	95.70 %	-1.29	94.29 %	96.21 %	-1.29

In 2024–25, attendance for pupils with FSM6 was **91.8%**, broadly in line with the national average of 92.2%. Attendance for pupils with no FSM was 96.8%, resulting in a **5% gap** between groups. This shows that the gap has not yet closed sufficiently.

Persistent Absence:

<p><i>lower than their peers</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During the academic year 2024-25, whole-school persistent absence was 3.3%, which is significantly below the national average of 12.6% and represents strong provision at a whole-school level. However, 25% (5/20) of PP pupils were persistently absent, and a further 25% were at risk of becoming persistently absent. This remains a priority area for improvement. <p>The attendance lead has now been trained in the ATTEND framework and this has been trialled with identified pupils. We will continue to monitor its impact and maintain a strong focus on improving attendance outcomes for PP pupils.</p> <p>Next steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to implement and monitor the ATTEND framework with a focus on PP pupils. Continue to strengthen early identification and targeted support for pupils at risk of persistent absence through the use of new systems (FFT) Maintain the focus on closing the gap between PP and non-PP pupils by extending and refining existing strategies.
--------------------------------------	---

Three Year Analysis: FSM6									
	2022-23			2023-24			2024-25		
	School	LA	Gap	School	LA	Gap	School	LA	Gap
EYFS - GLD	0% (0/1)	52.2%	-52.2 (1 child)	N/A – 0 chn	48.2%	N/A – 0 chn	0% (0/1)	LA: 47% Gedling 48%	-47 (1 child)
Y1 Phonics	N/A = 0 chn	67.8%	N/A – 0 chn	50% (1/2)	66.4%	-16.4	N/A – 0 chn	LA: 64.4% Gedling 64%	N/A – 0 chn
Phonics – All pupils at end of Y2	100% (2/2)	83.0%	+17	0% (0/1)	82.9%	-82.9 (1 child)	50% (1/2)	LA: 80.3% Gedling: 84.5%	-30.3
KS1 Reading	50% (1/2)	54.5%	-4/5	0% (1 child)	56.5%	-56.5 (1 child)	50% (1/2)	53.6%	-3.6
KS1 Writing	50% (1/2)	44.9%	+5.1	0% (1 child)	49.0%	-49 (1 child)	50% (1/2)	46.9%	+3.1
KS1 Maths	50% (1/2)	57.4%	-7/4	0% (1 child)	58.3%	-58.3 (1 child)	50% (1/2)	57.4%	-7.4
KS2 Reading	N/A – 0 chn	58.5%	N/A	100% (1 child)	60%	+40	N/A – 0 chn	LA: 61.2% Gedling: 65%	N/A – 0 chn

KS2 Writing	N/A – 0 chn	57.1%	N/A	100% (1 child)	57.4%	+42.6	N/A – 0 chn	LA: 57.5% Gedling: 61.5%	N/A – 0 chn
KS2 Maths	N/A – 0 chn	59.4%	N/A	100% (1 child)	58.8%	+42.2	N/A – 0 chn	LA: 60.2% Gedling 62%	N/A – 0 chn
KS2 GPS	N/A – 0 chn	56.6%	N/A	100% (1 child)	57.4%	+42.6	N/A – 0 chn	LA: 57.5%	N/A – 0 chn

2024-2025 Review

EYFS	Abbey Gates Pupils eligible For FSM6	LA Pupils eligible for FSM6	Abbey Gates Pupils not eligible for FSM6	LA Pupils not eligible for FSM6
EYFS % achieving a Good Level of Development	0% (1 child)	Notts: 47% Gedling: 48%	85.7%	Notts: 71% Gedling: 72%
There were a particularly low number of children who were eligible for FSM in Year 1 and Year 2 (1 child), therefore numbers are not significant enough to provide a comparison. Whilst this child did not achieve a good level of development, internal assessments and close tracking via the cherry garden evidences progress in the areas 'language and communication' and 'reading'. Reading and phonics support will continue for this child in Year 1.				
Phonics	Abbey Gates Pupils eligible for FSM6	LA Pupils eligible for FSM6	Abbey Gates Pupils not eligible for FSM6	LA Pupils not eligible for FSM6
Y1 % meeting the required standard	0 children	Notts: 64.4% Gedling: 64%	83%	Notts: 83.2% Gedling: 83.5%
End of Y2 % meeting the required standard	50% (2 children)	Notts: 80.3% Gedling: 84.5%	96%	Notts: 92.9% Gedling: 92.1%
There were a particularly low number of children who were eligible for FSM in Year 1 and Year 2 (2 children), therefore numbers are not significant enough to provide a comparison. There are 0 children eligible for FSM within the Y1 cohort, therefore a comparison cannot be made. Out of the 2 children eligible for FSM within the Y2 cohort, 1 child has not yet received the expected outcome. However, internal tracking evidences that progress has been made as part of a targeted phonics intervention. Reading and phonics intervention will continue for this child in Year 3 and progress will be tracked via the Birmingham Toolkit.				
Key Stage 1	Abbey Gates Pupils eligible for FSM6	LA Pupils eligible for FSM6 <i>Dataset of 106 schools</i>	Abbey Gates Pupils not eligible for FSM6	LA Pupils not eligible for FSM6 <i>Dataset of 106 schools</i>
% achieving expected or above standard in reading	50% (2 children)	53.8%	80.8%	Out of a dataset of 106 schools 77%
% achieving expected or above	50% (2 children)	46.9%	77.8%	70%

standard in writing				
% achieving expected or above standard in maths	50% (2 children)	57.6%	85.2%	79.7%
<p>There were a particularly low number of children who were eligible for FSM in Year 2 (2 children), therefore numbers are not significant enough to provide a comparison.</p> <p>Outcomes suggest that data is mostly in-line with the local authority outcomes for FSM children. Although 1 child did not achieve the expected standard, internal tracking via the Birmingham Toolkit and phonics intervention tracking evidences progress from this child's starting point.</p>				
Key Stage 2	Abbey Gates Pupils eligible for FSM6	LA Pupils eligible for FSM6	Abbey Gates All children	LA All children
% achieving expected or above standard in reading	N/A - 0 children	Notts: 61.2% Gedling: 65%	90%	Notts: 75.6% Gedling: 79.1%
% achieving expected or above standard in writing	N/A - 0 children	Notts: 57.5% Gedling: 61.5%	93.3%	Notts: 73.3% Gedling: 76.4%
% achieving expected or above standard in maths	N/A - 0 children	Notts: 60.2% Gedling: 62%	93.3%	Notts: 75.7% Gedling: 76.7%
<p>0 children were eligible for FSM in this current cohort therefore a comparison in outcomes cannot be measured.</p>				