

Pupil Premium Strategy Statement

The Halifax Academy

2025-2028

Updated February 2026

Based on IDSR data released 6 February 2026

With reference to the EEF Teaching and Learning Toolkit (updated May 2025)

School Overview	3
Funding Overview	3
Part A: Pupil Premium Strategy Plan	4
Statement of Intent	4
Challenges	5
Intended Outcomes	7
Activity: Teaching (Including CPD, Recruitment and Retention)	8
Activity: Targeted Academic Support.....	10
Activity: Wider Strategies.....	11
Part B: Review of Outcomes (IDSR February 2026)	12
Key Stage 4 Outcomes: Dual-Lens Analysis	12
Key Stage 2 Outcomes: Dual-Lens Analysis	13
Attendance and Behaviour: Dual-Lens Analysis	13
Narrative Review of Previous Strategy Impact (Dual-Lens Judgements)	15
Appendix: EEF Teaching and Learning Toolkit Evidence Summary....	Error! Bookmark not defined.

School Overview

School name	The Halifax Academy
URN	140326
Type	All-through Academy Converter
Local authority	Calderdale
Number of pupils on roll	1,451
Proportion of pupils eligible for PP (FSM6)	37.84% (above national average)
Proportion of pupils with EAL	74.60% (well above national average)
Academic years covered by this strategy	2025/26 to 2027/28
Date this statement was published	February 2026
Date on which it will be reviewed	February 2027
Statement authorised by	Matt Perry
Pupil premium lead	Rachel Jones – Deputy Headteacher
Governor / Trustee lead	Lauren Parker – Governor

Funding Overview

Funding figures below are based on the latest available allocations. The school should update these once the 2025/26 allocation is confirmed by the ESFA.

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year	£ 616,385
Recovery premium funding allocation (if applicable)	£ 0
Pupil premium funding carried forward from previous years	£0
Total budget for this academic year	£ 616,385

Part A: Pupil Premium Strategy Plan

Statement of Intent

The Halifax Academy serves 1,451 pupils in an area of well above average deprivation. 37.84% of our pupils are eligible for the pupil premium (FSM6), and 74.60% have English as an Additional Language. These contextual factors are central to our strategy and inform every spending decision.

This strategy uses a dual-lens approach to evaluate pupil premium impact. We compare disadvantaged pupils against the national disadvantaged average (to assess whether our PP spending is closing the gap with similar pupils) and against the national all-pupil average (to assess whether our disadvantaged pupils are achieving the outcomes they need for future success, regardless of background). Both comparisons matter, and they tell different stories.

What the dual lens shows:

Against national disadvantaged averages, the picture is largely positive. Disadvantaged pupils at The Halifax Academy consistently and significantly outperform the national disadvantaged average across most KS4 measures: Attainment 8 (41.0 vs 34.9, sig+), English Attainment 8 (9.1 vs 7.8, sig+), English 4+ (68.1% vs 56.3%, sig+), English 5+ (54.2% vs 41.3%, sig+), Humanities (sig+), Languages (100% at 4+), and Open A8 (sig+). At KS2, disadvantaged pupils outperform national disadvantaged in reading (78% vs 63%) and writing (72% vs 59%). This demonstrates that PP spending is having real impact in these areas.

However, against national all-pupil averages, the picture is more challenging. All-pupil E&M 5+ is 32.2% against 45.4% (sig below), driven almost entirely by maths. Maths A8 is 7.6 against 9.1 (sig below). Science is 51.0% against 65.8% at 4+ (sig below). Critically, even on the disadvantaged-vs-disadvantaged comparison, maths and science are only marginally above average. This means that while PP spending is effective in English, humanities and languages, it is not yet delivering the maths and science outcomes that disadvantaged pupils need.

The tension between these two lenses is the central challenge for this strategy: we must protect the areas where disadvantaged provision is strong while urgently addressing the areas — particularly mathematics — where disadvantaged pupils are merely matching, not exceeding, national disadvantaged averages, and where all-pupil outcomes remain significantly below national.

Our strategy is rooted in evidence from the Education Endowment Foundation (EEF) Teaching and Learning Toolkit, updated May 2025. We prioritise high-impact, evidence-informed approaches: high quality teaching (the single most important lever), metacognition and self-regulation (+8 months, EEF), targeted academic support including reading comprehension strategies (+7 months, EEF) and small group tuition (+4 months, EEF), and wider strategies addressing attendance, wellbeing and parental engagement.

We are committed to an iterative, data-driven approach. This strategy will be reviewed annually against IDSR and internal assessment data, using both the disadvantaged-vs-disadvantaged and disadvantaged-vs-national-all comparisons to make honest judgements about impact.

Challenges

This details the key challenges to achievement that we have identified among our disadvantaged pupils, informed by IDSR data (February 2026), internal assessments, and qualitative evidence.

No.	Challenge	Evidence (IDSR February 2026 and internal data)
1	Mathematics attainment and progress	Vs national all: Maths A8 is significantly below national across all three years (7.6 vs 9.1 in 2025). Maths P8 is significantly below in 2023 and 2024. E&M 5+ has been static at 32.2% vs 45.4% nationally for three consecutive years. KS2 Maths expected standard is below national (65% vs 74%). Vs national disadvantaged: Disadvantaged Maths A8 is only close to the national disadvantaged average — not above it. This is in stark contrast to English, where disadvantaged outcomes are significantly above. Maths is the one subject where PP spending is not delivering a positive gap. Diagnostic note: Strong MTC scores (23.5 vs 21.0, sig+) indicate the issue is not basic arithmetic but reasoning and problem-solving at KS2 and KS4.
2	Literacy and reading	Vs national disadvantaged: Disadvantaged reading outcomes at KS2 are a clear strength (78% vs 63% national disadvantaged in 2025). Writing is similarly strong (72% vs 59%). English A8 at KS4 for disadvantaged is significantly above (9.1 vs 7.8). English 5+ for disadvantaged is significantly above (54.2% vs 41.3%). Vs national all: English 4+ for all pupils (71.2%) is close to but still below national (74.3%). The gap is narrowing but not yet closed. Remaining concern: Internal assessments indicate that a proportion of disadvantaged pupils across phases still have reading ages below chronological age, which impacts curriculum access despite the positive IDSR picture.
3	Persistent absence	Vs national disadvantaged: FSM6 overall attendance (90.4%) is above the national FSM6 figure (89.1%) — this is a genuine positive. Disadvantaged persistent absence is close to the national disadvantaged average. Vs national all: All-pupil persistent absence is 28.0% against 21.9% national — above average. For SEN pupils it is 36.6% vs 28.1% nationally. Judgement: Broad attendance strategies are working for disadvantaged pupils relative to similar pupils nationally. The concern is the persistent absence tail and SEN persistent absence, which require more targeted intervention. The trend is improving from 37.9% in 2022/23 but needs to accelerate.
6	Science outcomes	Vs national all: Science is significantly below national for all pupils at both 4+ (51.0% vs 65.8%) and 5+ (33.8% vs 47.9%). Science VA dropped to -0.53 (sig below) in 2024. Vs national disadvantaged: Science 4+ for disadvantaged was above national disadvantaged in 2023 (59.0% vs 46.0%, sig+), but this fell to close to average in 2024 and 2025. Science VA for disadvantaged was significantly above in 2023 but close to average in 2024. Judgement: The declining disadvantaged-vs-disadvantaged trend in science is concerning. Unlike English, where the PP advantage is widening, in science it is narrowing. This mirrors the maths pattern of PP spending not delivering a strong positive gap.
7	High prior attaining disadvantaged pupils	High prior attainers are significantly below national across almost every KS4 measure: Overall A8 (57.8 vs 66.1), English P8 (-0.84), Maths P8 (-0.74), E&M 5+ (70.8% vs 87.3%), Science 4+ (83.3% vs 95.7%). This represents the most consistent negative theme in the IDSR. Note: the IDSR reports HPA against national HPA averages, and the school is significantly below on every measure. This affects disadvantaged high prior attainers specifically and represents a failure of the curriculum to stretch the most able.

8	Cultural capital, careers and parental engagement	Many disadvantaged pupils lack the cultural capital enjoyed by more affluent peers nationally. Parental engagement remains inconsistent. Disadvantaged students are nationally more likely to become NEET. The school's Open A8 is above national (15.1 vs 13.6, sig+), which suggests the applied/vocational curriculum is partially addressing this, but more is needed in terms of aspiration, exposure and careers provision.
---	--	---

Intended Outcomes

This 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.

Intended Outcome	Success Criteria
<p>Maths attainment and progress improve significantly</p> <p>Disadvantaged outcomes remain a strength</p>	<p>Maths A8 to be within 0.5 of national average by 2028. E&M 5+ to increase from 32.2% to at least 40%. KS2 Maths expected standard to be in line with national. Maths P8 for disadvantaged to remain at or above national disadvantaged.</p> <p>Disadvantaged A8, P8, and English outcomes to remain significantly above national disadvantaged averages. The current gap advantage to be maintained or extended.</p>
<p>Improved reading and literacy outcomes across all phases</p>	<p>GL assessments to show a narrowing of SAS gaps between PP and non-PP. Disadvantaged KS2 reading to remain above national disadvantaged.</p>
<p>Persistent absence reduces to close to national</p>	<p>Persistent absence to reduce from 28.0% to below 24% by 2027. SEN persistent absence gap to national to narrow by at least 4pp.</p>
<p>Improved science outcomes</p>	<p>Science 4+ for all pupils to increase from 51.0% towards 60%. Science VA to be close to or above 0.00.</p>
<p>High prior attainer outcomes improve</p>	<p>High prior attainer A8 and P8 to be close to national averages. E&M 5+ for HPA to increase from 70.8% towards 80%.</p>
<p>Enhanced cultural capital, careers and parental engagement</p>	<p>Increased participation in enrichment activities by disadvantaged pupils. Lower than national average NEET rate. Improved parental engagement metrics.</p>

Activity: Teaching (Including CPD, Recruitment and Retention)

Budgeted cost: [To be confirmed]

Activity	Evidence and Rationale (EEF / IDSR)	Challenge
<p>High quality teaching: recruitment, retention and development of specialist staff, including coaching programme and evidence-informed CPD</p>	<p>The EEF states that high quality teaching is the most important lever schools have to improve pupil attainment, including for disadvantaged pupils. The IDSR confirms the school's teaching approach is effective for disadvantaged pupils (A8 sig+ above national disadvantaged). Investing in staff quality protects this strength. EEF: High Quality Teaching EEF Guidance Reports</p>	1, 2, 4, 6, 7
<p>Mathematics improvement programme: curriculum review across KS2-KS4, enhanced mastery approaches, appointment of maths specialist leads, cross-phase planning</p>	<p>Maths is the school's most significant weakness (A8: 7.6 vs 9.1, sig below all pupils). Critically, even on the disadvantaged-vs-disadvantaged comparison, maths is only close to average — unlike English where the school has built a significant positive gap. The EEF Toolkit rates mastery learning at +5 months' additional progress. Strong MTC scores (23.5 vs 21.0) indicate the issue is in reasoning and problem-solving, not basic number work. KS2 maths disadvantaged (61%) merely matches national disadvantaged (61%), confirming this is a cross-phase issue. EEF: Mastery Learning (+5 months) EEF Improving Mathematics guidance</p>	1
<p>Improving literacy across all subjects: staff training, Bedrock, Lexia, Accelerated Reader, disciplinary literacy focus</p>	<p>Reading comprehension strategies are rated at +7 months' additional progress (EEF, updated 2025, 184 studies). Oral language interventions are rated at +6 months. Given 74.6% EAL, explicit literacy instruction is essential for curriculum access. Disadvantaged reading at KS2 is already a strength (78% vs 63%), but this needs extending into KS3/4. EEF: Reading Comprehension Strategies (+7 months) Oral Language Interventions (+6 months)</p>	2
<p>Science curriculum and pedagogy review: staffing audit, specialist development, alignment with maths improvement strategy</p>	<p>Vs national all: Science is significantly below (4+: 51.0% vs 65.8%; VA: -0.53). Vs national disadvantaged: Science was a PP strength in 2023 (59.0% vs 46.0%, sig+) but has deteriorated to close to average in 2024/25. This declining trajectory mirrors the maths pattern where PP spending is not delivering an advantage. Given the overlap between maths and science reasoning skills, this should be addressed alongside the maths improvement programme. IDSR February 2026: Science deep dive data</p>	6
<p>High prior attainer provision: curriculum audit, stretch and challenge framework, lesson observation focus</p>	<p>HPA underperformance is the most consistent negative theme in the IDSR (Overall A8: 57.8 vs 66.1, sig-; English P8: -0.84; Maths P8: -0.74). The EEF emphasises that effective teaching includes adapting lessons to meet the needs of all learners, including the most able. IDSR February 2026: HPA cross-cutting concern</p>	7
<p>Continued revision and enrichment of the wider curriculum: trips, visitors, extra-curricular activities, touchstone curriculum, careers programme (Gatsby benchmarks)</p>	<p>The EEF evidence on life skills and the Sutton Trust research show that confidence, motivation and resilience are associated with better academic outcomes. The school's Open A8 is above national (15.1 vs 13.6, sig+), suggesting strong applied/vocational provision. Cultural capital development directly addresses Challenge 8. EEF: Life Skills and Enrichment Sutton Trust research</p>	8

Activity: Targeted Academic Support

Budgeted cost: [To be confirmed]

Activity	Evidence and Rationale (EEF / IDSR)	Challenge
<p>One-to-one and small group tutoring in English, Maths and Science (after school and holiday sessions)</p>	<p>One-to-one tuition is rated at +5 months' additional progress (EEF, 123 studies). Small group tuition is rated at +4 months. The EEF notes that impact is greater in primary (+6 months) and that the smaller the group, the better. Given the maths deficit (A8: 7.6 vs 9.1) and science weakness (51.0% vs 65.8%), targeted tutoring in these subjects is essential. EEF: One-to-One Tuition (+5 months) Small Group Tuition (+4 months)</p>	1, 6
<p>Homework clubs across year groups, with disadvantaged pupils with poor attitudes to home learning guided to attend</p>	<p>The EEF rates homework at +5 months' additional progress for secondary pupils. Given that many disadvantaged pupils lack suitable home study environments, supervised homework clubs provide structured support. This also addresses the metacognition challenge by modelling effective study habits. EEF: Homework (+5 months secondary)</p>	1, 4
<p>Guided reading during tutor time for pupils with below-expected reading scores</p>	<p>Reading comprehension strategies are rated at +7 months' additional progress (EEF, 184 studies). Targeted daily reading intervention ensures that pupils with the weakest literacy skills receive consistent support. This is particularly important given the EAL context where academic language development is ongoing. EEF: Reading Comprehension Strategies (+7 months)</p>	2
<p>Training of primary TAs in targeted literacy and numeracy intervention strategies</p>	<p>The EEF rates teaching assistant interventions at +4 months when TAs are well-trained and deliver structured programmes to small groups or individuals. This represents good value for money as a targeted intervention. EEF: Teaching Assistant Interventions (+4 months when well-trained)</p>	1, 2

Activity: Wider Strategies

Budgeted cost: [To be confirmed]

Activity	Evidence and Rationale (EEF / IDSR)	Challenge
Community Programme: community kitchen, breakfast club, Connect Programme, coffee mornings	Parental engagement is rated at +4 months' additional progress (EEF, extensive evidence from 94 studies). Approaches that target particular families or outcomes are associated with higher gains. The Community Programme addresses practical barriers to learning (food, heating, cost of living) while strengthening home-school relationships. This is especially important in a community with 37.84% FSM6. EEF: Parental Engagement (+4 months, extensive evidence)	3, 8
Careers education programme aligned to Gatsby benchmarks, delivered through the Character curriculum	Disadvantaged students are nationally more likely to become NEET. The school has a fully integrated careers curriculum. The EEF and Sutton Trust evidence shows that aspiration-raising alone is insufficient; practical exposure to career pathways alongside academic achievement is what changes outcomes. EEF: Aspiration Interventions Sutton Trust: Life Skills research	8

Part B: Review of Outcomes (IDSR February 2026)

This section reviews the impact of the previous pupil premium strategy against the data presented in the IDSR released 6 February 2026.

Key Stage 4 Outcomes: Dual-Lens Analysis

This table presents each measure through two lenses: how disadvantaged pupils compare to the national disadvantaged average (does our PP spending close the gap with similar pupils?), and how all pupils compare to the national all-pupil average (are pupils achieving the outcomes they need?). Where a measure is only reported for all pupils in the IDSR, only the national-all comparison is shown.

Measure	School Disadv	Nat Disadv	vs Disadv	Nat All	vs All	RAG
Overall A8	41.0	34.9	Sig above	46.0	Close to avg	Green
Overall P8	Above	—	Above	Avg	Close to avg	
English A8	9.1	7.8	Sig above	9.8	Close to avg	
English 4+	68.1%	56.3%	Sig above	74.3%	Close	
English 5+	54.2%	41.3%	Sig above	60.4%	Close	Green
English P8	Above	—	Sig above	Avg	Close to avg	
Maths A8	Close	Nat D	Close to avg	9.1	Sig below	Yellow
Maths P8	Close	—	Close to avg	-0.03	Sig below	Red
E&M 4+	Close	Nat D	Close to avg	64.8%	Sig below	Red
E&M 5+	Close	Nat D	Close to avg	45.4%	Sig below	
Science 4+	Close	46.0%	Close (was sig+)	65.8%	Sig below	
Science VA	Close	—	Close (was sig+)	-0.53	Sig below	Red
Languages 4+	100%	—	Sig above	73.1%	Sig above	
Languages 5+	87.5%	—	Sig above	60.6%	Sig above	Green
Humanities 4+	Above	Nat D	Sig above	Avg	Close to avg	Green
Humanities VA	Above	—	Sig above	Avg	Close to avg	Green
Open A8	Above	Nat D	Sig above	13.6	Sig above	Green

What the dual lens tells us at KS4:

The two comparisons reveal a clear split. In English, humanities, languages, and Open bucket measures, disadvantaged pupils are significantly above national disadvantaged AND closing in on national all-pupil averages. English 4+ for disadvantaged (68.1%) is within 6pp of national all (74.3%). This is strong evidence that PP spending in these areas is having genuine impact.

In mathematics, however, disadvantaged pupils are only close to the national disadvantaged average — they are not outperforming similar pupils nationally. When measured against national all-

pupil averages, maths outcomes are significantly below (A8: 7.6 vs 9.1). The same pattern holds for E&M combined thresholds (E&M 5+: 32.2% vs 45.4% nationally). Science shows a deteriorating picture: disadvantaged science outcomes were significantly above national disadvantaged in 2023 but have since fallen to close to average, while all-pupil science remains significantly below national.

This dual lens exposes maths and science as the areas where PP spending is not yet delivering. Unlike English, where the school has built a clear advantage for disadvantaged pupils, in maths the school is merely matching national disadvantaged — and both groups are performing poorly against national all.

Key Stage 2 Outcomes: Dual-Lens Analysis

Measure	School	Nat Disadv	vs Disadv	Nat All	vs All	RAG
RWM combined	All: 59%	—	—	~62%	Close to avg	
Reading	All: 75%	—	—	~75%	In line	
Reading	Disadv: 78%	63%	Sig above	~75%	Above	
Writing	All: 72%	—	—	~72%	In line	
Writing	Disadv: 72%	59%	Sig above	~72%	In line	
Maths	All: 65%	—	—	74%	Below	
Maths	Disadv: 61%	61%	Close to avg	74%	Below	
MTC (Year 4)	All: 23.5	—	—	21.0	Sig above	
Phonics	All: 83%	—	—	~80%	Close to avg	

What the dual lens tells us at KS2:

The KS2 data mirrors the KS4 pattern exactly. In reading and writing, disadvantaged pupils significantly outperform the national disadvantaged average (reading: 78% vs 63%; writing: 72% vs 59%) and are at or above national all-pupil averages. This demonstrates that PP spending on literacy is working across phases.

In maths, disadvantaged pupils are merely matching the national disadvantaged average (61% vs 61%) and both are well below the national all-pupil figure of 74%. The disadvantaged gap in maths is not being closed. The RWM gap to non-disadvantaged also swings dramatically year-on-year (-8pp, -22pp, -14pp), suggesting inconsistency in maths provision for disadvantaged pupils. Strong MTC scores (23.5 vs 21.0) confirm the issue is not basic number work but broader mathematical reasoning.

Attendance and Behaviour: Dual-Lens Analysis

Measure	School	Nat Disadv	vs Disadv	Nat All	vs All	RAG
Overall attendance	91.7%	—	—	91.9%	Close to avg	

FSM6 attendance	90.4%	89.1%	Above nat FSM6	91.9%	Below nat all	
Persistent absence	28.0%	Close	Close to disadv	21.9%	Above nat all	
PA (SEN)	36.6%	28.1%	Sig above	21.9%	Well above	
Suspensions 23/24	17.97%	—	—	Avg	High	
Suspensions 24/25	9.17%	—	—	N/A	Improving	

What the dual lens tells us for attendance:

FSM6 attendance (90.4%) is above the national FSM6 figure (89.1%), which is a genuine positive — attendance strategies for disadvantaged pupils are working better than for similar pupils nationally. However, when compared to all-pupil national averages (91.9%), there remains a 1.5pp gap. Persistent absence for disadvantaged pupils is close to the national disadvantaged average, meaning the school is matching but not outperforming. The SEN persistent absence figure (36.6% vs 28.1%) is significantly above and is the most concerning attendance metric.

Narrative Review of Previous Strategy Impact (Dual-Lens Judgements)

High Quality Teaching

Judgement against national disadvantaged: Strong impact. Disadvantaged pupils consistently and significantly outperform the national disadvantaged average at KS4 in English A8 (9.1 vs 7.8, sig+), English grade thresholds (4+: 68.1% vs 56.3%, sig+; 5+: 54.2% vs 41.3%, sig+), Overall A8 (41.0 vs 34.9, sig+), Humanities (sig+), and Languages (sig+). At KS2, disadvantaged reading (78% vs 63%) and writing (72% vs 59%) are also significantly above national disadvantaged. This demonstrates that the investment in teaching quality, coaching, and disciplinary literacy is having genuine impact on disadvantaged outcomes in these areas.

Judgement against national all: Mixed. In English, the school is closing in on national all-pupil averages (English 4+ all: 71.2% vs 74.3%). In maths, however, all-pupil A8 is significantly below (7.6 vs 9.1) and has been static for three years. E&M 5+ all (32.2% vs 45.4%) is the single biggest barrier to headline measures. Science all (4+: 51.0% vs 65.8%) is also significantly below. HQT investment has not yet resolved the maths and science deficit for any group, including disadvantaged.

The critical gap: Disadvantaged pupils are only close to (not above) national disadvantaged in maths. This contrasts sharply with English where the school has built a significant positive gap. The maths deficit is not a PP-specific problem — it spans all prior attainment groups, is worst for high prior attainers (Maths P8 HPA: -0.74), and persists despite strong arithmetic foundations (MTC: 23.5 vs 21.0). This points to a curriculum and pedagogy issue in mathematical reasoning and problem-solving that the previous strategy did not resolve.

Targeted Academic Support

Judgement against national disadvantaged: Partially effective. Tutoring and targeted interventions in English have contributed to the strong disadvantaged English outcomes. The positive gap between school disadvantaged and national disadvantaged in English has been maintained across three years. However, targeted support in maths and science has not shifted the needle: disadvantaged maths remains only close to (not above) national disadvantaged, and disadvantaged science has deteriorated from significantly above (2023) to close to average (2024/25).

Judgement against national all: The strategy needs to increase the intensity and specificity of maths intervention, with a focus on the reasoning and problem-solving gap identified in both the IDSR and KS2 data.

Wider Strategies

Judgement against national disadvantaged: Positive. FSM6 attendance (90.4%) is above the national FSM6 figure (89.1%). Disadvantaged persistent absence is close to the national disadvantaged average. This means the school's attendance strategies are performing at least as well as, and in some measures better than, comparable schools nationally.

Judgement against national all: Requires improvement. All-pupil persistent absence (28.0%) remains above the national all-pupil figure (21.9%), though improving from 37.9% in 2022/23. SEN persistent absence (36.6% vs 28.1%) is significantly above although there is a high level of need within this cohort. Suspension rates were very high in 2023/24 (17.97%) with SEN disproportionately represented (33.56%), though early 2024/25 data (9.17%) shows significant improvement.

The Community Programme and Connect Programme have strengthened home-school relationships and provided practical support to vulnerable families.

Appendix: EEF Teaching and Learning Toolkit Evidence Summary

The table below summarises the EEF Toolkit strands referenced in this strategy, with impact ratings based on the May 2025 update. These figures represent the average additional months of progress for pupils who received the intervention compared to those who did not.

EEF Strand	Impact	Cost	Evidence	Key Notes
Metacognition and self-regulation	+8 months	Low	Extensive (107 new studies)	Very high impact, effective across all age groups. Higher impact in studies with more disadvantaged pupils.
Reading comprehension strategies	+7 months	Low	Extensive (184 studies)	Crucial alongside phonics. High impact on reading outcomes.
Feedback	+6 months	Low	High	Improving feedback quality has consistent positive impact.
Oral language interventions	+6 months	Low	Extensive (34 new studies)	Higher impact in early years (+7) and primary (+6) than secondary (+5).
One-to-one tuition	+5 months	Moderate	Moderate (123 studies)	Greater impact in primary (+6) than secondary (+4).
Peer tutoring	+5 months	Low	Moderate	Dual benefit for tutor and tutee.
Mastery learning	+5 months	Very low	Limited	Particularly effective in maths for ages 13-14.
Homework (secondary)	+5 months	Low	Low	Impact varies by task quality and pupil engagement.
Parental engagement	+4 months	Low	Extensive (94 studies)	Intensive, targeted approaches show higher gains.
Small group tuition	+4 months	Moderate	Moderate	Smaller groups are more effective. Diminishes above 6-7 pupils.
Teaching assistant interventions	+4 months	Moderate	Moderate	Impact dependent on training quality and structured delivery.
Social and emotional learning	+4 months	Low	Extensive	Higher impact in secondary (+5) than primary (+2). Best when embedded in routine practice.
Behaviour interventions	+3 months	Moderate	Moderate	More effective when targeted at specific issues.

Source: Education Endowment Foundation Teaching and Learning Toolkit, updated May 2025.

<https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit>