

Pupil Premium Strategy Statement

This statement details our college's use of pupil premium funding to help improve the attainment of our disadvantaged students.

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 college.

College overview

Detail	Data
College name	Kingsbridge Community College
Number of students in college	KS3 - 992 KS5 - 223 Total - 1215
Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible students	12.8%
Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers (3 year plans are recommended)	Academic Year: 2025 - 2026 3-year cycle: 2025 – 2026 2026 – 2027 2027 - 2028
Date this statement was published	December 2025
Date on which it will be reviewed	September 2026
Statement authorised by	Tina Graham (Principal)
Pupil premium lead	Kelly Ray (Assistant Principal)
Governor / Trustee lead	Julian Bates

Funding overview

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year	£148,900
Pupil premium funding carried forward from previous years (enter £0 if not applicable)	£0
Total budget for this academic year If your college is an academy in a trust that pools this funding, state the amount available to your college this academic year	£148,900

Part A: Pupil Premium Strategy Plan

Statement of intent

Our intention is that all students, irrespective of their background or the challenges they face, make good progress and achieve high attainment across the curriculum which equips our young people with the qualifications, skills and personal attributes to lead happy and fulfilling lives.

The focus of our pupil premium strategy is to support disadvantaged students to achieve that goal, including progress for those who are already high attainers. We will consider the challenges faced by vulnerable students, such as those who have a social worker and young carers. The activity we have outlined in this statement is also intended to support their needs, regardless of whether they are disadvantaged or not.

High-quality teaching is at the heart of our approach, with a focus on areas in which disadvantaged students require the most support. We use our Ordinarily Available Inclusive Provision (OAIP) offer to achieve this. Our approach is proven to have the greatest impact on closing the disadvantage attainment gap and at the same time will benefit the non-disadvantaged students in our college. Implicit in the intended outcomes detailed below, is the intention that non-disadvantaged students' attainment will be sustained and improved alongside progress for their disadvantaged peers.

Our approach will be responsive to common challenges and individual needs, rooted in robust diagnostic assessment, not assumptions about the impact of disadvantage. The approaches we have adopted complement each other to help students excel.

Challenges

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

Challenge number	Detail of challenge
1	Students eligible for PP do not make progress in line with their similar prior attaining non-PP peers.
2	Students eligible for PP have lower literacy rates which is contributing to lower outcomes. This is evident through assessments, observations and discussions with students. Literacy, and vocabulary in particular, are limiting factors in progress and attainment.
3	Students eligible for PP are disproportionately issued with consequences or removed from lessons. Data shows that lower attaining, disadvantaged students and those disadvantaged students with SEN spend a disproportionate amount of time in Parking, Internal Exclusion or being suspended, suggesting metacognitive and self-regulation strategies are lacking as well as a lack of engagement with college in general. This has increased since the pandemic and college closures suggesting a greater negative impact on disadvantaged students.

4	Attendance for PP students is below that of non-PP students. There are higher rates of persistent absence in PP than non-PP students and, on average, PP attendance is consistently lower than that of non-PP peers. This is carefully monitored, and timely responses are in place but the gap remains significant.
5	There is a lower proportion of PP students participating in extracurricular provision. Data gathered at every extra-curricular club shows that fewer PP students are involved in extra-curricular activities. This may be tied to Challenge 3 whereby PP students are in consequences and therefore unable to attend. Research suggests this is indicative of an overall lack of engagement in college.

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 are in line with similar prior attaining students who are non-PP	By the end of our current 3-year plan there is no difference in performance between PP and non-PP peers with regard to outcomes.
Literacy rates for year 7 students improve	Number of students needing additional literacy intervention has reduced. Any additional support needed is identified promptly.
PP students are more proportionately represented in behaviour data	Parking, Internal Exclusion and suspension data will reduce, and show similar proportions of PP students represented as their non-PP peers.
Attendance of PP students in line with non-PP peers.	Attendance figures above Devon and at least in line with national averages with no gaps between PP and non-PP attendance. Persistent absence will be at a minimum with clear evidence that early interventions to identify barriers, support plans with timely interventions are in place, prioritising PP students .
An increasing number of PP students participate in extra curricular activities.	Participation data will evidence higher number of PP students participating in extra-curricular activities term on term and year on year.

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.

Teaching (for example, CPD, recruitment and retention)

Budgeted cost: £71,540

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
High Quality First Teaching implemented through weekly Instructional Coaching for staff in 6-weekly blocks.	Instructional Coaching has been evidenced as having a high impact on PP outcomes whilst maintaining and boosting the outcomes of all students. Sutton Trust and EEF data demonstrates that high quality teaching has a greater impact on PP students than non-PP peers. This also aims to meet the needs of individual students in the classroom. The coaching programme is lead by 2 members of staff with specific responsibility for coordinating the strategy.	1, 2, 3
CPD and on-going development opportunities to improve practice in pedagogical principles underpinned by TLAC and OAIP strategies.	EEF guidance on SEN in the classroom focused on the benefits of consistent pedagogical principles which are evidence informed. EEF guidance supports the use of 5 key methods of adaptive teaching. Staff skills at adapting practice increases outcomes.	1, 2
Accessibility to the curriculum, high quality delivery of lessons ensuring all students make rapid progress, minimising disruption allowing for progress to be made.	EEF guidance on meeting the needs of individuals in the classroom to ensure scaffolding and modelling appropriate for all. Constant review of the curriculum through ESW teams to ensure curriculum is best available model.	1, 2, 3

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

Budgeted cost: £62,760

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Small group and 1:1 provision of Lexia and Read Write Fresh Start Phonics literacy to close gaps in year 7 to 9 students.	EEF guidance on small group and 1:1 provision used to target individuals. Lexia – EEF teachers toolkit identified that students using Lexia make 6 months additional progress on average. Lexia Reading Core5® EEF	1, 2
Small group intervention to bridge gaps in English and Maths	Targeted intervention with subject specialists. Small group tuition shown to be effective in addressing gaps Teaching Assistant Interventions EEF	2

Referral into Inclusion Hub for supported curriculum adjustments in order to ensure unmet needs are identified and addressed as quickly as possible.	EEF guidance on meeting needs of individuals and identifying the needs of individual as part of the Graduated Response. NASEN and Whole College SEND guidance on provision mapping and effective college culture. Teaching Assistant Interventions EEF	1, 2, 3
--	--	---------

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

Budgeted cost: £14,600

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Attendance strategy is systematic and robust and focuses on PP students' attendance increasing and being better than the national average of non-PP students	Embedding principles of good practice set out in DFE's Improving College Attendance. Working closely with safeguarding leads, Inclusion Leads and Raising Standards Leads to ensure absence is identified and acted upon very quickly. Supporting attendance EEF	4
Raising Standards Leads appointed with a specific DS remit focusing on sense of attendance, behaviour for learning and developing a sense of belonging	Evidence already cited from the EEF which links to the Improving Behaviour in Schools guidance. Improving behaviour in schools EEF	1,2,3
Culture of celebration and success increases participation in extra-curricular activities for PP students	Reducing exclusions research suggests that celebration of all helps to engage students in college. Monitoring this ensures we can intervene early and build cultural capital and positively discriminate to promote opportunities for PP students.	5

Total budgeted cost: £148,300

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 students in the 2024-25 academic year.

Gaps in data reduced	Data from academic year 24-25 shows whole college progress recorded as +0.58 (internal progress data). The gap between PP and non PP students was -1.28. We recognise that the gap between DS and Non-DS remains and is widening and our strategy moving forward will continue to have the reduction in the gap at its core. A review of interventions and the raising standards process has taken place with personalised targeted support being put in place where appropriate to close the gap.
Attendance	Attendance figures show gaps continue however, a new 4 tier improving attendance strategy with a detailed provision map to support a graduated response to improving attendance is now in place. This includes early intervention by tutors, supporting PA students with personalised plans utilising the Inclusion Hub and evidence-based referrals to access LA support (SI9) for those unable to attend on medical grounds.
Extracurricular	PP students are underrepresented compared to non-PP students. Through improved data analysis, we have a systematic approach to monitoring and tracking participation in extracurricular and enrichment activities and are able to be strategically target DS students for participation. We actively seek student voice to further explore the barriers that prevent our DS students from taking part in enrichment activities. The 11 by 11 programme will form a core part of our offer going forward as part of our Discovery Curriculum.

Externally provided programmes

Please include the names of any non-DfE programmes that you purchased in the previous academic year. This will help the Department for Education identify which ones are popular in England

Programme	Provider