

Pupil Premium Impact Statement 2025/26

The school remains committed to ensuring that disadvantaged pupils achieve as well as their peers and can access the full range of educational opportunities. Pupil Premium Grant (PPG) funding supported targeted academic, pastoral and therapeutic provision during 2025/26. This evaluation identifies improvements in KS4 performance against targets, reduced suspension days and individual attendance gains, alongside lower overall PPG attendance and widening gaps in performance against targets. It sets out priorities for 2026/27.

Attendance

Overall PPG attendance was 88.1% in 2025/26, compared with 93.4% for non-PPG pupils, a gap of 5.3 percentage points. Within this overall picture, some disadvantaged pupils made substantial progress from their Year 7 starting points. The evaluation below considers these individual gains alongside cohort outcomes.

Comparison between student groups in 2025/2026

Measure	PPG	Non-PPG
Number of students	91	103
Average attendance	88.1%	93.4%
Authorised absence	10.5%	5.9%
Unauthorised absence	1.4%	0.7%
Persistently absent students under 90% attendance	28	14
Persistent absence rate	30.8%	13.6%

In 2025/26, 28 of 91 PPG pupils (30.8%) were persistently absent, compared with 14 of 103 non-PPG pupils (13.6%). Reducing this difference remains a priority through early support, family engagement and pastoral and multi-agency working.

Eight PPG pupils and one non-PPG pupil were supported through reduced timetables during 2025/26. Their attendance and access to education are considered in the Interventions and Access to Learning section.

Pupil Premium attendance compared with last year

Measure	2024/25 PPG	2025/26 PPG	Change
Attendance	90.1%	88.1%	-2.0 pp
Authorised absence	7.8%	10.5%	+2.7 pp
Unauthorised absence	2.2%	1.4%	-0.8 pp

PPG attendance decreased from 90.1% to 88.1%, a fall of 2.0 percentage points. Authorised absence increased from 7.8% to 10.5%, while unauthorised absence fell from 2.2% to 1.4%. The reduction in unauthorised absence is encouraging, but did not offset the increase in authorised absence. Understanding and addressing the barriers behind these absences remains a priority.

Evaluation

Targeted attendance support included phased timetables, transport assistance, home visits, regular contact with trusted adults and personalised provision linked to pupils' interests and needs. These approaches aimed to maintain engagement and support increased attendance where full-time attendance was not immediately achievable.

Individual case studies provide examples of progress during this support. One pupil moved from a combination of home-based and online learning to attending school daily by the end of the academic year. This is an encouraging outcome, although a single case does not establish the effectiveness of provision across the cohort.

Longer-term attendance patterns also show positive progress. Since Year 7, 19 PPG pupils and 20 non-PPG pupils in the attendance improvement review achieved a gain of at least 5 percentage points at a subsequent point. Comparing their Year 7 baseline with their latest 2025/26 attendance, 14 PPG pupils and 16 non-PPG pupils retained a gain of at least 5 percentage points.

Three PPG pupils who were persistently absent in Year 7 recorded attendance above 90% in 2025/26, alongside six non-PPG pupils. The PPG pupils improved from 68.7% to 92.9%, from 73.9% to 97.6% and from 84.2% to 97.0%. These gains of 24.2, 23.7 and 12.8 percentage points demonstrate substantial improvements in access to education.

Positive progress is also evident among PPG pupils who remain below 90% attendance. One improved from 54.7% in Year 7 to 76.1% in 2025/26, a gain of 21.4 percentage points. Two others improved by 13.1 and 11.5 percentage points. These pupils continue to need support, but their increased attendance represents meaningful progress. Further strengths include three PPG pupils who improved from Year 7 attendance above 90% to 100% attendance in 2025/26.

These individual successes show improved access to education for some pupils. However, comparisons with Year 7 reflect progress over differing periods and should be considered separately from changes during 2025/26. Overall PPG attendance remained below the previous year's level. Evaluation should therefore track both sustained individual improvement and reductions in absence across the cohort.

Behaviour

Behaviour outcomes for disadvantaged pupils were mixed in 2025/26. PPG pupils recorded more Level 1 incidents per pupil, slightly more Level 2 incidents per pupil and fewer Level 3 incidents per pupil than non-PPG pupils. PPG suspension days fell compared with the previous year, although a higher proportion of PPG pupils received a suspension than their non-PPG peers.

Comparison between student groups in 2025 to 2026

Measure	PPG	Non-PPG
Level 1 incidents	343	285
Level 2 incidents	447	485
Level 3 incidents	54	97
Suspension events	10	13
Students suspended	7	6

Measure	PPG	Non-PPG
Days lost through suspension	8	12

The cohorts differ in size: 91 PPG pupils and 103 non-PPG pupils. Level 1 incidents equated to approximately 3.77 per PPG pupil and 2.77 per non-PPG pupil. Although the PPG total for Level 2 was lower, the rate was slightly higher at 4.91 incidents per pupil, compared with 4.71. Level 3 incidents were lower both in total and per pupil: 0.59 for PPG pupils and 0.94 for non-PPG pupils.

In 2025/26, PPG students recorded 343 Level 1 incidents compared with 285 for non-PPG students. However, at the more serious levels of behaviour, PPG students recorded 447 Level 2 incidents compared with 485 for non-PPG students, and 54 Level 3 incidents compared with 97 for non-PPG students. This suggests that while minor behavioural concerns remain more frequent among disadvantaged students, higher-level incidents are less prevalent.

Behaviour incidents compared 2024/25 – 2025/26

Incident level	2024/25 weekly average PPG / non-PPG	2025/26 weekly average PPG / non-PPG
Level 1	7 / 11	9 / 8
Level 2	12 / 20	12 / 13
Level 3	1 / 2	1 / 3

Rounded weekly averages suggest that PPG Level 1 incidents increased from 7 to 9 per week, while Level 2 remained around 12 and Level 3 around 1. Non-PPG weekly averages fell at Levels 1 and 2 and increased at Level 3. These are counts per week rather than rates per pupil; differences in cohort size and rounding limit direct comparisons.

Suspension days compared with last year

Group	2024/25 days	2025/26 days	Change
PPG	21	8	-13
Non-PPG	9.5	12	+2.5

PPG pupils experienced 10 suspension events involving 7 pupils, with 8 days lost, compared with 13 events involving 6 non-PPG pupils and 12 days lost. PPG suspension days fell from 21 in 2024/25 to 8 in 2025/26, a reduction of 61.9%. This represents less time lost through suspension, although these figures alone do not establish which interventions contributed to the change.

Evaluation

A range of pastoral and therapeutic interventions continues to support disadvantaged pupils, including personalised behaviour plans, trusted-adult relationships, targeted mentoring and individualised support packages. These approaches aim to address the underlying causes of behaviour concerns while promoting self-regulation, engagement and positive relationships with school.

The lower rate of Level 3 incidents and reduction in suspension days are encouraging. However, Level 1 incidents remained more frequent among PPG pupils and their Level 2 rate was slightly higher than that of non-PPG pupils. Evaluation should examine which pupils experience repeated incidents and whether the frequency and severity of incidents change during targeted support.

Seven of 91 PPG pupils received a suspension (7.7%), compared with six of 103 non-PPG pupils (5.8%). The reduction in days lost therefore sits alongside a higher proportion of disadvantaged pupils experiencing suspension. Both measures should inform the evaluation of support.

The priorities are to sustain the reduction in suspension days, reduce lower-level incidents and support pupils at risk of repeated suspension. Linking individual support records with subsequent behaviour outcomes would strengthen the evidence for the contribution of pastoral and therapeutic provision.

Interventions and Access to Learning

Pupil Premium funding supported personalised provision, reduced timetables, mental health support and reintegration programmes. These approaches aimed to maintain access to education and address barriers to participation. The figures below describe participation in provision; they do not by themselves demonstrate its impact.

Measure in 2025/26	PPG	Non-PPG
Students on reduced timetables	8	1
Students completing mental health support	3	3
Students receiving ongoing mental health support	4	2

In 2025/26, disadvantaged pupils made greater use of targeted interventions than their peers. Eight PPG pupils were supported through reduced timetables, compared with one non-PPG pupil. Mental health support was also a significant area of provision, with three pupils in each group completing a programme of support and four PPG pupils continuing to receive ongoing intervention, compared with two non-PPG pupils.

Reduced timetables comparison

Group	2024/25 students	2025/26 students	Change
PPG	5	8	+3
Non-PPG	4	1	-3
Total	9	9	0

Nine pupils were supported through reduced timetables in each year. Within this group, the number of PPG pupils increased from five to eight, while the number of non-PPG pupils fell from four to one. In 2025/26, this represented 8.8% of PPG pupils and 1.0% of non-PPG pupils. This change shows greater use of the provision among PPG pupils, but does not on its own establish increased need or improved outcomes.

Profile of students on reduced timetables in 2025/2026

Measure	PPG	Non-PPG
Students with reduced timetables	8	1
Percentage of respective cohort	8.8%	1.0%
Average attendance of identified students	44.3%	44.8%
Suspension events	2	0

Average attendance for pupils supported through reduced timetables was 44.3% for the PPG group and 44.8% for the single non-PPG pupil. These figures indicate limited attendance and require careful interpretation alongside individual starting points, timetable arrangements and time spent in provision. The non-PPG figure represents one pupil and should not be treated as a reliable group comparison.

Evaluation

Individual case studies describe improved attendance and progress towards full-time education during personalised support. To evaluate outcomes across the provision, monitoring should record attendance before and during support, time spent on a reduced timetable, increases in access to education and sustained returns to full-time learning.

The school uses Assess, Plan, Do, Review (APDR) processes, multi-agency working and personalised reintegration pathways to support pupils with complex social, emotional and mental health needs. Evaluation should connect these support plans with recorded changes in attendance, wellbeing and engagement.

Mental health support figures show how many pupils completed programmes or continued to receive support. Completion alone does not demonstrate improvement. Baseline and follow-up wellbeing measures, pupil feedback and subsequent attendance and engagement would provide a stronger basis for assessing outcomes and deciding whether provision should continue or change.

Achievement

The majority of reported PPG results met or exceeded their targets in 2025/26: 77.7% at Key Stage 3 (KS3) and 80.8% at Key Stage 4 (KS4). Science results were a relative strength, with 93.9% of KS3 and 94.3% of KS4 PPG outcomes on or above target. The percentages describe recorded results against targets, rather than the percentage of individual pupils meeting all their targets, and should not be interpreted as a direct measure of absolute attainment.

Position against target in 2025/26

Position against target	KS3 PPG	KS3 Non-PPG	KS4 PPG	KS4 Non-PPG
Below target	22.3%	19.6%	19.2%	12.0%
On or above target	77.7%	80.4%	80.8%	88.0%

At KS3, the proportion of PPG results on or above target was 2.7 percentage points below the non-PPG proportion. At KS4, the difference was 7.2 percentage points. These are gaps in performance against targets. Their interpretation depends on how targets are set and how results are counted across pupils and subjects.

Comparison with the previous year

Measure	2024/25 PPG	2024/25 Non-PPG	2025/26 PPG	2025/26 Non-PPG
KS3 on or above target	83%	82%	77.7%	80.4%
KS3 below target	17%	18%	22.3%	19.6%
KS4 on or above target	75%	71%	80.8%	88.0%
KS4 below target	25%	29%	19.2%	12.0%

At KS4, PPG results on or above target increased from 75.0% to 80.8%, a rise of 5.8 percentage points. Non-PPG results increased more sharply, from 71.0% to 88.0%. PPG therefore moved from 4.0 percentage points ahead to 7.2 points behind. At KS3, PPG results on or above target fell from 83.0% to 77.7%, while non-PPG results fell from

82.0% to 80.4%. PPG moved from 1.0 point ahead to 2.7 points behind. The relative position of PPG pupils weakened at both key stages, despite the improvement in their KS4 results.

Evaluation

The strongest reported outcomes are improved PPG performance against targets at KS4, strong Science results, fewer suspension days and substantial attendance gains for some pupils. These sit alongside lower overall PPG attendance, declining KS3 performance against targets and widening differences between PPG and non-PPG results. The evidence therefore presents a mixed picture.

The available results do not isolate the contribution of Pupil Premium funding or individual interventions. Evaluation should link provision more closely to pupils' starting points and subsequent outcomes, while checking that assessment methods and targets are comparable between groups and years. Priorities are to improve attendance, strengthen KS3 performance and reduce the gaps in performance against targets at both key stages.

Key Priorities for 2026/27

- Improve attendance for disadvantaged students and reduce persistent absence through earlier intervention, strengthened family engagement and personalised attendance planning.
- Continue to reduce behaviour incidents and days lost through suspension while maintaining effective pastoral, therapeutic and trusted-adult support.
- Further strengthen the monitoring and evaluation of reduced timetables and reintegration programmes, including tracking successful returns to full-time education.
- Further evaluate the long-term impact of mental health interventions on attendance, wellbeing, engagement and outcomes.
- Strengthen KS3 performance against targets, sustain the PPG improvement at KS4 and reduce the gaps with non-PPG pupils at both key stages.
- Develop more robust destination and progression tracking to evaluate the longer-term impact of Pupil Premium funding.