

MINUTES

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE	
Date/Time:	2 nd June 6 pm
Location:	Patcham Junior School
For:	Curriculum Committee and website
Quorum:	3
Attendees:	Ashley Seymour-Williams (ASW) – Headteacher (HT), Danny Simpson (DS) – Chair of Governors Nicky Caldwell (NC) Iseult Hull-Flower (IHF) – Chair of Curriculum Committee Marion Rajan (MRJ) Anita Lower (AL) Valerie Williamson (VW) Shadric Toop (ST) Debbie Willsher (DW) Mark Rodericks (MRD) Associate member: Andrew Saunders (ASD) Clerk : Janet Johnson (JJ)

DISCUSSION AND DECISION		ACTION
1	Welcome and apologies for absence IHF opened the meeting of the full committee which followed a well-attended staff-governor social event. She welcomed DW, who had recently been elected staff governor, to the Governing Body and introduced ASD. It was the first formal committee meeting since the Ofsted inspection and the report rating the school as Good was now public.	
2	DECLARATION of Interest Both ST and DS had already declared their spouses worked at the school. No other declarations were made when invited and no withdrawal from any agenda item was required.	
School Improvement:		
3	MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING These were agreed to be an accurate record and signed accordingly.	
4	MATTERS ARISING 4.1 SEN. It was agreed SSS would present the SEN policy and up-date at the autumn meeting. 4.2 The homework survey results were awaited. 4.3 AL had not been able to attend the Learning Advocates meeting and ASW would advise a new date. 4.4 Google Drive was being used. ASW would re- issue AL with the password. The ability for governors to have a school email address was anticipated in the autumn term. 4.5 Gifted and Talented. ASW had circulated a report outlining the activities for each subject. He further advised some events did not happen every year. How do you decide which activities are for gifted and talented children and which for everyone? When possible we have an inclusive policy. Some activities have started off for gifted and talented and then widened e.g. Let's Dance. If there is an opportunity for only a few, then this could be for	Chair ASW All

MINUTES

	<p>these pupils but the priority is inclusivity. Governors noted there was an impressive range and ASW confirmed that in comparison to other schools PJS offered a lot. The nominated school lead in this area would be clarified in the autumn. Is the 'talent' assembly continuing to run? Yes, with a wider range, for example there had been one on photography recently and comedy routines were now popular. Can you elaborate on the science and technology opportunities? ASW we are giving science greater priority now and working with Sussex University, someone is coming to promote science for girls. The school was looking for opportunities at the moment. Interesting science is happening at school for example a teacher with skills in the area had recently carried out a coral reef project with children. The new NQT is a science specialist. Governors agreed it was important not to perpetuate stereotypes in science materials. A full report would be provided in due course. ASD would monitor.</p> <p>4.6 ASW would email the writing initiative. 4.7 DS had attended the staff meeting. There was nothing to report. 4.8 The strategic development group meeting had been deferred so the review of governor links had not taken place. Governors were invited to email DS with comments.</p>	<p>ASD</p> <p>ASW</p> <p>All</p>
5	<p>Chair's report: This would be IHF last curriculum meeting and she invited anyone interested in taking on responsibility in the committee to come forward prior to the strategy meeting when succession would be discussed.</p> <p>In discussion recommendations for the future were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All governors needed to visit the school as part of monitoring any new improvement plan • Visit feedback needed to be timely and in a form understandable by all either at the time or by brief synopsis at FGB. This would be easier as the remit widened and became more strategic. • Reports should be read when circulated • The main business of committee meetings should be briefly covered at FGB 	<p>FGB Chairs</p>
6	<p>SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (SUMMER) SCHOOL VISION</p> <p>The school had been inspected by Ofsted in May and judged to be good. Since November 2013 the focus had been on a number of key objectives as directed by Ofsted but now this could be directed at a vision for the school and developing a clear framework that would drive a new school improvement plan. ASW presented a format using the existing vision. It clearly set out the cascade from vision to key objectives to success criteria. Governors could see how it could be used to provide individual action plans and they were keen to have real impact in setting the agenda. Will Ofsted look at this? Yes. Much work was to be done to consider how leadership would know to what degree the vision was being met, measurement of key objectives and setting up monitoring schedules. The structure of the governing body would need to be reassessed to ensure it was fit for the purpose of delivery of the plan and governor links may well be changed. SDG would consider these matters for further discussion and agreement by FGB.</p>	<p>SDG</p>

MINUTES

	<p>An inset day to revisit the vision statement with staff was being arranged. All governors were to be invited and ASW would advise the date. 2 September</p> <p>Discussion moved to item 8.</p>	
7	<p>SEN*</p> <p>7.1 Termly monitoring Governors could refer to the Ofsted report on this occasion. Ofsted have confirmed SEN pupils performed well and the SENCO arranged robust new systems. With the Achievement for All, pupil progress meetings etc everyone had taken responsibility for SEN pupils and the TAs had lots of training. Everyone targeted SEN and a range of other children and using all the data had helped.</p> <p>7.2 Annual review policy (for FGB ratification) VW and MRD had the new policy and would present this for FGB. MRD advised the SENCO had achieved much in this area. Discussion then turned to item 10.</p>	
8	<p>Teaching and Learning*: ASW had provided termly data and advised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Floor targets were expected to be met comfortably for attainment • Comparisons with the national average (NA) for met and exceeded were generally positive but needed to be monitored. • For year 6 SATS results were awaited but they had been well prepared and considered that maths was an accurate prediction. Writing was still not likely to quite make the NA of 33% but it would be close enough. <p>How well did predictions compare with actuals last year? It would be close, although we got more level 6s in maths. MRD confirmed the data was backed up with test results and were not just teacher assessments.</p> <p>Are you still working with West Hove? We work with Junior schools mainly, we look at attainment upon entry and compare the data.</p> <p>Governors had noticed the Year 3 and 4 figures looked good and that Year 3 had somewhat polarised data. The head of the Infant school and ASW had been in discussion. PIS phonic scores had been low and it would have an impact at PJS. Governors expressed their disapproval of resitting SATS.</p> <p>MRD advised that teachers were still getting to know what is a 'met' under the new assessment regime. Since joining the City Partnership moderation was being undertaken with vigour to aid calibration.</p> <p>A full report would be made at the July FGB</p>	
9	<p>Assessment without levels</p> <p>9.1 Over the last year governors had been keeping a watching brief on preparations for a system of assessment without levels and now ASW gave an informative summary of the background, development and current situation.</p> <p>9.2 Difficulties with the levels system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confusing for parents. • Fundamental flaws. 	

MINUTES

- Possibly detrimental to pupil learning because there was a notion of speed through the levels rather than understanding all the work at that level.
- There was an expectation that pupils should exceed the national expectation.
- A pupil might get a level 3 overall but only be able to answer level 2 questions and some level 4 & 5 questions so is not really level 3 but the marks say they are. So the levels don't tell us much about their ability

9.3 This brings forth the idea of depth of understanding of all key concepts of the curriculum. Other best international systems have never used levels. How we can do it is use Bloom's taxonomy, using higher order thinking skills and applying what they know in new experiences. It is a paradigm shift but there is a strong message of depth, not speed and we need to deepen the grasp of age expectation. The objectives have also become more demanding throughout the school and subjects, for example some areas taught in year 6 are now to be covered in year 5.

Has the DfE spearheaded this? Yes and I think for maths it is a positive development with the level of challenge being put in.

Does it link with new curriculum? Yes. It has been gradually coming in for example with the spelling and grammar test.

Is the SPAG test going? No

9.4 What will it look like?

PJS has worked with the LA and developed a set of outcomes as to what a child at end of each year will look like. Although it is up to each school to decide how they will assess and track children we have taken the decision to join in with other schools in a common B&H LA approach. Clearly, comparing with other schools is very important for moderation especially as it won't be tested nationally till the end of year 6.

MRD advised the government only provided the met objectives for each year group so we have had to show a split for each level and decided to do it 5 steps – emerging, met-, met, met+, deep. Each term they move on one step.

9.5 **It is all very subjective – how do teachers manage that?** There are tests and teacher assessments for maths and this system is slightly simpler. English is not so different from the current system and there are statements to compare with for other subjects.

DW confirmed that when you use it as a guide you get accustomed to it.

Where was it developed? It started here from work with Darren Ellsum (DE) and our Maths leader then DE developed it elsewhere.

Who is leading from the LA to check it is ok nationally? DE who is a consultant who works across a number of LA's and an OFSTED inspector.

9.6 **Is the floor standard now 85% for maths, reading and writing?** Yes. We should just be ok but there has been no guidance regarding progress.

When Ofsted were here they wanted to make sure there was a system in place to ensure progress and they confirmed it was robust. ASW showed the matrix to be used – similar to that used for levels but with the 5 steps along the top and RAG. For example a child coming in at Level 3 would

MINUTES

	<p>need to be met+ to meet the target and 'deep' to exceed. How can Ofsted make judgements or Raise on-line comparisons when each school can have their own method of assessment? This was not known.</p> <p>9.7 The way forward Governors recommended communicating with parents. ASW advised it had been mentioned in his blog but he would write to parents in due course.</p> <p>Will it start next term? By the end of term we will have assessed all the current pupils under new system. The new year 3 children will arrive with levels and an assessment under the new system. We are currently looking at options for a new baseline assessment for the year 3s. The school would continue to refine systems.</p> <p>Governors would include observation of this on visits and an up-date was requested for the autumn term after the first assessment. ASW was thanked for the presentation and discussion turned to item 7.</p>	ASW
10	<p>Safeguarding* This had been reported fully at the last meeting. Ofsted had taken an unusual step and classed governance in this area as highly effective. Governors praised and thanked MRD, the safeguarding link governor for her work.</p>	--
11	<p>Behaviour and anti-bullying policies 11.1 Up-dates and developments MRD provided a verbal up-date.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He had set up an anti-bullying squad, ABS, with DW and the SENCO. • Training had been given • A flow chart was being developed to explain how the school deals with behaviour and bullying to make it clear to parents and children. • The mid-day supervisors had contributed and there were lots of proactive strategies. • The final draft would be presented. • The challenge at the moment was in distinguishing behaviour and bullying. <p>Is behaviour recorded? Yes and tracked. It will be reviewed next year, particularly the lower level to reduce escalation. Governors wondered whether there was a need for a behaviour for learning link governor and it was decided the strategic development group would consider this when reviewing priorities. ASW advised the inspectors had examined the behaviour log over a long time and wanted to know how the school supported pupils long term. They were satisfied with this. Some children who had been victims have had counselling.</p> <p>Do you have repeat occurrences? Some children do have difficulties with behaviour. We support them by helping them understand how relationships work and they have a 'circle of friends' who help when they are having difficulties. We also look to uncover and tackle any underlying cause of the 'symptom' of the exhibited behaviour.</p> <p>If the cause is outside of school, how can you deal with it? We do have to deal with it. It could be a safeguarding issue. ASW advised that when they do have bullying incidents they are monitored</p>	

MINUTES

	<p>and we have been very successful in not having them being repeated.</p> <p>11.2 Monitoring This was briefly discussed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views from and communications with parents would be useful • Governors could attend an ABS meeting • Actions could be revisited when the flow chart was finalised • Following readdressing the vision, the monitoring of the key objectives would be decided • Attendance was currently 96.4% and there had been no exclusions. It was not a problem area. 	
12	<p>Pupil Premium – termly DHT report Ofsted considered use of the pupil premium was robust at PJS. 10% of children in this group had outstanding progress for the spring term. Year 5 were not doing so well so focus will be on them.</p>	
13	<p>Date of Next meeting: these would be decided at July FGB</p>	
14	<p>Any other urgent business An issue had arisen concerning the LA's amended attendance code of conduct. Details had been circulated earlier that day. Attendance at the school was good but ASW had now been informed there was now no leeway and in the absence of exceptional circumstances any unauthorised absence was to be fined. Whilst acknowledging the possibility of disruption to education to all as a result of unauthorised absence, governors were concerned the proposed changes may affect disproportionately the less affluent who were more likely to have fixed holiday dates. They also agreed sometimes absence could be beneficial. The difficulty was in defining the exceptional circumstances. The attendance officers from local schools were meeting very soon and it was decided governors would discuss the matter by email with the benefit of feedback from that meeting. ASD would conduct a brief investigation as to approaches taken by other schools. There being no further business, the meeting closed at 20.15</p>	<p>ASW ASD ALL</p>

*Standing item

ACTION POINT SUMMARY

Item	Owner	Action	Due date
4.1	New Chair	SSS to present SEN policy at autumn meeting	next meeting
4.2	ASW	Present homework survey findings	next meeting
4.3	All/ ASW	Liaise and arrange someone to attend at a L Advocate meeting Advise date(s)	
4.5	ASD	Monitor G&T report delivery	ongoing
4.6	ASW	Email the writing initiative	
4.8	All	Email comments to DS re GB structure and governor links for discussion at SDG	By SDG meeting tba
5	FGB	Consider recommendations	10.6.15/ 15.7.15
6	SDG	Consider format of School Improvement plan	
11	ASW	Up-date on Assessment without levels	Next meet
14	ASD	Research attendance	11.6.15
14	ASW All	Circulate feedback from attendance meeting Respond with views	11.6.15 01.07.2015