



# Pupil Premium Strategy Statement

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 effect that last year's spending of pupil premium had within our school.

## School overview

Detail	Data
School name	Handsworth Grange Community Sports College
Number of pupils in school	987
Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils	35.87%
Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers <b>(3-year plans are recommended)</b>	2024 – 2027
Date this statement was published	September 2024
Dates on which it will be reviewed	September 2025/6
Statement authorised by	Suzy Mattock
Pupil premium lead	Kirk Burdett
Governor / Trustee lead	Ken Matthews

## Funding overview

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year	£361,197
Pupil premium funding carried forward from previous years (enter £0 if not applicable)	£0
<b>Total budget for this academic year</b> If your school is an academy in a trust that pools this funding, state the amount available to your school this academic year	£361,197

# Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

## Statement of intent

### Context

At Handsworth Grange Community Sports College, we are committed to the belief that a pupil's socioeconomic status should not prevent them from reaching their full potential in life. The purpose of this strategy is to tackle challenges that under-resourced families face in our community. We believe that delivering quality first teaching, alongside enrichment and intervention activities, and providing targeted academic and pastoral support will enable disadvantaged pupils to achieve outcomes that give them the opportunity to go to university or pursue a real alternative, ensuring they have genuine freedom of choice when moving on to the next stages of their education, employment, or training.

At Handsworth Grange Community Sports College, we use data intelligently and proactively to diagnose challenges and inform our decision-making. We apply evidence-informed strategies that have a proven track record of improving pupil outcomes. We regularly monitor reading ages and provide targeted support to help students make progress. We also believe that fostering a love of reading—through reading for pleasure and celebrating the joy of reading—is a powerful way to enhance student outcomes and broaden their horizons.

Pupil Premium students continue to lag their peers in several areas. These include attainment, attendance, behaviour, suspensions and access to enrichment opportunities.

Several pastoral, social, and behavioural post-pandemic issues persist at Handsworth Grange. To address these, the school has invested in behaviour resilience, pastoral and academic mentoring, enhanced pastoral support, an expanded enrichment offers, and in-house alternative provision. A new rewards system has been launched, embedding positive classroom behaviour using the Golden Ticket and a raffled reward, designed to re-engage pupils and build resilience.

This strategy outlines the use of Pupil Premium funding and follows the tiered approach recommended by the Education Endowment Foundation (EEF). It is a key part of our mission to provide “exceptional education for every student, every day”, and is closely aligned with our core values: Be Present, Be Kind, Be Brave.

## Challenges

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

Challenge number	Detail of challenge
1	<b>Attendance and Punctuality</b> There was an overall attendance gap of 6.7% for disadvantaged students compared to non-disadvantaged students. This gap has widened over a 3-year period and across the academic year from HT1-6. The number of disadvantaged students that are Persistently and Severely absent is also higher than non-disadvantaged students. This is leading to gaps in knowledge and disengagement from additional support and intervention.
2	<b>Academic achievement</b> There is an attainment gap for disadvantaged students for all key measures, compared to non-disadvantaged students. The gaps for the 2024-2025 outcomes were: Attainment 8 -9.37, 7+ English & Maths - 8.8%, 5+ English & Maths -13.9%, 4+ English & Maths -15.3%, EBacc good pass -8.7% and EBacc strong pass -6.9%. These gaps are significant and a limiting the life choices and chance of disadvantaged students as they do not have the relevant knowledge, skills and qualifications to progress into appropriate post-16 provision.
3	<b>Curriculum</b> Curriculum intent and implementation in some areas does not meet the needs of disadvantaged learners. Curriculum content and sequencing do not always allow embedding of key knowledge and skills, with implementation not sufficiently allowing learning to take place. The current lesson model does not develop metacognition, in some cases is leading to cognitive overload, and does not forensically check for misconceptions.
4	<b>Reading comprehension</b> There is a gap between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students in terms of reading ages. Data suggests that this has become more pronounced over the past three years. Disadvantaged students have an average reading age gap of 12%, for both those below and above their chronological reading age. This is up from 10% and 11% in the previous academic years. Disadvantaged students are also disproportionately represented in students with a reading age of less than 7 years, with 8% more students compared to non-disadvantaged students. This presents a significant challenge, as it limits access to the curriculum and exacerbates gaps in attainment, attendance and engagement as students cannot access learning.

5	<p><b>Home learning</b></p> <p>Disadvantaged students engage less well in home learning compared to non-disadvantaged students. This is in part due to not having access to the same resources, technology, space and support at home to allow them to effectively engage in independent study. This is hindering the achievement of these students as they cannot consolidate and embed learning as effectively outside the classroom. The latest available home learning data suggests an on-time completion rate of -13% between PP and non-PP.</p>
6	<p><b>Aspirations and enrichment</b></p> <p>A disproportionately high number of disadvantaged students have lower aspirations and lower expectations for post-16 pathways than their non-disadvantaged peers. Disadvantaged pupils do not have the same cultural capital than non-disadvantaged pupils and have lower rates of attendance to enrichment activities in school.</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
Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils improve so that they are in line with non-disadvantaged pupils nationally	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gaps at 4+, 5+ and 7+ English and Maths decrease year on year.</li> <li>The number of disadvantaged students achieving at least a grade 4 in English and Maths improves year on year.</li> </ul>
Attendance of disadvantaged pupils improves so that they are in line with non-disadvantaged students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disadvantaged pupils' attendance improves year on year and is in-line with non-disadvantaged pupils.</li> <li>Disadvantaged pupils' persistent absence and severe absence reduces year on year.</li> </ul>
The standard age score of pupils (SAS) of disadvantaged pupils increases so that pupils are secondary ready.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The gap between the average reading ages of disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged decreases year on year.</li> <li>The number of disadvantaged students that enter year 8 not at a chronological reading ages decrease year on year.</li> </ul>

<p>An increased proportion of disadvantaged pupils attend enrichment and intervention activities at Handsworth Grange.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disadvantaged students attend intervention activities in line with non-disadvantaged students.</li> <li>• A year-on-year increase in the percentage of disadvantaged students engaging with enrichment activities.</li> </ul>
<p>Increased aspirations and expectations for post-16 pathways for disadvantaged pupils in line with their peers.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% of disadvantaged students access careers advice from year 7 and in all other years.</li> <li>• 100% of disadvantaged pupils complete post-16 applications.</li> <li>• 100% of disadvantaged students go into a sustained post-16 education.</li> </ul>
<p>Curriculum modification to meet the needs of disadvantaged learners.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% of lessons meet the non-negotiables of The Handsworth Way.</li> <li>• Work scrutiny demonstrates consistency between the work produced between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students.</li> <li>• All staff actively model metacognitive techniques.</li> <li>• AfL is embedded in all lessons to highlight misconceptions.</li> </ul>

## Activity in this academic year

This details how we intend to spend our pupil premium (and recovery premium funding) **this academic year** to address the challenges listed above.

### Quality of Education (for example, CPD, teaching, recruitment and retention)

Budgeted cost: £194,227

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Metacognition and self-regulation CPD for all staff. Lesson model to include metacognitive strategies.	High impact for very low cost based on extensive evidence. <a href="#">Metacognition and self-regulation   EEF</a>	1,2&3
Embedding Formative Assessment CPD for all staff.	Moderate impact for low cost on extensive evidence. <a href="#">Embedding Formative Assessment   EEF</a>	2&3
Home learning - provision of equipment to allow effective learning at home for PP students.	Moderate impact for very low cost based on very limited evidence. <a href="#">Homework   EEF</a>	2&5
Feedback – live marking and TLAC strategies to prioritise PP students.	High impact for very low cost based on extensive evidence. <a href="#">Teaching and Learning Toolkit   EEF</a>	2&3
Mastery learning – Ark and White rose curriculum to support PP students.	Moderate impact for very low cost based on limited evidence <a href="#">Mastery learning   EEF</a>	2&3

<p>High quality CPD for all staff on the new lesson structure and pedagogy.</p>	<p>Pedagogy is based around reducing cognitive load, effective formative assessment, developing oracy, metacognition and independent practice.</p> <p><a href="#"><u>Principles of Instruction: Research-Based Strategies That All Teachers Should Know, by Barak Rosenshine; American Educator Vol. 36, No. 1, Spring 2012, AFT</u></a></p>	<p>1,2,3</p>
<p>Additional teaching groups in Maths, English and Science to focus on PP students.</p>	<p>Low impact for very high cost based on very limited evidence</p> <p><a href="#"><u>Reducing class size   EEF</u></a></p>	

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

Budgeted cost: £100,464

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Assertive Mentoring for Y11 PP students.	Low impact for moderate cost based on moderate evidence. <a href="#">Mentoring   EEF</a>	1,2,5 & 6
Small group tuition as part of tutor time intervention for Y11 PP students.	Moderate impact for low cost based on moderate evidence <a href="#">Small group tuition   EEF</a>	2
Reading comprehension strategies for PP students with a SAS of 85-100.	PP students with a SAS of less than 85 High impact for very low cost based on moderate evidence. <a href="#">Reading comprehension strategies   EEF</a>	2&4
Phonics interventions for PP students with a SAS of <75	Moderate impact for very low cost based on extensive evidence. <a href="#">Phonics   EEF</a>	2&4
Oral language interventions as part agreed classroom pedagogy.	High impact for very low cost based on extensive evidence <a href="#">Oral language interventions   EEF</a>	2&3
Intervention and enrichment programme with funding for PP students.	Moderate impact for moderate cost based on moderate evidence <a href="#">Extending school time   EEF</a>  Moderate impact for very low cost based on moderate evidence <a href="#">Arts participation   EEF</a>  Low impact for very low cost based on extensive evidence <a href="#">Physical activity   EEF</a>	1,2,5&6
One to One independent career advice for PP students.	The Good Career Guidance Report (Gatsby, 2013) <a href="#">Gatsby Good Career Guidance: The Next 10 Years</a>	1&6

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

Budgeted cost: £66,506

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Pastoral interventions – social, emotional and wellbeing	<p>Moderate impact for low cost based on moderate evidence  <a href="#">Behaviour interventions   EEF</a></p> <p>Moderate impact for very low cost based on moderate evidence  <a href="#">Social and emotional learning   EEF</a></p>	1,2&6
Targeted attendance interventions with PP students as a priority.	<p>Embedding principles of good practice set out in DfE's Working together to improve school attendance.</p> <p><a href="#">Working together to improve school attendance (applies from 19 August 2024)</a></p>	1&2
Careers and aspirations programme	<p>The Good Career Guidance Report (Gatsby, 2013)</p> <p><a href="#">Gatsby Good Career Guidance: The Next 10 Years</a></p>	6
Breakfast club for PP students	<p>Ensuring that disadvantaged pupils have the best start to the day, ensuring that they are ready to learn throughout the day.</p> <p><a href="#">Free breakfast clubs in schools: what Labour's plans would mean for pupils and families   Institute for Fiscal Studies</a></p>	1&2
Duke of Edinburgh	<p>Giving disadvantaged pupils culturally enriching opportunities beyond the academic curriculum.</p> <p><a href="#">Outdoor adventure learning   EEF</a></p>	6
Alternative provision – Phoenix	<p>Adding an extra layer of support to disadvantaged pupils through an alternative to suspensions and permanent exclusions.</p>	1,2 & 6

**Total budgeted cost:** £364,216

## Part B: Review of outcomes in the previous academic year

### Pupil premium strategy outcomes

This details the impact that our pupil premium activity had on pupils in the 2024 to 2025 academic year.

#### Year 11 Attainment – 2024/25

All Pupils	2023-24	2024-25
<b>Progress 8</b>	-0.65	N/A
<b>9 – 4 E &amp; M</b>	54.2%	46.1%
<b>9 – 5 E &amp; M</b>	32.8%	27.0%
<b>Attainment 8</b>	39.58	36.5
<b>9 – 4 English</b>	60.2%	55.9%
<b>9 – 4 Maths</b>	64.5%	54.4%
<b>9 – 5 English</b>	43.8%	38.2%
<b>9 – 5 Maths</b>	39.8%	35.3%

PP Data	2023-24	2024-25
<b>Progress 8</b>	-1.26	N/A
<b>9 – 4 E &amp; M</b>	33.9%	30.8%
<b>9 – 5 E &amp; M</b>	18.6%	13.5%
<b>Attainment 8</b>	28.9	27.1
<b>9 – 4 English</b>	39%	41.5%
<b>9 – 4 Maths</b>	39%	36.9%
<b>9 – 5 English</b>	28.8%	27.7%
<b>9 – 5 Maths</b>	20.3%	18.5%

The attainment of Disadvantaged students in all national performance measures demonstrates a gap as compared to non-disadvantaged students. The attainment of disadvantaged students is less than both local and national average for each of the measures. The attainment of disadvantaged students for each measure shows a decline compared to the 2023-2024 outcomes. Progress 8 was not part of the accountability measures for 2024-2025 but based on the attainment of disadvantaged students they would not have made positive progress overall as a cohort.

## Attendance – 2024-2025

All Pupils	2023-2024	2024-2025
Overall	87.7%	87.8%
Persistent absence	39.9%	36.4%
Severe absence	5.2%	6.5%
Unauthorised absence	8.2%	5.1%

PP Data	2023-2024	2024-2025
Overall	83.7%	81.13%
Persistent absence	48.5%	52.6%
Severe absence	10.8%	11.3%
Unauthorised absence	14.40%	10.60%

The overall attendance of disadvantaged students is lower than that of non-disadvantaged students, with higher rates of persistent, severe and unauthorised absence, with the gap widening between 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.

## Suspensions – 2024-2025

All students	2023-2024	2024-2025
Suspensions	346	507
Permanent exclusions	1	1

PP Data	2023-2024	2024-2025
Suspensions	188	294
Permanent exclusions	0	0

The number of suspensions for disadvantaged students increased but this was against a backdrop of an increased rate of suspensions for all students. The proportion of disadvantaged students being suspended as a percentage of all suspensions has remained the same at around 54% However, as disadvantaged students only make up 36% of the total student population they are disproportionately represented.

## PP reading age data – 2024-2025\*

74 pupils were involved in some form of reading intervention. 34 of the 74 are PP students. 43 are SEND. 19 pupils are both PP and SEND. EEF benchmarks state an increase of 3 points is meaningful.

### Year 7 Phonics Support

	<b>Avg. SS</b>	<b>Avg. SS (PP)</b>	<b>Avg. SS (SEN)</b>	<b>Avg. SS (EAL)</b>
<b>Sept 2024</b>	69	69	69.4	69
<b>Feb 2025</b>	73.5	73.3	73.8	73.8
<b>Diff</b>	+4.5	+4.3	+4.4	+4.8

- PP gains in standardised scores in line with whole cohort and SEND.
- Significant increase of 4.3.
- Improvements in two PP pupils with extreme behaviour issues (+7 and +5 SS). Attendance is an issue to school and lessons, but they do attend phonics when they are in.
- PP students made 14 months additional progress on average.

### Year 8 Phonics Support

	<b>Avg. SS</b>	<b>Avg. SS (PP)</b>	<b>Avg. SS (SEN)</b>	<b>Avg. SS (EAL)</b>
<b>Sept 2024</b>	71	72	71	76
<b>Feb 2025</b>	74.5	84	74.5	75
<b>Diff</b>	+3.5	+12	+3.5	-1

- Small group intervention. One PP made +12 SS increase. Pupil has now moved onto lexia. This equates to 4 years and 3 months progress.

### Year 7 Lexia Support

	<b>Avg. SS</b>	<b>Avg. SS (PP)</b>	<b>Avg. SS (SEN)</b>	<b>Avg. SS (EAL)</b>
<b>Sept 2024</b>	72.12	71.75	72	71
<b>Mar 2025</b>	74.6	76.75	72.6	74.5
<b>Diff</b>	+2.48	+5	+0.6	+3.5

- 12.8 months average progress from pupils doing lexia.
- PP students made 16 months progress on average.

### Year 8 Lexia Support

	<b>Avg. SS</b>	<b>Avg. SS (PP)</b>	<b>Avg. SS (SEN)</b>	<b>Avg. SS (EAL)</b>
<b>Sept 2024</b>	76.25	77	73.25	N/A
<b>Mar 2025</b>	81.25	82	78.75	N/A
<b>Diff</b>	+5	+5	+5.5	N/A

- Large intervention groups with a mix of PP and SEND pupils.
- PP in line improvements.
- PP students made 13.4 months progress on average.

### Year 9 Lexia Support

	<b>Avg. SS</b>	<b>Avg. SS (PP)</b>	<b>Avg. SS (SEN)</b>	<b>Avg. SS (EAL)</b>
<b>Sept 2024</b>	69.7	70	69	76
<b>Mar 2025</b>	72.72	74.1	75.14	75
<b>Diff</b>	+3.03	+4.1	+5.14	-1

- PP pupils 15.1 months progress on average.
- Significant improvements in both PP and SEND pupils.

*\*End of year reading tests are not included in this analysis due to Hodder changing the format and test conditions SS are more accurate and therefore they do not align with the previous results. The results in this snapshot refer to The MARK scores from Hodder. The July 2025 Boost insights scores are included in next year's data for relevant comparison.*

## Externally provided programmes

<b>Programme</b>	<b>Provider</b>
GCSE Pod	Access Education
Sparx Maths	Sparx Maths
Sisra	Juniper Education
EAL Support	Flash Academy
Duke of Edinburgh	Duke of Edinburgh
Unravel	Unravel
Wellbeing area	Golddigger