Pupil premium strategy statement – Mounts Bay Academy

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	930
Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils	25.3%
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**)	2024-2025 2025-2026 2026-2027
Date this statement was published	1/12/2025
Date on which it will be reviewed	01/09/2026
Statement authorised by	Simeon Royle
Pupil premium lead	Karyn Frayne
Governor / Trustee lead	Cathryn Andrews

Funding overview

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year	£ 247,254
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*	£ 247,254

Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

Statement of intent

*At Mounts Bay Academy, we are committed to ensuring that every student, regardless of background or circumstance, achieves their full potential. Our Pupil Premium Strategy is rooted in our core values of **Equity, Evolution, and Excellence** and is designed to remove barriers to learning so that disadvantaged students thrive academically, socially, and emotionally.*

***Quality of Education** – we aim to deliver a well-sequenced curriculum, improving teaching quality through evidence-based CPD, and embedding strong literacy provision.*

***Behaviour and Attitudes** – we are committed to raising attendance, reducing persistent absence, and fostering positive engagement in lessons and homework.*

***Personal Development** – we provide enrichment opportunities, wellbeing support, and opportunities for parental engagement to build resilience and aspiration.*

Equity and Inclusion
We believe equity is essential for an inclusive learning environment. Our approach identifies and addresses specific barriers faced by disadvantaged students, ensuring equal access to high-quality teaching, resources, and opportunities.

High Expectations for All
We maintain ambitious expectations for every student. Our strategy reflects the belief that all children can succeed, and we will provide the support needed for disadvantaged pupils to meet and exceed these expectations.

Monitoring and Evaluation
We will rigorously monitor impact through termly data reviews, lesson observations, and pupil voice. Adjustments will be made based on evidence to ensure interventions remain effective and responsive.

Conclusion
Through this strategy, we aim to close attainment gaps and create an environment where all students feel valued, supported, and empowered to succeed.

Challenges

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

Challenge number	Detail of challenge
1	Some disadvantaged pupils have limited or no access to books at home.

2	Some disadvantaged pupils have less background vocabulary knowledge than their non disadvantaged peers.
3	In some lessons, there is lower engagement and participation in lessons from disadvantaged pupils compared to their non disadvantaged peers.
4	Some disadvantaged pupils are not completing homework as often as their non-disadvantaged peers.
5	Attendance of disadvantaged pupils as a group is lower than that of their non disadvantaged peers.

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 Increase the breadth and depth of vocabulary for disadvantaged pupils to close the gap with their peers and improve access to the curriculum and to decrease the gap in reading attainment.	Vocabulary assessments show disadvantaged pupils vocabulary knowledge is improving over time. Gaps in NGRT scores and vocabulary knowledge between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils reduce over time.
Ensure consistently high-quality teaching that meets the needs of disadvantaged pupils and accelerates their progress.	100% of lesson observations show evidence of adaptive teaching strategies for disadvantaged pupils. Disadvantaged pupils' homework completion rate is in line with that of non-disadvantaged peers by July 2025. Attainment gaps reduce over time.
Reduce persistent and severe absence and close the attendance gap between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils.	Attendance for disadvantaged pupils improves to **92% or higher** by July 2027. Persistent absence among disadvantaged pupils falls below national average. Gap between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged attendance reduces to **less than 2%**.

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: £123,627

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
All teaching staff enrolled in EEF Embedding formative assessment programme to increase the quality of formative assessment in lessons.	- Education Endowment Foundation (EEF). (2017). *Formative Assessment*. - OFSTED. (2021). *Research Review Series: Science*. - OFSTED. (2021). *Research Review Series: English*.	3
Regular coaching for all teaching staff, to improve the quality of teaching and learning.	- Education Endowment Foundation (EEF). (2021). *Effective Professional Development*. - Gordon, E. W., et al. (2018). *The Impact of Coaching on Teacher Practice and Student Achievement*. - Knight, J. (2018). *Instructional Coaching: A Partnership Approach to Improving Instruction*. - Kraft, M. A., Blazar, D., & Hogan, D. (2018). *The Effect of Teacher Coaching on Instruction and Achievement: A Meta-Analysis of the Causal Evidence*.	3
Staff CPD on reading and literacy strategies to improve literacy provision.	- Ofsted. (2021). *Research Review Series: English*. - Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible Learning: A Synthesis of Over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement*. - Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *A Meta-Analysis of the Effectiveness of Writing Instruction for Students in Grades 1-12*. - Torgesen, J. K., et al. (2006). *Academic Literacy Instruction for Adolescents: A Guidance Document from the Centre on Instruction*. - National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching Children to Read: An Evidence-Based*	2

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
	Assessment of the Scientific Research Literature on Reading and Its Implications for Reading Instruction.	
Regular quality assurance lesson observations by senior and middle leaders with a focus on high expectations for all students.	• Muijs, D. (2015). *The Benefits of Collaboration for School Improvement*. • OFSTED. (2021). *Research Review Series: English*. • Strand, S. (2016). *The Impact of School Leadership on Pupil Outcomes*.	3

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

Budgeted cost: £74,176

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Reading Interventions for pupils flagged by NGRT tests (phonics and/or Lexia) to improve literacy and reading skills for students with the lowest standardised reading scores.	• Education Endowment Foundation (EEF). (2021). *Improving Literacy in Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2*. • Torgesen, J. K., et al. (2006). *Academic Literacy Instruction for Adolescents: A Guidance Document from the Centre on Instruction*. • Rosenshine, B. (2012). *Principles of Instruction: Research-Based Strategies That All Teachers Should Know*. • Higgins, S., et al. (2017). *The Impact of Interventions on Literacy Outcomes*. • Institute of Education Sciences (IES). (2016). *What Works Clearinghouse: Literacy Interventions*. • Reading Recovery Council of North America. (2020). *Reading Recovery: A Summary of the Evidence*.	1, 2

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Lesson 0 for Year 11 – additional sessions in English, Maths and Science delivered by subject specialists.	• Education Endowment Foundation (EEF). (2021). *Special Educational Needs in Mainstream Schools*. • Institute of Education Sciences (IES). (2016). *What Works Clearinghouse: Small Group Interventions*. • Education Policy Institute (EPI). (2019). *Closing the Gap: Trends in Educational Attainment*.	3, 4
Lesson 5 for Year 11, offered in all subjects, with free transport provided.	• Education Endowment Foundation (EEF). (2021). *Special Educational Needs in Mainstream Schools*. • Institute of Education Sciences (IES). (2016). *What Works Clearinghouse: Small Group Interventions*. • Education Policy Institute (EPI). (2019). *Closing the Gap: Trends in Educational Attainment*.	3, 4
Homework club, with free transport provided, to support students who need help with their homework.	• Education Endowment Foundation (EEF). (2022). *Teaching and Learning Toolkit: Homework*. • Cooper, H., et al. (2006). *The Effects of Homework on Student Achievement*. • Trautwein, U., & Köller, O. (2003) *The Relationship Between Homework and Achievement: A Meta-Analysis*. • Paschal, R. A., et al. (2007). *The Effects of Homework on Student Achievement*.	3, 4

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

Budgeted cost: £49,450

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed

Tutor time reading programme – reading aloud to improve reading fluency and vocabulary.	• OFSTED. (2024). *Research Review Series: English*. • Department for Education (DfE). (2023). *The Reading Framework*. • Beck, I. L., McKeown, M. G., & Kucan, L. (2002). *Bringing Words to Life: Robust Vocabulary Instruction*. • Institute of Education Sciences (IES). (2016). *What Works Clearinghouse: Reading Aloud Strategies*.	1, 2
Attendance officer appointment and daily workflow to identify opportunities for early intervention to improve attendance.	• Education Endowment Foundation (EEF). (2022). *Attendance and Attainment*. • Department for Education (DfE). (2021). *Improving Attendance: A Guide for Schools*. • Institute of Education Sciences (IES). (2016). *What Works Clearinghouse: Attendance and Student Achievement*.	5
Targeted phone calls to PP families to engage and support with school attendance.	• Education Endowment Foundation (EEF). (2022). *Attendance and Attainment*. • Department for Education (DfE). (2021). *Improving Attendance: A Guide for Schools*. • Institute of Education Sciences (IES). (2016). *What Works Clearinghouse: Attendance and Student Achievement*.	5
Breakfast club, to support students to be ready to learn.	• Education Endowment Foundation (EEF). (2022). *Breakfast Clubs: Improving Educational Outcomes*. • Department for Education (DfE). (2021). *The Role of Breakfast Clubs in Supporting Student Outcomes*. • Institute for Social and Economic Research (ISER). (2019). *The Impact of Breakfast Clubs on Academic Performance: A Systematic Review*. • University of Leeds. (2018). *The Effects of Breakfast Clubs on Student Behaviour and Engagement*.	3, 5
Subsidising trips and Adventure learning	• https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/outdoor-adventure-learning	

Total budgeted cost: <mark>£239,400</mark>

Part B: Review of the previous academic year

Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils

Headline Measure	23/24 Exams	23/24 Gap	24/25 Exams	24/25 Gap
Average Total Attainment 8	33.93	10.22	30.85	16.31
Average Attainment 8 Grade	3.39	1.02	3.09	1.63
Average KS2 Prior Attainment	102		99	
Average Estimated A8	41.76	6.43	39.81	10.72
Average Total Progress 8	-0.78	0.41	NA	NA
Students Achieving 9-5 in English and Maths	18.9	17.6	7.7	37.3
Students Achieving 9-5 in English	32.4	19.2	20.5	41.8
Students Achieving 9-5 in Maths	32.4	9.1	17.9	37.1
Students Achieving 9-4 in English and Maths	40.5	16.1	35.9	38.3
Students Achieving 9-4 in English	48.6	21.2	51.3	34.1
Students Achieving 9-4 in Maths	54.1	8.8	51.3	24.9

Attainment measures showed a drop in 24/25. The PP cohort in 24/25 consisted of 39 students and included 14 students who joined the school in Year 9 or later. 5% of the cohort were in the high prior attainment band, compared to 16% the year before.

In the NGRT reading tests, there has been an improvement in standardised scores (SAS) for Year 7 into 8 and Year 8 into 9, as well as a narrowing of the gap in Year 8 into 9. As well as this, the number of students with reading ages below their chronological age has fallen in Year 7 into 8.

2024-25	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9
Mean SAS Non PP	103.94	100.37	99.68
Mean SAS PP	98.55	90.4	95.6
PP Gap	-5.4	-9.97	-4.08
Mean SAS Non SEND	104.62	100.12	100.04
Mean SAS SEND	92.78	89.28	91.48
SEND Gap	-11.84	-10.84	-8.56

	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9
No of pupils below chronological age	74	94	

2025-26	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9
Mean SAS Non PP	104.07	106.28	101.79
Mean SAS PP	99.8	99.48	95.95
PP Gap	-4.27	-6.8	-5.84
Mean SAS Non SEND	105.51	105.97	101.74
Mean SAS SEND	93.58	97.1	95.67
SEND Gap	-11.93	-8.87	-6.07

	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9
No of pupils below chronological age	59	48	100

Progress tests in English and maths conducted in 24/25 and at the start of 25/26 show a narrowing of the gap in standardised scores for maths for Year 7 into 8 and Year 8 into 9. In English the gap has narrowed for Year 7 into 8 but widened slightly for Year 8 into 9.

2024 - 25			
English	Year 7	Year 8	
Mean SAS	97.41	100.28	
Mean SAS Non PP	98.55	102.28	
Mean SAS PP	93.79	93.86	
PP Gap	-4.76	-8.42	

2025 - 26			
English	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9
Mean SAS	97.01	102.36	99.34
Mean SAS Non PP	98.30	103.14	101.74
Mean SAS PP	93.67	99.52	91.66
PP Gap	-4.62	-3.63	-10.08

Maths	Year 7	Year 8	
Mean SAS	92.60	96.29	
Mean SAS Non PP	94.02	100.03	
Mean SAS PP	88.13	89.29	
PP Gap	-5.90	-10.74	

Maths	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9
Mean SAS	97.59	101.09	101.58
Mean SAS Non PP	99.38	101.91	103.68
Mean SAS PP	92.89	97.76	94.79
PP Gap	-6.49	-4.16	-8.90

FSM6 · Attendance

Year	Cohort	School	National	National distribution banding	Sch trend vs Nat trend	School context
2024/25 (2 term)	231	87.0%	87.3%	Close to average	Relative improvement	-
2023/24 (3 term)	238	84.8%	86.0%	Close to average	In line	-
2022/23 (3 term)	225	84.8%	86.0%	Close to average	Relative decline	-

Year	Cohort	School	National	National distribution banding	Sch trend vs Nat trend	School context
2018/19 (3 term)	214	91.4%	91.8%	Close to average	Not available	High - SEN

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
None	

Service pupil premium funding (optional)

For schools that receive this funding, you may wish to provide the following information: **How our service pupil premium allocation was spent last academic year**
The impact of that spending on service pupil premium eligible pupils