

Oswald Road Primary School

Teaching and Learning Committee Meeting

Minutes

Quorum: 3 - met at this meeting

Approved as a true and accurate record.

Chair: Ellie Russell

Name: ERussell

Date of meeting: 29 March 2016

Date: 11/7/16

Venue: Oswald Road Primary School

Chair of Committee / Governing Body

Attendees

Name	Governor Designation	Term of Office End Date	Present – P Apologies – Ap Absent – A
Tom Grimshaw (TG)	Co-Opted	14/07/19	P
Deborah Howard (HT)	Headteacher	N/A	P
Ellie Russell	Co-Opted	31/03/18	P
Ali Ayub	Parent		P
Joanna Dennis (JD)	Co-Opted	14/07/19	P
Richard Price (RP)	Co-Opted (Chair)	31/03/18	Ap
James Britton (JB)	Co-Opted	23/09/19	Ap
Simon Bentall (SB)	Parent	23/09/18	Ap

Also Present	Role
Jon Beisly	Deputy Headteacher
Gerard McCoy	Clerk - AGM Clerking and Administration Service

Agenda Items

Item 1	Apologies
<p>Apologies had been submitted by Richard Price, Simon Bentall and James Britton.</p> <p>There were no issues raised and the Committee agreed to accept the above apologies.</p> <p>It was considered that for the remainder of the current academic year a chair would be elected.</p> <p>Ellie Russell was proposed seconded and elected unopposed as Chair for the remainder of the current academic year.</p>	

Resolutions / Agreed Actions	Owner	Date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed – accept apologies submitted. Elected – Ellie Russell as Chair for remainder of academic year. 	T&L Committee T&L Committee	

Item 2	Declaration of Pecuniary Interests		
There were no declarations of pecuniary interest in relation to any of the agenda items.			
Resolutions / Agreed Actions		Owner	Date

Item 3	Minutes of the Previous Meetings and Matters Arising		
The Chair confirmed that there were no minutes to review – the Governing Body had decided at the start of the current academic year to focus on developing the newly appointed Governors prior to establishing a committee system. This was the first meeting of the Teaching and learning (T&L) Committee.			
Resolutions / Agreed Actions		Owner	Date

Item 4	New Assessment System – Update
<p>Jon Beisly, Deputy Headteacher (DHT), presented his report in relation to the new assessment system and the following points were noted in discussion.</p> <p>The Committee reviewed the data in relation to the whole school attainment as of Spring Term 2. It was noted that in relation to the Year 1 phonics 17% of pupils were currently designated as working towards the national standard and 83% of pupils were currently meeting the national standard.</p> <p>The Committee considered the breakdown of the six different assessment stages in terms of emerging, emerging plus, expected, secure expected, exceeding and greater depth.</p> <p>It was recognised that the majority of pupils across the different year groups and subject areas were designated as expected with some pupils in the 'exceeding' area. Reading was especially noted across the different year groups – it was recognised that 59% of pupils in Year 1 had been designated as 'emerging plus' and 31% at the expected stage.</p> <p>Q. Was the data based on current assessments or predictions? A. The data was current, although it has been recently updated to take into account the more recent assessments.</p> <p>It was also recognised that 'gaps' identified in reading for Year 4 and Year 5 were being addressed.</p> <p>In terms of writing the DHT confirmed that this aspect was being addressed in a</p>	

cross curricular manner. In addition the Year 2 and Year 6 cohorts were being moderated extensively as part of the Chorlton cluster and the feedback from these exercises was very positive.

Q. What were the main areas of challenge for the school?

A. The school has identified spelling, handwriting and grammar as the main areas of challenge.

The Committee recognised that 32% of marks in the forthcoming SATs tests would be allocated to these areas

The DHT confirmed that the school was identifying evidence of progress in these areas from the workbook scrutiny exercises. However, staff were conscious that these areas required further emphasis in order to be fully embedded. In addition the school was mindful of achieving this focus while maintaining creativity in learning.

In terms of maths it was noted that this area represented a strength of the school.

Q. Should the school consider if its interpretation of 'expected' differ from other schools' interpretation of 'expected' – which would impact on the data?

A. It was considered to a degree, but the school had robust procedures and practices in place and was confident that the assessments were rigorous and fair. In addition the assessments were supported through external moderation exercises – with the Chorlton cluster of schools.

The Committee reviewed the end of year (EOY) predictions across the school for the different subject areas. It was noted that the EOY predictions were broken down into three designated areas – emerging; secure expected or more and exceeding. The data between the EOY predictions and the whole school attainment were compared.

The committee noted that with the exception of Year 1 the other cohorts were in line with the expected 65% floor target set by central government. However, it was also appreciated that although the current Year 5 group was at 65% when they became the Year 6 group for 2016-2017 the floor target would have been adjusted to 85%. This would be a major challenge for a cohort with a number of on-going issues.

In terms of writing the EOY data was considered quite strong:

Year 1 – 67%

Year 2 – 53%

Year 3 – 58%

Year 4 – 68%

Year 5 – 61%

Year 6 – 65%

It was appreciated that the Year 5 group was again a challenge and an area of concern especially going forward to 2016-2017.

Q. Maths overall was again very strong?

A. Yes – the same proviso as above for Year 5.

In terms of the targets for spelling, punctuation and grammar the Committee noted that in relation to Year 2 - 67% 'secure plus' and 22% 'exceeding'. Whereas I for Year 6 80% 'secure plus' and 37% 'exceeding'.

The Committee discussed the impact on the data of the school's vulnerable groups

which required additional work.

Q. What was the main challenge for Year 5?

A. 31% of the cohort were designated as 'disadvantage pupils'.

The Committee considered the data in relation to a number of different targeted groups: gender; Pupil Premium Grant (PPG) eligible pupils (disadvantaged); English as an additional language (EAL) and special educational needs and disability (SEND).

Q. There are high percentages of EAL pupils in some year groups?

A. Yes especially in Year 5 (39%) and Year 6 (36%).

Q. Was there any merit in sub-dividing the 'age related expectation' (ARE) aspect for the disadvantaged pupils?

A. It was possible, and it would provide greater detail; the differentiation was already built into the grading criteria.

Q. Was the school aware of pupils that were represented in more than one of the vulnerable groups?

A. Yes – there were a number of pupils across the different groups.

Q. Was the school investigating the different intervention / support options for the pupils in the vulnerable groups?

A. Yes – although the school has not identified a single intervention programme that was consistently successful. The school was focused on adapting the current systems with teachers leading the interventions / support activities in order to maximise the impact.

Q. Has the school supported the staff in developing their understanding of the new assessment methods?

A. Yes – in addition to training the pupil progress meetings have helped identify those teachers who have developed strongly. These teachers were then supporting their colleagues, sharing their knowledge and developing others.

The Committee discussed the additional pressures on staff and the potential impact on staff turnover – this was considered in association with anecdotal evidence of staff leaving the teaching profession.

Q. Did the school consider that the new curriculum would have an impact on staff turnover?

A. No – currently the staffing situation was very positive; a number of teachers currently on maternity leave were scheduled to return for the start of the new academic year. It was recognised by the school that the returning staff would require additional support.

The Committee considered that with the returning staff from maternity leave it was essential for the school to retain the 'strong' staff.

The DHT confirmed that the school's data compared favorably with the 'outstanding' schools in the cluster.

Q. was there a difference in assessments with the comparable schools?

A. There would be minor differences as all schools based their assessments on a model provided by the Department for Education (DfE).

Q. Were the newly qualified teachers (NQT) impacted by the changes in the curriculum?

A. The NQT staff were coping well with the changes. They were strong practitioners and also were befitting from being involved in the early stages of the change process.

There were no additional points raised in relation to the report to update the Committee on the new assessment. The Committee agreed to accept the report into the record of the meeting.

There were no additional points raised in relation to the Spring Term data collection and it was agreed to accept the report into the record of the meeting.

Resolutions / Agreed Actions	Owner	Date
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Agreed – new assessment update report accepted into record of meeting.	T&L Committee	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Agreed – Spring Term data report accepted into record of meeting.	T&L Committee	

Item 5	Spring Data Collection		
The chair confirmed that the points for discussion under this item were raised as part of Item 4 above.			
Resolutions / Agreed Actions		Owner	Date

Item 6	Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) Data.
<p>The Headteacher presented her report in relation to the EYFS data and the following points were noted in discussion.</p> <p>The Committee recognised that the curriculum and assessment processes had not changed.</p> <p>It was noted that the prediction was for 70% of pupils on track currently to achieving the required standard known as a good level of development (GLD) at the end of Reception. The area of greatest improvement was in 'knowledge and understanding of the world', with lower increases in relation to reading. The EYFS department has already taken actions in order to address the issue of reading – although it was appreciated that the projections for attainment were good.</p> <p>In addition it was noted that the pupils' grasp of numbers was also not as good and the attainment was not at the same level as reading. Again the school has already taken action to address the issue – including the establishment of 'maths packs' to support the pupils and additional workshops to support the parents.</p> <p>In terms of Reception it was recognised that the data was also strong and this was a developing area of the school. Currently the prediction was for 76% of pupils to attain a GLD despite the arrival mid-year of two additional pupils. The school was expecting to exceed the national average and last year's results.</p> <p>The area of concern was writing with only 68% at the required level; the previous year was 70% and as a result additional actions have been taken. The school was developing the writing books further and also planning two writing tasks each week.</p>	

In relation to the writing books there was additional emphasis on staff marking as a means of supporting pupil progress. The school was also developing improvements in the transition process from Nursery to Reception.

There were no additional points noted in relation to the EYFS data report and the Committee agreed to accept the report into the record of the meeting.

Resolutions / Agreed Actions	Owner	Date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed – accept EYFS data report into record of meeting. 	T&L Committee	

Item 7	AOB	
There were no additional points for discussion and the meeting was closed.		
Resolutions / Agreed Actions	Owner	Date
•		

Item 8	Date of Next Meeting		
The Committee agreed the date of the next scheduled meeting: Monday 11 July 2016 at 5.00pm to precede the scheduled Governing Body meeting.			
Resolutions / Agreed Actions		Owner	Date
• Agreed – date and time for next meetings		Resource Committee	