



**St. Pauls Primary  
Curriculum Committee meeting  
Wednesday 15<sup>th</sup> January 2020 at 6.00pm  
Draft Minutes**

**Present**

Mrs Hils Corcoran	Foundation Governor
Aydin Djemal	Parent Governor
Ms Abi Lee	Staff Governor
Ms Jan Sorohan	Headteacher
Mrs Jane Walter	Parent Governor (Chair of Committee)

**Apologies**

Mr Rob White	Co-opted Governor
--------------	-------------------

**In attendance**

Ms Kathy Crotty	Clerk
-----------------	-------

*The meeting was quorate*

*Any text in red bold italics represents Governor question (Q); challenge (C); Governor and/or clerk support (S). Black bold upright represents decisions and actions.*

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

- Governors were welcomed to the meeting by the Chair Jane Walter.

**2. Apologies**

- Apologies were received and accepted from Rob White.

**3. Declaration of Business & Pecuniary Interest**

- There were no declarations of Pecuniary Interest other than those already declared on the school website.
- Rob White has two children; Jane Walter has two children in the school and Ayden Djemal has one child in the school.

**4. Jan Sorohan to present Category 1 changes – The Quality of Education**

- Governors were invited to explore The Key for information on the new Ofsted inspection framework which was effective from September 2019. Although the framework changes frequently this new inspection framework is the largest

change from some time. Amanda Spielman, the chief inspector, has led the changes in focus. The last framework had four judgements which were (1) overall effectiveness (2) leadership and management (3) quality of teaching and learning and (4) behaviour and safety. The new judgement is (1) quality of education encompassing teaching and learning (2) behaviour and attitudes (3) Personal Development and how children learn and (4) leadership and management.

- Section 5 was a full inspection looking at all judgements. Section 8 was a one-day inspection (for good and outstanding schools). Now the section 8 is also two days and this will still not change the judgement. If inspectors think the judgement needs changing, they can come back and undertake a section 5 within 18 months. The Headteacher felt two days works better to showcase the school.
- Internal performance data is no longer used as inspection evidence.

**Q: Will inspectors ask why data is being collected and how it is used?**

There is an issue about teacher workload and hothousing children and the new focus is how the data is used to help the children.

**Q: How much is enough data collection? Is end of year data sufficient?**

There is no minimum and data collection is left to the school to determine what works. Learning is more important than data collection. Assessing as you are teaching is seen as more important. The end points and whether children are meeting them will be required. If the children are making the expected standard this seems to be sensible.

**Q: Are the teachers happy with this new focus?**

The presentation of the curriculum is changing and teachers are working on this. Subject co-ordinators are working on the intent of their subject areas. Staff feel the “intent” statement link to knowledge and skills is progressive.

- The “implementation” of the curriculum will be inspected. There will be “deep dives” into certain subjects and reading will be one of these. In section five inspection, four subjects will be inspected, and during a section eight inspection there will be three subject areas inspected.
- There is a 90-minute phone call the day before the inspection begins during which it will be decide which subjects will be inspected. You will only know the subjects to be inspected after this phone call.
- This year is a transition year for the new framework. Governors noted this school is really good at knowing the pupils and their capabilities. The subject co-ordination staff are currently being prepared for working with the inspection team. The staff are being very positive. Staff will always be with a member of leadership team when speaking to inspectors.

**Q: Is there any feedback from schools which have been inspected under this new framework?**

Yes, and the feedback from schools often depends on the inspection result. Governors were advised to look on the DfE website for reports from this academic year.

**C: Are there any areas which present challenges for St. Pauls in the new framework?**

The Headteacher reassured Governors there is no reason why St. Pauls will not retain the “good” judgement and the support given should improve the confidence of subject leaders. The Headteacher is not concerned as this school has been on the mastery journey for all subjects. The impact of the curriculum is strong in this school and the main weakness is articulating why

the curriculum is the way it is. This “intent” could be provided for staff but the leadership want the staff to develop this understanding and develop an ownership. Staff meetings are emphasising this is not a tick list but defining a bespoke curriculum for this school. This school has maintained a broad and balanced curriculum so does not need to change the offering. Music, Art and MFL are strong in this school.

- Behaviour and attitudes should address off rolling which is not an issue for this school. Personal Development relates to the PSHE (personal, social, health and economic) curriculum and how the impact of this on the children’s learning.
- The SEF (self-evaluation form) is being changed to reflect the new framework.

**Action: Clerk to include amended SEF on the 11<sup>th</sup> March 2020 agenda**

**Q: Are MATS inspected against this framework?**

The schools are inspected but not the trusts.

**Q: Outstanding schools are exempt from routine inspections, is section five for “good” and “outstanding” schools?**

All schools can have a section five inspection. It is still the case “outstanding” schools are exempt from routine inspections but this is expected to change. The law has not yet changed.

**Q: Can you still be judged “good with outstanding features”?**

There have been no examples seen so far.

**Q: “No onsite preparation time for inspectors”, what does this mean?**

This was removed after consultation.

**S: Governors formally thanked Jan Sorohan for a very informative presentation.**

## **5. Minutes of meeting held 24<sup>th</sup> October 2019 and matters arising**

**The minutes of the meeting held 24.10.19 were approved as a true and accurate record.**

Action: Clerk to include on the 15<sup>th</sup> January agenda: Monitoring – Review of Yr6 case studies (writing and maths).

See agenda item 5

Action: Headteacher to send the completed 2018/19 SIP to Curriculum Committee Members.

This has been actioned

Action: Jane Walter to email out to governors the curriculum committee review in advance of the 15<sup>th</sup> January 2020 meeting.

This has been actioned.

**Action: Clerk to resend review template and to include summary on the 11<sup>th</sup> March 2020 agenda**

Action: Headteacher to check if the Use of Reasonable Force guidance has been updated since 2013.

There has been no update since 2013 and Governors were shown the evidence of this.

Action: Clerk to include on FGB agenda 15<sup>th</sup> January 2020 agenda (after the parent elections) a review committee membership.

There are now seven committee members and the issue were ensuring the staff members amounted to no more than one third of the committee.

The clerk informed the committee (DfE Constitution of Governing Bodies for Maintained Schools 2017) the ratio of staff on the GB must not exceed one third for FGB meetings and this was good practice for the committees. This would only be an issue when decisions were to be made which rarely occurs in the curriculum committee.

## **6. Review of Yr6 case studies**

- Abi Lee explained the reason for changing a data report to case studies to explain the trends in the Yr6 results in 2019. The Yr6 data dipped last in 2019 and a report was circulated explaining why. The school QA advisor Brian Holmes will present this data more fully with the full governing body on the 26<sup>th</sup> February 2020 at 6pm.
- Abi Lee reported this cohort included a higher proportion of SEND children.
- The issue was the writing progress scores and the maths progress scores which had dipped and were a minus. This was not 'significantly below' even though this is recorded as a minus.

### **Q: What does a negative score mean?**

This is progress less than expected. This is measured from KS1 performance.

- This report explains the performance of individual children.

### **Q: Is this a small cohort?**

There are 45 pupils which is not a small cohort and each child represents 2.2%.

- The maths results show the overall progress was more than a -2 as highlighted, even though within this cohort some children made great gains. There is a story relating to each child whose progress was a minus. One child was -15, and this child joined St. Pauls in Yr3 with an EHC plan and this child's attendance was only 40% due to medical needs. This child has to be included in the data.
- Each individual case was explained to justify the results. Common overall themes were the mobility of the children and joining the school late.
- The KS1 gradings were explained. This cohort was the last to be assessed on old curriculum gradings known as levels. Level 3 was exceeding; 2b was expected; 2a was higher than expected; 2c is below expected. Level 1 or below is a child not achieving the expected standard. This is the last cohort whose progress is measured against the old levels. The impact of mobility was further compounded for this year group who also had the new curriculum for KS2. The new formula impacted on all children. Nationally all children were placed in attainment groups to enable measurement of progress at KS2. Children at KS1 were assessed in each separate subject and this was aggregated to determine expectations at KS2. This is a national issue and the school does not know how progress will be determined this year. There is now a standardised score for KS2 SATS and KS1 is teacher assessments. Pupils in higher attainment groups at KS1 had the biggest impact in this data.
- Some children with a minus score attained at GD (greater depth) but not at the expected higher point. Four children attained GD at a score of 110 but their progress expectation was 112 so they did not achieve the progress measure. This might be the result of one question on the assessments.

- Most children who left KS1 with the expected standard do continue to peak throughout schooling but children's development is not always a straight line.
- Writing also was a negative progress score and the only judgements that could be attained is 91 for children working towards the expected standard; 103 for children who attained the expected standard; and 110 for children who attained GD. Children were between 103 and 110. One child was 106 which is progress but this is not counted unless this child attained 113. This school has two staff who are city wide moderators so the assessments are consistent. Progress scores in this school are still above the national average. The school is proud of this cohort. This school had three children with EHC plans in this cohort (out of seven in the school). The new framework will help explain this. This has reduced the position of the school in the Manchester assessment of good schools despite the excellent attainment. This is Yr6 is the first cohort judged on the curriculum on KS1 and KS2.

**S: *Governors were pleased with the analysis undertaken by the school to be able to identify the data and explain the trends.***

## **7. Monitoring**

### QA visit report Oct 2019

- The report by Brian Holmes was completed in November 2019 and was circulated in advance of this meeting. The LA have funded this QA report and this had to review the quality of education and leadership and management. In March 2020 the QA will focus on behaviour and the school can chose the other areas from overall effectiveness or behaviour. This report will inform the SEF judgements.

#### **Q: *Does this process allow the school assessment judgments?***

The school and the QA agree the judgements between them. Brian Holmes is very rigorous. All judgements are supported by evidence including external evidence such as the IDS. (Integrated Data Set)

#### **Q: *Who are "Our Children and Young People?"***

The clerk reported after consultation with young people in care, this terminology replaces the previous terminology for P/CLA (previously / children who are looked after) or P/LAC (previously / looked after children)

## **8. Agree areas of focus / presentations for 13<sup>th</sup> May 2020**

**Governors agreed to review Music or Art; (if not History or Geography).**

**Action: Clerk to include a standing item on "The Curriculum" to be reported by Abi Lee**

## **9. Review of committee membership**

Governors agreed the current committee of seven members was sufficient.

## **10. Policy review**

### Anti-bullying policy – update

Transphobic bullying has been added and information for parents has been changed.

**Governors formally approved the Anti-bullying Policy**

## 11. Any Other Business

- There were no items of any other business.

## 12. Dates of future Meetings

- Wednesday 11<sup>th</sup> March 2020 at 6.00 pm – Presentation on SIAMs worship
- Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> May 2020 at 6.00 pm – presentation tbc (music or art, history or geography).

Signed.....  
  
Jane Walter (Chair)

Date..... 11 | 3 | 2020

*Meeting closed at 19.15*

### Summary of actions

- Action: Clerk to include amended SEF on the 11<sup>th</sup> March 2020 agenda
- Action: Clerk to resend review template and to include summary on the 11<sup>th</sup> March 2020 agenda. ***This has been actioned.***
- Action: Clerk to include a standing item on “The Curriculum” to be reported by Abi Lee