

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Meeting of: | CURRICULUM COMMITTEE |
| Date/Time: | Weds 18 th January 2017 – 6 pm |
| Location: | Patcham Junior School |
| For: | All governors and website |
| Present: | Ashley Seymour Williams (ASW) Andrew Saunders (AS) Rebecca Stevens (RS) Marion Rajan (MRJ) Mark Rodericks (MRD) Debbie Willsher (DW) Shadric Toop (ST) Nicky Caldwell (NC) Iseult Hull-Flower (IHF) |
| Quorum: | 3 |

| | DISCUSSION and DECISIONS | ACTIONS |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| 1 | MRJ opened the meeting and for the benefit of RS, who was new to the governing body, everyone introduced themselves. Prior to the meeting RS had met with ASD as part of the induction process. | |
| 2 | MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING These were agreed to be an accurate copy following the addition of ASD as present. MRJ signed the minutes accordingly. | |
| 3 | MATTERS ARISING 3.1 A governor had checked the website and ASW had followed up the few minor omissions or amendments required. ASW thanked ST for his assistance following a recent hacking of the website. In discussion governors were reassured improved security systems were now in place. 3.2 Has the Education Act s89, re behaviour and principles, been looked at? MRD would attend to this. He informed the poster on rights and responsibilities had now been produced and the behaviour rules had been rewritten in child friendly language. The behaviour policy incorporated the information and a flow chart. 3.3 ASW advised the SEN policy had been reviewed for compliance within the BCPfE partnership. 3.4 SMSC would be considered in the summer term. 3.5 ASW would update the visit form to include the latest improvement 'spotlights'. All other matters had been completed or would be covered elsewhere. Discussion turned to item 4.2 | MRD ASW ASW |
| 4 | SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN Focus: 4.1 Responding to pupil learning | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>4.1.1 ASW presented information on this aspect of the school improvement plan. It was one of the 'even better ifs' from the Ofsted Inspection report when it was felt that in some lessons some children were not fully challenged all the time. The aim was to see challenge all through the every lesson and teachers checking on the learning during the lesson and adjusting work set during lessons. This was to be achieved by following several strands:</p> <p>4.1.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Choice of difficulty – this was fully embedded• Formative assessment – already being used• Focussed teaching – the change from two years ago was now very evident. Most teaching was now in groups and moving between the groups during the lesson, always with a further challenge at hand.• 'Guides on the side' nudging individuals on to the right direction and encouraging mistakes and reflection• Growth mindset – although embedded there were still some children with fixed mindsets in some parts of the curriculum.• Planning – expectations are now for all teachers to annotate plans to show how they have been adapted for their class as the week progresses. Other members of staff all annotate them and share information. This is seen increasingly. <p>4.1.3 Was this directed at the most able? Not necessarily. Is choice of difficulty more work for teachers? Not really and there are plenty of resources. Is it just maths? No, English, science and PE. It is now fully embedded. Will this happen in a year group? Yes sometimes – we need to have consistency with the plan across the classes but there will be some divergence during the week. Does the sharing go on as a matter of course? It is hard to formalise. It happens in some year groups more than others. The teams work well together and the year group leader job includes helping this to work. A governor could confirm a lot of the sharing happened informally.</p> <p>4.1.4 Improvements had already been made and the spotlight was to ensure complete consistency, especially in view of new members of the team. A governor could confirm that whenever visits had been made pupils were at work right from the start of every lesson.</p> <p>4.2 Bullying</p> <p>4.2.1DW gave an up-date on developments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A presentation had been given on 'the Power of Good' which had met with a good reception.• The sociogram exercise had been completed again to reveal any isolated pupils and provide information on class dynamics. Some of the information could be passed on to the next year/school.• The safe and well at school survey had not been | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|--|------------|
| | <p>completed as the sociogram had replaced it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The anti-bullying squad had met. • One member of staff was taking on a learning mentor role to help those with friendship difficulties. • DW had been asked to lead a partnership session on disability 'nothing about me without me'. Children from a Brighton school for deaf children had visited the school, ran an assembly and workshops. PJS children had been respectful and interested. • CPOMS continued to be used and it enabled the school to focus on victims and bystanders. • The approaches were superior to the safe and well at school survey as matters could be followed up and identified. • DW had attended training on mental health for primary pupils. <p>4.2.2 Were there any surprises from the sociogram? Yes. Did all the year groups do it? Yes. What have you done since? An example was given where the sociogram had confirmed where there was a difficulty with a group of children and it helped the teacher realise how teaching behaviour could be adapted to help. If there was a group would you work with them? Yes that is what we have done. MRD confirmed he had checked the outcomes of several classes. Did the policy seem fair to the children? Yes and the process teachers need to through they found enlightening. Governors supported ASW in the use of restorative justice. The PSHE policy had not been received. DW left 18.36 and discussion turned to item 4.1</p> <p>4.3 Pupil Progress/Most able Pupils A governor had met with MRD and Rowlie Derby (gifted and talented lead at Patcham High School) and although a written report would follow, now gave a summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focus was now on the most able rather than gifted and talented. • The meeting was constructive and all were concerned to ensure raising achievement for all, not just the most able. • Movement was now away from a register. • The Department for Education report on the transition primary to secondary for the more able had been examined. These groups were found to do better where transition was better and there were fewer feeder schools. It included suggestions as to how secondary schools can work with primary schools and all agreed mentoring should be followed up. • The next inset day relevant staff will get together to discuss transition. • A first draft of a fresh joint policy for gifted and talented, which would possibly be called 'challenge and achievement', had been made by MRD and work would continue to share good practice. | <p>ASD</p> |
|--|--|------------|

| | | |
|---|--|-----|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy would include gender and prior attainment and it would aim to use a definition other than the Ofsted prior attainment as it was acknowledged that children changed. This has had an impact on the results as the school was doing well. <p>Have you had similar conversations with the Infant School? We are meeting on Friday.</p> <p>MRD added the policy wanted to identify existing provision and provision that goes beyond the classroom. In discussion it was considered the future would require more creative and human interaction skills and these should be supported. Different approaches along these lines may suit more able learners.</p> <p>Do the middle attainers get pushed? The way it works now is that every child's score contributes to the grade. The structure will aid that.</p> | |
| 5 | <p>Relationship and Sex Education Policy</p> <p>Governors were advised a new policy would soon be on the website. MRJ would take forward governor review arrangements.</p> | MRJ |
| 6 | <p>Evaluation of School improvement plan</p> <p>ASW tabled:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a comprehensive evaluation of the autumn spotlights the spring spotlights Progress on achievement report as at December 2016 for each year for reading writing and maths. This included detail on those meeting and exceeding age related expectations with additional data for SEN and disadvantaged groups. <p>Further information was provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The figures as at December 2016 related to actual performance rather than current predicted outcomes at the end of the year. The aim was that for each year more children meet age related expectations and more meet the 'deep' criteria. The review of the spotlights had shown the disadvantaged were all on track in year 6; however, there were concerns with other years so this would remain a focus. One of the success criteria for spelling had not been met and that required further work. The SEN gap was closing. The school was aiming to be a dyslexia friendly school. This would also help those undiagnosed. <p>Governors noted that the year 3 reading was approximately half a year behind but the gap closed throughout the years. It was noted year 3 came up much weaker than previous cohorts as demonstrated in their Key stage 1 results and would need to be a key focus.</p> <p>What is the difficulty with year 5 pupil premium writing? This is a small group. Year 5 is more of a difficulty with maths and year 6 has a strong performance. Governors were aware there were extra support groups and regular pupil progress meetings.</p> <p>Why is writing blank for year 6? Data not fully collated yet.</p> <p>Numbers coming in to year 6 are high. Are they moving to area</p> | |

| | | |
|---|---|-----|
| | <p>or from other schools? Both. Will there become a point where there are not enough places? We have very low mobility. Governors knew that the SATS results in 2016 showed the school to be in the top 6% for writing maths and reading. They would undertake further scrutiny of the papers presented and submit questions by email.</p> | ALL |
| 7 | <p>Overview of monitoring A governor had reviewed the monitoring and the log of visits and the visit reports had been checked. It was confirmed the safeguarding governor need report only on a termly basis. Most sections of the improvement plan had been covered as had year groups and subjects. ST would make a further visit re art and meet with staff. There were no recommendations.</p> | |
| 8 | <p>Safeguarding update The safeguarding governor reported that the designated leads and governors from Patcham High, Junior and Infant schools had had their termly meeting. They had touched on a range of issues such as the recording systems of SIMS, CPOMS to make sure these were consistent through the schools, and update on protocols re FSM, mobile phones, training and the Prevent agenda. There was a need for schools to have a Prevent risk assessment – MRD and MRJ to take this forward. MRJ was in discussions about being the primary governor representative with the LA for a Safeguarding Support Group for the lead Safeguarding governors for each school. Governors were invited to attend training re domestic violence 27th Feb 10.50 to 11.50 or 28th Feb 3.45 to 4.45 and WISE (What is sexual exploitation?) training 6th February 10.50 to 11.50 or 7th Feb 3.45 to 4.45. The school was also piloting a scheme for some WISE support material for year 6.</p> | |
| 9 | <p>Any other Urgent Business The next meeting, 25th April would focus on pupil assessment; writing and reading; PSHE (personal social and health education); and Art. There being no further business, the meeting closed 19.54</p> | |

..... Signed Dated

| Item no | OWNER | ACTION | DUE DATE |
|---------|---------|--|--------------|
| 3.2 | MRD | Review compliance with s 88/89 of Education act and report back | Next meeting |
| 3.4 | MRJ ASW | SMSC – consider how this will be reported to governors – due summer term | summer |
| 3.5 | ASW | Up-date visit form with current spotlights | 30.1.17 |
| 4.3 | ASD | Provide written report on the most able | 6.2.17 |
| 5 | MRJ | Follow up RSE policy and arrange evaluation as appropriate | 19.2.17 |
| 6 | ALL | Scrutinise assessment and spotlight plan/evaluation and raise queries by email | 6.2.17 |