

Carshalton Boys Sports College

Pupil Premium Strategy Statement

2025–28

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 this academic year, and the outcomes for disadvantaged pupils last academic year.

FINAL VERSION

School Overview

School name	Carshalton Boys Sports College
Number of pupils in school (11–16)	1,248
Proportion of pupil premium eligible pupils	32% (401 pupils)
Academic years covered by this strategy	2025/26 to 2027/28 (3-year plan)
Date this statement was published	September 2025
Date on which it will be reviewed	September 2026
Statement authorised by	Simon Barber, Jenny Gaylor
Pupil premium lead	Kristina Manuel, Assistant Principal (Inclusion)
Governor / Trustee lead	Katrina O'Brien

Funding Overview

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year	£409,575
Recovery premium funding carried forward	£0
Total budget for this academic year	£409,575

Part A: Pupil Premium Strategy Plan

Statement of Intent

At Carshalton Boys Sports College, our pupil premium strategy is driven by a determination to break the link between socioeconomic disadvantage and educational outcomes. With 32% of our 11–16 cohort (401 pupils) eligible for pupil premium funding, closing the attainment and progress gap is not a peripheral concern — it is central to everything we do.

Our approach is rooted in the evidence base established by the Education Endowment Foundation (EEF) and follows their recommended tiered model. We prioritise high-quality teaching as the single most impactful lever for improving outcomes, supplemented by targeted academic support and wider strategies that address the non-academic barriers our disadvantaged students face.

Our key principles: (1) Every teacher is a teacher of disadvantaged pupils.
(2) What works for disadvantaged pupils works for all pupils.
(3) Investment should follow the evidence: low-cost, high-impact strategies first.
(4) Attendance is the prerequisite for all learning.
(5) Aspiration without opportunity is hollow - we provide both.

Our current IDSR data reveals a stark picture:

Disadvantaged Progress 8 of -0.71, only 21.7% of disadvantaged boys achieving Grade 5+ in English and Maths (vs 53.1% nationally for non-disadvantaged peers), and 45% persistent absence among our FSM6 cohort. These figures demand urgent, evidence-based action. This strategy sets out how we will respond.

Barriers

This table details the key barriers to achievement identified among our disadvantaged pupils. These are informed by our IDSR data, internal assessments, and the school's self-evaluation.

No.	Barriers	Details
1	Literacy and oracy gaps at entry	Disadvantaged pupils arrive in Year 7 with significantly lower reading ages and limited academic vocabulary. 27% of students have EAL. Only 21.7% of disadvantaged students achieved Grade 5+ in English and Maths in 2025, compared with 53.1% nationally for non-disadvantaged peers — a gap of 31.4 percentage points.
2	Persistent absence among disadvantaged pupils	45% of FSM6-eligible pupils are persistently absent (national average significantly lower). Overall FSM6 attendance is 86.4%, compared with 90.7% whole-school. Year 10 attendance is the lowest at 89.3%, with 34% PA — a critical barrier at the start of GCSE courses.
3	Lower progress across all subjects	Disadvantaged Progress 8 is -0.71, equating to nearly one full grade below non-disadvantaged national peers across every GCSE subject. This gap persists despite whole-school P8 of -0.14.
4	Behavioural and social-emotional barriers	In 2023/24, 19.72% of disadvantaged pupils were suspended (1 in 5). Repeat suspensions among disadvantaged students were 11.39%. SEMH needs are rising alongside a 41% increase in the SEN cohort since 2022/23.
5	Aspiration and cultural capital deficit	Destinations data shows a decline from 94% (2021) to 91% (2023) in sustained post-16 pathways. Grade 5+ attainment gap locks 80% of disadvantaged boys out of competitive post-16 and university routes. Limited access to enrichment and professional networks.

Intended outcomes

This table explains the outcomes we are aiming for by the end of our current strategy plan (2027/28), and how we will measure whether they have been achieved.

No.	Intended outcome	Success criteria
1	Improved literacy and attainment in English and Maths for disadvantaged pupils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) Disadvantaged Grade 5+ in E&M rises from 21.7% to at least 35% by 2028 (5% a year). • b) Reading age gap at KS3 entry narrows year-on-year. • c) Disadvantaged P8 improves to at least -0.3.
2	Reduced persistent absence for disadvantaged pupils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) FSM6 PA rate falls from 45% to below 30% by 2028. • b) FSM6 overall attendance rises from 86.4% to at least 90%. • c) Year 10 attendance improves to above 92%.
3	Improved progress across the curriculum for disadvantaged pupils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) Disadvantaged P8 improves from -0.71 to at least -0.3 by 2028. • b) Disadvantaged A8 rises to within 5 points of whole-school average. • c) Gap to non-disadvantaged narrows in every subject bucket.
4	Improved behaviour outcomes and reduced suspensions for disadvantaged pupils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) FSM6 suspension rate falls from 19.72% to below 8% (sustained). • b) Repeat suspensions for disadvantaged drop below 5%. • c) Behaviour incidents for PP pupils reduce by 30%.
5	Raised aspirations and improved post-16 destinations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) Sustained positive destination rate for disadvantaged pupils exceeds 95%. • b) Increase in disadvantaged pupils accessing Level 3 courses post-16. • c) Every PP student receives at least 4 meaningful encounters with employers/HE by Year 11.

Activity in this academic year

This details how we intend to spend our pupil premium funding this academic year to address the barriers and achieve outcomes listed above. These strategies have been structured using the EEF's recommended tiered approach, with further details in their respective tables.

Tier	Evidence based rationale	Budgeted cost (£)
Tier 1: Teaching (High-Quality Teaching for All)	<i>EEF evidence is clear: high-quality teaching is the most important lever schools have to improve outcomes for disadvantaged pupils. Approaches in this tier have the strongest evidence base and represent the best value for money.</i>	210,000
Tier 2: Targeted Academic Support	Evidence consistently shows the positive impact of well-structured one-to-one and small group tuition as a supplement to (not replacement for) quality classroom teaching.	160,000
Tier 3: Wider Strategies	<i>Non-academic barriers — particularly attendance, behaviour, and wellbeing — can have a significant impact on outcomes. These strategies address the root causes that prevent disadvantaged pupils from benefiting fully from classroom teaching.</i>	105,000

Total budgeted cost: £475,000

(£210,000 Teaching + £160,000 Targeted Support + £105,000 Wider Strategies)

Tier 1: Teaching (High-Quality Teaching for All)

EEF evidence is clear: high-quality teaching is the most important lever schools have to improve outcomes for disadvantaged pupils. Approaches in this tier have the strongest evidence base and represent the best value for money.

Budgeted cost: £210,000

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Barrier number(s) addressed
<p>Metacognition and self-regulation training programme</p> <p>Whole-school CPD programme embedding explicit teaching of metacognitive strategies across all subjects.</p>	<p>EEF Teaching & Learning Toolkit: Metacognition and self-regulation = +8 months' progress. Very low cost. Evidence strength: High (355 studies).</p> <p>The single highest-impact, lowest-cost strategy in the entire EEF Toolkit. Effective across all phases and subjects.</p> <p><i>Total budget: £35,000</i></p>	1, 3
<p>High-quality feedback programme</p> <p>Structured CPD on effective feedback practices. Departmental coaching triads focused on responsive marking and verbal feedback.</p>	<p>EEF Toolkit: Feedback = +8 months' progress. Very low cost.</p> <p>Research shows improving feedback quality has transformative impact. Focus on task-level and process-level feedback, not personal praise.</p> <p><i>Total budget: £35,000</i></p>	1, 3
<p>Disciplinary literacy strategy</p> <p>Appointment of a Literacy Coordinator. Subject-specific academic vocabulary instruction. Reading across the curriculum programme.</p>	<p>EEF Toolkit: Reading comprehension strategies = +7 months' progress. Very low cost.</p> <p>EEF Toolkit: Oral language interventions = +6 months' progress. Very low cost. Especially effective for disadvantaged learners — the higher the proportion of disadvantaged pupils, the greater the impact.</p> <p><i>Total budget: £40,000</i></p>	1, 3, 5
<p>Collaborative learning structures</p> <p>Training all staff in structured collaborative learning techniques (Think-Pair-Share, Jigsaw, reciprocal teaching) with specific PP monitoring.</p>	<p>EEF Toolkit: Collaborative learning = +5 months' progress. Very low cost.</p> <p>Metacognition strategies are most effective when taught in collaborative groups where learners make their thinking explicit through structured discussion.</p> <p><i>Total budget: £35,000</i></p>	1, 3, 5
<p>Adaptive teaching CPD for stretch and challenge</p> <p>Targeted CPD addressing the 'glass ceiling' for high-prior-attaining disadvantaged pupils. Focus on higher-order questioning and curriculum depth.</p>	<p>IDSR data shows HPA A8 = 61.7 vs national 66.1 (sig-). Disadvantaged HPAs are significantly underperforming.</p> <p>EEF evidence: Quality First Teaching is the most cost-effective approach for all attainment groups.</p> <p><i>Total budget: £65,000</i></p>	1, 3

Tier 2: Targeted Academic Support

Evidence consistently shows the positive impact of well-structured one-to-one and small group tuition as a supplement to (not replacement for) quality classroom teaching.

Budgeted cost: £160,000

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Barrier addressed
<p>Small-group English and Maths tuition</p> <p>Targeted tuition for disadvantaged pupils on the Grade 4/5 boundary (3 pupils per group, 3 sessions per week). Delivered by qualified teachers, not teaching assistants.</p>	<p>EEF Toolkit: Small group tuition = +4 months' progress. High cost.</p> <p>Most effective with groups of 3 or fewer, delivered by qualified teachers with structured curricula, at least 3 times per week over a sustained period.</p> <p><i>Total budget: £70,000</i></p>	1, 3
<p>Structured literacy intervention (KS3)</p> <p>Phonics-based catch-up programme for Year 7 and 8 students with reading ages below chronological age. Daily 20-minute sessions.</p>	<p>EEF Toolkit: Phonics = +5 months' progress. Very low cost.</p> <p>EEF Toolkit: Reading comprehension strategies = +7 months' progress. Very low cost.</p> <p>27% EAL cohort requires explicit language and decoding instruction alongside comprehension strategy teaching.</p> <p><i>Total budget: £25,000</i></p>	1
<p>One-to-one academic mentoring</p> <p>Dedicated academic mentors for Year 10 and 11 PP students at risk of underperformance. Weekly mentoring focused on study skills, metacognition, and subject-specific gaps.</p>	<p>EEF Toolkit: One-to-one tuition = +5 months' progress. Moderate cost, but targeted at highest-need students.</p> <p>Combined with metacognitive strategies, mentoring addresses both academic gaps and self-regulation deficits.</p> <p><i>Total budget: £45,000</i></p>	1, 3, 5
<p>Homework and revision support club</p> <p>After-school supervised study space with access to resources, technology, and teacher support. Priority access for PP students.</p>	<p>EEF Toolkit: Homework (secondary) = +5 months' progress. Very low cost.</p> <p>Provides structured study environment for students who lack quiet space at home. Removes practical barriers to independent study.</p> <p><i>Total budget: £20,000</i></p>	1, 3, 5

Tier 3: Wider Strategies

Non-academic barriers — particularly attendance, behaviour, and wellbeing — can have a significant impact on outcomes. These strategies address the root causes that prevent disadvantaged pupils from benefiting fully from classroom teaching.

Budgeted cost: £105,000

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
<p>Attendance mentoring and intervention programme Dedicated Attendance Officer for PP cohort. Daily first-day-absence calling. Tiered intervention: letters, meetings, home visits, parenting contracts. Termly rewards programme.</p>	<p>DfE research: Every 1% increase in attendance = approximately 5–6 additional GCSE grade points. FSM6 PA rate of 45% is the single biggest barrier to improved outcomes. No intervention can work if students are not in school.</p> <p><i>Total budget: £15,000</i></p>	2
<p>Year 10 attendance recovery programme Targeted intervention for Year 10 cohort (89.3% attendance, 34% PA). Personalised attendance plans, period-by-period monitoring, family engagement.</p>	<p>Year 10 is the critical transition year when GCSE content begins. 34% PA rate means one-third of the cohort is missing the foundation of their exam courses. EEF evidence on mentoring (+2 months) combined with attendance-specific interventions.</p> <p><i>Total budget: £30,000</i></p>	2
<p>ELSA and SEMH support expansion Expand Emotional Literacy Support Assistant (ELSA) provision from 3 to 5 trained staff. Structured wellbeing check-ins for all PP students. SEMH intervention groups.</p>	<p>EEF Toolkit: Social and emotional learning = +4 months' progress. Very low cost. SEMH needs are rising (41% SEN increase since 2022/23). 1 in 4 SEN pupils were suspended in 2023/24 — proactive wellbeing support reduces crisis-driven exclusion.</p> <p><i>Total budget: £25,000</i></p>	4
<p>Restorative behaviour approach Whole-school shift from purely punitive sanctions to restorative justice practices. Staff training in de-escalation, restorative conferencing, and trauma-informed approaches.</p>	<p>EEF Toolkit: Behaviour interventions = +4 months' progress. Moderate cost. Addresses disproportionate suspension of PP pupils (19.72% in 2023/24). Restorative approaches rebuild relationships and reduce repeat incidents.</p> <p><i>Total budget: £18,000</i></p>	4
<p>Enrichment, cultural capital, and aspirations programme Termly careers and employer encounters. University visits for PP students. Subject-specific enrichment trips. PP student access to all extracurricular activities (subsidised).</p>	<p>EEF Toolkit: Aspiration interventions are most effective when combined with practical academic support. Destinations data declining (94% to 91%). 80% of PP students currently locked out of competitive post-16 routes by Grade 5+ gap.</p> <p><i>Total budget: £17,000</i></p>	5

Part B: Review of the previous academic year

Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils

The following data summarises the performance of our disadvantaged pupils in the 2024/25 academic year, drawn from national assessments, IDSR data, and internal monitoring.

Attainment

- Disadvantaged Grade 5+ in English and Maths: 21.7% (national non-disadvantaged: 53.1%). Gap: -31.4 percentage points, narrowing from -34.8 in 2023.
- Disadvantaged Grade 4+ in English and Maths: gap of -28.1 to national non-disadvantaged, narrowing from -29.4.
- Whole-school Attainment 8: 45.0–45.4 (close to national average but plateaued over three years).
- Low prior attainers achieved A8 of 32.0 vs national 25.2 (significantly above) — evidence that intensive support works.
- High prior attainers achieved A8 of 61.7 vs national 66.1 (significantly below) — stretch and challenge remains a concern.

Progress

- Whole-school Progress 8: -0.14 (below national average of -0.03).
- Disadvantaged Progress 8: -0.71, equating to approximately -0.88 grades per subject below non-disadvantaged national peers.
- All eight P8 progress measures rated 'below' national averages.

Attendance

- Whole-school attendance: 90.7% (national: 91.9%).
- FSM6 attendance: 86.4% (relative decline against peers).
- FSM6 persistent absence: 45.0% (significantly above national, a systemic concern for three consecutive years).
- Year 10 attendance: 89.3% with 34% persistent absence (lowest year group).

Behaviour

- FSM6 suspension rate improved from 19.72% (2023/24) to 7.69% (Autumn 2024/25) — a significant reduction, though still approximately double the whole-school rate.
- SEN suspension rate improved from 24.74% to 10.43%.
- Permanent exclusions reduced from 12 (2022/23) to 8 (2023/24) to 3 (Autumn term 2024/25).

Assessment of previous strategy

Our analysis indicates that Tier 1 (teaching quality) interventions showed the strongest return, consistent with EEF evidence. The success of our low prior attainer cohort (A8 significantly above national) demonstrates that intensive, scaffolded support delivers results. However, this expertise has not been equitably distributed across the disadvantaged cohort. Tier 3 (attendance) interventions have been insufficient given the scale of the challenge. The 45% persistent absence rate for disadvantaged students means that even the highest-quality classroom teaching cannot reach nearly half of our most vulnerable learners. This strategy therefore significantly increases investment in attendance intervention.

Externally provided programmes

The following non-DfE programmes were used, in part funded through pupil premium:

Programme	Provider
Educational Psychology Service	London Borough of Sutton
Specialist Behaviour Support Worker	London Borough of Sutton
Speech and Language Therapy	Local Authority SLA
ASD Specialist Support	Adapptolearn
Occupational Therapy	NHS

Further information

This strategy has been developed using the EEF’s recommended tiered approach and draws directly on the EEF Teaching and Learning Toolkit evidence base. Our spending is deliberately weighted towards Tier 1 (Teaching) as the evidence is clear that high-quality teaching is the most impactful and cost-effective lever for improving outcomes for disadvantaged pupils.

We have prioritised low-cost, high-impact strategies from the EEF Toolkit, including metacognition (+8 months), feedback (+8 months), reading comprehension (+7 months), and oral language interventions (+6 months). These represent the strongest evidence base and the best value for pupil premium investment.

This strategy is a living document. It will be reviewed termly by the senior leadership team and annually by the governing body. Impact data will be tracked through half-termly progress reviews, attendance monitoring, behaviour logs, and student voice surveys. Adjustments will be made in-year where the evidence indicates a change of approach is needed.

Key evidence sources

- EEF Teaching and Learning Toolkit (2025 update)
- EEF Guide to the Pupil Premium (2024)
- DfE Using Pupil Premium: Guidance for School Leaders (March 2025)
- CBSC IDSR Data (February 2026)
- CBSC Self-Evaluation Form and School Development Plan