

**Minutes of the Pupil Progress and Performance (formerly Curriculum) Committee Meeting,  
 held on Tuesday 8<sup>th</sup> December 2015 @ 1900hrs**

Present: Bridget Harrison (BH)  
 Chris Hyland (CH)  
 Monique Clark (MC)  
 Rebecca Lewis, Chair (RL)  
 Alison Lovatt (AL)  
 Elmira Thacker (ET)  
 Trevor Walker (TW)

In Attendance: Alison Dudley, Clerk to the Governors (AD)

**Governor support and challenge highlighted.**

The meeting started at 1910hrs.

	TOPIC	ACTION	RESP
1	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>statutory</i>)</p> <p>No apologies had been received before the meeting. All present.</p> <p>The meeting was quorate.</p>		
2	<p><b>DECLARATION OF INTEREST</b> (<i>statutory</i>)</p> <p>No governor made any declaration of interest in any specific agenda item at this meeting.</p>		
3	<p><b>TERMS OF REFERENCE</b></p> <p>MC welcomed governors, thanking them for attendance and stressing the importance for governors to regularly look at the curriculum</p> <p>- pt. 7: MC commented <i>Every Child Matters</i> is not as current as it was, the emphasis moving increasingly towards looking at e.g. Prevent Strategy and Child Sexual Exploitation issues, representing a change towards a more generic stance in terms of welfare and safeguarding.</p> <p>- pt. 13: TW queried the role of governors in “overseeing” the production of the school prospectus?</p> <p>Governors understood that Kris Aldridge (KA) was currently the governor with responsibilities pertaining to the website.</p> <p>Governor discussion around whether the word “prospectus” should be replaced with ‘website’; also, about whether this particular responsibility should sit on the Full Governing Body (FGB) agenda, rather than that of the Resources Committee?</p> <p>General agreement that this made more sense, in particular because it went hand in hand with Pupil Premium Policies review.</p>	<p><b>Add to agenda for next FGB</b></p>	<p><b>AD</b></p>

	<p>MC fed back regarding the website audit, emphasising that whilst much had been found to be in good order, some of the policies were not yet 'live' and this needed to be followed up.</p> <p>MC said Cheryl would address this, and that over-time would need to be paid for her complete.</p>		
4	<p><b>MINUTES</b> (<i>statutory</i>)</p> <p>Governors confirmed the minutes of the previous meeting as an accurate record and these were signed by the Chair.</p>	Minutes to be filed in school office	AD
5	<p><b>MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES</b> (<i>statutory</i>)</p> <p>- (3) <b>Governor Visit Schedule</b></p> <p>BH had completed a SEN governor visit.</p> <p>Agreement that a schedule of governor monitoring visits should be drawn up.</p> <p>Noted that KA had spent an afternoon on a 'general walk-around' in respect of the School Development Plan (SDP)</p> <p>RL requested that MC give her a list of the "pressing items", so that visits could be assigned. Governors agreed with general suggestion that each governor should be aiming to undertake a monitoring visit once per term.</p> <p>- (4) (i) <b>survey of staff on performance management process</b></p> <p>- (4) (ii) <b>update of policies on the website</b></p> <p>- 4 (iii) <b>check of name change for committee on website</b></p> <p>- 4 (iv) <b>SDP re-write</b> has been completed</p> <p>- 4 (v) <b>SEN policy</b> has been sent out and confirmed as up-to date;</p> <p>- 4 (vi) <b>PTA purchase of library system</b></p> <p>MC was going to visit Potter's Gate but new books have been bought. Teachers very happy.</p> <p>- <b>11 Policies Review</b></p> <p>MC confirmed that Safeguarding and Whistle-blowing policies have been reviewed and that they will go onto the school website.</p> <p>Agreement that the Governing Body should take back the responsibility for putting policies up onto the website.</p>	<p><b>Governor visit schedule to be drawn up</b></p> <p><b>List of priority areas to be sent to RL</b></p> <p><b>This item is to be carried forward to the next meeting</b></p> <p><b>These are to be updated</b></p> <p><b>CH to liaise with Jakoba Murray</b></p> <p><b>Add to next FGB (AD)</b></p>	<p>RL</p> <p>MC</p> <p>AD</p> <p>MC End Jan. 2015</p> <p>CH</p> <p>KA</p>
6	<p><b>ACHIEVEMENT OF PUPILS AND TARGETS</b></p> <p>The Headteacher's report had been tabled with the agenda, before the meeting.</p> <p><b>1. KS1 Targets for 2015-16</b></p> <p><u>Assessment without Levels (Babcock)</u></p> <p>MC opened with an update regarding the new approach to assessment of children's performance, explaining the previous method using the 7 steps within each year group (e.g. for Yr.1: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 etc. to 1.7) would no longer</p>		

apply.

Explanation from MC that increasingly the government is looking for depth of learning rather than extension. To that end, the new systems will use a metric based on assessment of children working either **towards, at** or **beyond** expectation for age.

MC suggested that TW might well have expertise to share in helping to introduce the 'no levels' approach.

**Discussion regarding the anticipated impact on parents.**

MC said a meeting during the first half of the spring term would be arranged to properly update parents, and to enable them to understand the new measure in the context of children's previous performance levels.

MC said there were 3 children with SEN who would continue to be tracked using the P levels.

MC assured governors that every half term staff complete tracking forms for each child.

MC said most schools do not use Babcock, others use private tracking systems instead.

**RL asked what measure Churt and Tilford use?**

MC said Angela Harper (Head Teacher, Churt School) used the same one as St. Andrews but that she was unsure about Sara Bedford (Head of All Saints in Tilford)

**TW emphasised the extent of difference between the 2 systems; before, he said, it was a question of "best fit" but now you have to get all 12 points, 11 won't do.**

**CH asked was the current Yr.1 cohort going to start with this?**

MC said no, that Yr. 2 would be being tested this year, although this in itself was problematic, because children are not currently being taught in this way and therefore an immediate change is required.

MC remarked that in the early roll-out of assessments, the following areas had proved challenging for the children:

- reading
- being asked to discuss a poem
- writing e.g. being asked to write about a toy

MC noted that under the new system, neither content nor theme is marked. Grammar and spelling are the things that matter.

MC had suggested introduction of a 'Weekly Write', highlighting the fact that in the past children had been used to writing through a topic-led curriculum.

**TW agreed the new assessment system is very demanding, insisting as it does, for example, on the consistent and competent use of 10 tenses.**

**RL asked whether assessments would continue to be marked at school?**

MC was as yet unclear as to whether this would be the case.

**RL asked when would staff begin moderating the tracking progress?**

MC replied that for those children 'stuck and stalled' staff will continue to moderate against the 1.1 to 1.7 model; this will happen every half term.

**RL asked whether this would allow for age?**

<p>MC said it was wider than that, to allow for 'embedded'.</p> <p>Discussion around Maths Tracking Sheet shown to governors by MC.</p> <p>TW commented again it is all age-related focus is now on 'depth' rather than 'the ladder'.</p> <p><b>CH asked how depth related to 'extending activities?'</b></p> <p>MC explained all research-based. Many schools are confused by it, but teachers would simply need to start using it to see how it evolved.</p> <p>MC said she would be setting targets but had a concern that, against the new assessment set, results would 'drop'.</p> <p><b>CH asked against which measure the results would appear to drop, since there was no comparator from the previous year?'</b></p> <p>MC said expected will be 100, with raw scores being converted to scaled scores.</p> <p><b>General discussion about how to deepen but not extend learning; agreement that setting targets would be hard.</b></p> <p><b>CH said the expectation of the school and parents up until this point had been that children would, by the time they finished at the school, have reached an assessment level for Yr.3. He speculated about whether in fact fewer children would now reach that particular level.</b></p> <p><b>TW asked how the school could go about helping to deepen the learning?'</b></p> <p><b>ET asked whether there were any guidelines?'</b></p> <p>MC said no, not yet.</p> <p><b>AL said it would be important to advise parents of the new system and its potential impact.</b></p> <p><b>RL asked whether the anticipated challenges were peculiar to St. Andrews?'</b></p> <p>MC said no, that many other schools had also used topic-led systems in the past and would, therefore, have the same experience as St. Andrews</p> <p><b>CH wondered whether results in some other schools would also be lower than previously?'</b></p> <p>MC said yes.</p> <p><b>TW added that exemplars were due to be made available by end January 2016.</b></p> <p>MC agreed to send to committee governors a copy of the <a href="#">'Interim Teacher Assessment Framework at the End of Key Stage 1, September 2015'</a></p> <p>(NB. Governors can use link below to access online)  <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/461547/Interim_teacher_assessment_frameworks_at_the_end_of_key_stag_e_1_PDFa.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/461547/Interim_teacher_assessment_frameworks_at_the_end_of_key_stag_e_1_PDFa.pdf</a></p> <p>MC re-emphasised the potential level of challenge for the parents.</p> <p><b>ET asked if the parents could see the document?'</b></p> <p>MC: everything is evident-based and the marking policy will be adjusted/"tightened" to facilitate this e.g. the use of 'I' on work which has been completed by children independently.</p>	<p><b>MC to send document</b></p>	<p><b>MC</b></p>
---	-----------------------------------	------------------

	<p><b>CH was keen to know about the anticipated impact on Yr.1 children?</b></p> <p>MC reassured governors that the introduction was being put in place now. She said the Babcock system would be kept running for a year and then the staff will re-assess.</p> <p>MC said she was aware that writing was the biggest challenge.</p> <p><b>2. Phonics Screening Check 2015</b></p> <p><b>CH sought confirmation about when these take place?</b></p> <p>MC said they happen in June every year and children are expected to re-sit repeatedly if they do not achieve the requisite mark. MC said that paradoxically, more able readers sometimes do less well in the tests, because they attempt to guess the 'alien' words. Parents who had been shown the test contents after children had sat them had many concerns allayed, given the complexity and ambiguity of some graphemes and diagraphs used in the tests.</p> <p><b>CH asked whether there was already something specific in place for those Yr.2s who will be re-sitting the test in June 2016?</b></p> <p>MC said yes, and that targeted measures would be employed nearer the time. Referenced the 'Sound Discovery' system used by Teaching Assistants.</p> <p>MC said St. Andrews was moderated for Yr. 1 and EFYS. Last summer EYFS trialed the Early Excellence Baseline this Autumn. MC said schools had recently received an email to advise they should look only at the 1<sup>st</sup> page of the report, because the baseline was flawed. For that reason, independent tracking would continue. MC briefed re. the 5-year trend, stating it was a bit up and down, and highlighted the already discussed challenge around writing.</p> <p><b>CH asked whether there was an exercise to convert information e.g. to complete/continue a 5-year trend report?</b></p> <p>MC said that Ofsted was more concerned about how tracking was being conducted in school.</p> <p><b>RL asked about the target for surpassing writers?</b></p> <p>MC said the school will have to aim for age-appropriate still e.g. 12 under the new regime is quite high. Writing is still significant and therefore on a national basis, the school is not doing badly.</p> <p>MC said she hoped some guide material would soon be available, to support staff and give clearer idea of how best to set targets.</p>		
7	<p><b>GOVERNOR VISIT REPORTS</b></p> <p><b>1. Review of SEND Provision (BH)</b></p> <p>The report had been circulated with the agenda, ahead of the meeting.</p> <p>Discussion around <i>education, health and care (EHC) plans</i>. explanation of how this has replaced the use of <i>statements</i> in supporting children with SEN.</p> <p>BH emphasised the degree to which the whole process now has become focused towards the child, even during the lead-up to being assigned a plan.</p> <p>Great emphasis is also placed on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- review periods, and</li> <li>- checking</li> </ul>	<p><b>NB. Copy of the report to be filed with minutes</b></p>	<p><b>AD</b></p>

