ST BARNABAS' C.E. PRIMARY SCHOOL



Minutes of the virtual meeting of the Curriculum Committee held on Tuesday 18th January 2022 at 4pm

Present: Karen Boardman (Headteacher)

Anne Williamson (Chair of Governors)

Jo Patton (Chair)

Lorna Longman (from 5.06pm)

Daniel Wilkinson

Maguire Agnew Lindsay Graystone

Rachel Pena Harran – Deputy Headteacher In Attendance:

> Sarah Curry - EYFS & English Lead (until 5.13pm) Barbara Kybett – Governance Advisor, Clerk

Action 1. Welcome, Apologies for Absence, Consents and Declarations of Interest The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, with a particular welcome to the Deputy Headteacher, the Clerk and Sarah Curry. EYFS lead, who were all attending their first Curriculum Committee meeting. There were no apologies for absence. There were no declarations of interest. Minutes of the meeting held on 9th November 2021, Matters Arising and Action Plan 2. Previously distributed. The Headteacher advised that there was an error in the list of attendees as Kerry Davies was Deputy Headteacher at Clifton with Rawcliffe Primary not St Lawrence's. The Chair of Governors referred to page 2 of the minutes and paragraph 8, noting that the question was about a child with an EHCP, not an MSP. Subject to these amendments, the minutes from the meeting held on 9th November 2021 were agreed to be a true and accurate record. There were no matters arising from the minutes. **Action Plan** Action Status A governor suggested adding a sentence about the provision made for SEN on page 2, the Headteacher explained the word 'vulnerable' covered all groups and perhaps they needed to Complete remove the example instead. The Chair agreed and the Headteacher will remove the example. 2. The Chair of governors explained the SENDCo had a Power Point she had shared with staff at the training day and she would send Complete this out to governors. The Chair challenged would the maths scheme be remote learning ready if they needed it to be, the maths lead answered the Complete

company were looking into their provision for online learning and

| | she could find out. | | |
|----|--|----------|--|
| 4. | The governors requested another curriculum meeting at the end of | | |
| | January 2022. The clerk will review dates and organise another | Complete | |
| | meeting. | | |

With reference to Action Point 3, Lindsay Graystone explained that, in the event of another lockdown, Maths workbooks would be sent home with pupils, and teachers would teach from the content. She added that pupils were used to working from the books and there was a video guide to assist parents.

3. **Notification of Any Other Business**

No other business was notified.

4. Standards Update and Catch up plans including Support for SEND and Disadvantaged Pupils

Previously distributed.

Autumn Term Data Tables

Evaluation of Data

The Headteacher referred to the previously distributed papers, noting that the data had been analysed in school. She explained that the progress of the Year 2 cohort was based on the informal assessments undertaken on entry to Reception, as there had been no formal EYFS baseline assessment that year. Similarly, progress data of the Year 3 and Year 4 cohorts had been based on their prior attainment at the end of the summer term of Reception as they didn't have Key Stage 1 results. It was expected that all children would have made progress from their benchmarks and pupils who were underachieving have been identified and would be a focus for support and intervention.

The Headteacher referred first to the paper entitled *English Data Headlines January 2022* and reported that pupils in Years 2 and 3 had the lowest levels of attainment at this stage, as their education had been the most disrupted by the pandemic, and in the case of the Year 3 pupils by changes in staffing. In addition, Year 2 pupils had not been well prepared for independent learning in Year 2 as a result of missing part of Reception and Year 1 due to Covid lockdowns. The Headteacher highlighted the strengths of the data, specifically that the Year 6 mock test outcomes were positive and more pupils had reached the expected standard than in 2019. Areas for development focussed on Year 2 and 3 which had the highest number of pupils not meeting the expected standard.

In response to a governor's question, the Headteacher confirmed that the Phonics scheme "Little Wandle" used by the school was compliant with DfE requirements.

A governor asked if boys' lower attainment in Reading was unexpected. The Headteacher responded that it was not, as this was a common thread in Reading data from the Pathfinder schools.

The Chair of Governors challenged that the headline data for Years 1, 2 and 3 was disappointing. The Headteacher agreed that the standards were too low and were not replicated in other Pathfinder schools. She underlined that these year groups would be a priority for support. Phonics was a particular issue but governors should see improvements in the next set of data. She noted that teachers had erred on the side of caution in their

judgements. It was noted that the Committee would need to carefully monitor trends in the data from Years 1, 2 and 3.

The Headteacher advised that, in Writing, the outcomes were similar to those of Reading. Writing would be a priority for the second half of the spring and summer terms. She observed that Writing would also improve as a result of the focus on Phonics.

The Headteacher advised that Maths outcomes were generally lower than Reading and Writing.

The Headteacher shared a paper detailing the Phonics data headlines, which Sarah Curry spoke to. Sarah commented that the context of the data was similar to that of Reading and Writing – that is, the disruption to teaching caused by the pandemic and by staff absence had impacted on Phonics learning. Sarah guided governors through the areas of strength, highlighting the early impact of the Little Wandle phonics scheme. In terms of areas for development, Sarah noted that, whilst results from the Phonics check were disappointing, in fact pupils were reading well and it was the nonsense words in the check which were proving a barrier to some. Sarah advised that underperforming children would continue to be closely monitored; in fact, interventions set out in the Little Wandle scheme ensured that progress was checked every three weeks.

Sarah reported that Rachel Lanzillotti from the LA had visited the school and had undertaken a "deep dive" in Phonics and early reading; Ms Lanzillotti had been very positive about the Phonics teaching she had seen in progress. She had noted that reading books were matched correctly to lower ability readers and had identified next steps which included working with support staff to ensure that they were delivering support consistently.

In response to the Chair's question, Sarah confirmed that the Little Wandle scheme was making a significant impact. The Chair asked if there was any cross key stage work taking place. Lindsay responded that all teachers and TAs had undertaken training for Little Wandle and were putting this practice.

A governor asked if there was any evidence of parental involvement. Sarah advised that in her class, about half had written in their child's reading record and seemed to be engaged with reading with their child. There was some discussion about the Go Read app, and how this could be used to better record the type of reading which was being done at home, for instance, if older children read a few pages of a longer book each day. Lindsay commented that there was further work to be done to get the best of the app.

Moving to the Maths data headlines, the Deputy Headteacher advised that the areas for development were similar to those of Reading and Writing, that is, there had been a significant drop in attainment in Years 2 and 3. Maths overall had lower outcomes than Reading and Writing, except in Year 1. The Deputy Headteacher summarised the planned actions detailed in the paper. Lindsay reported that staff had been trained to implement the Teaching for Mastery programme in Maths and provided examples of how this was being put into practice in the classroom. The Chair of Governors asked how this work would be differentiated. The Deputy Headteacher shared examples of differentiation. Lindsay added that the children were partnered in mixed ability pairs which support their learning.

Catch up Plans

The Headteacher commented that catch up plans had been covered in the data headlines papers and added that small groups were accessing specific interventions. She advised that TA support was quite stretched due to budget constrictions and a sickness absence.

The Chair of Governors challenged whether TAs were adequately supported to work with challenging needs. The Headteacher responded that TAs had met with the SENDCo and the school's Behaviour Support officer; TAs would be supported to implement what they had learnt in training, and their work would be monitored.

The Chair asked if the Deputy Headteacher felt that she had a true overview of the school at this stage. The Deputy Headteacher responded that she had been well supported since she joined the school at the beginning of term and was confident that she had a good picture of the school's position.

5. **Curriculum Update**

Previously distributed.

5a) Curriculum Action Plan

The Headteacher referred to the previously distributed Curriculum Action Plan, noting that it was a work in progress still and that predictions for end of year outcomes were yet to be added. She reminded governors that challenging targets would be set for all pupils and referred to the key objectives, actions and success criteria for each subject in the Action Plan.

The Chair of Governors referred to the success criteria in the Reading section, and challenged that the parent survey planned for the first half of summer term would be too late to determine if parents needed support to help their child with Phonics. The Headteacher agreed to move this to the second half of the spring term. She also agreed to amend the monitoring of Go Read reading records to the first half of the spring term.

HT

(Lorna Longman joined the meeting at 5.06pm)

The Headteacher summarised the contents of the Action Plan.

(Sarah Curry left the meeting at 5.13pm)

Lindsay updated governors on the use of UFOs (Using the Four Operations) in Maths and the strategies being used in the classroom, the aim of which was to recap key skills on a daily basis.

It was noted that success criteria and timescales would added in where there were currently gaps in the plan.

- 5b) Phonics and Early Reading
- 5c) Maths

It was agreed that these items had been covered under Item 4.

5d) Updated non-negotiables for teaching and learning

The Headteacher reported that the non-negotiables had been reviewed and minor amendments made. They had now been shared with all staff. The Headteacher underlined

the importance of the non-negotiables as they underpinned teaching and learning. She advised that their implementation in the classroom would be monitored frequently so that areas to address were identified quickly. The Chair challenged that he would expect every teacher to adhere to them as they were all "non-negotiables". The Headteacher agreed but noted that teachers would demonstrate different levels of expertise.

The Chair asked how feedback on the non-negotiables would be shared. The Headteacher advised that Kerry Davies had undertaken lesson observations and had provided written feedback. In addition, the Headteacher and Deputy Headteacher were making notes for meetings with teachers on areas for development which they had identified from visits to lessons. The Chair asked if there were plans to share good practice. The Headteacher confirmed that this was in place.

5e) Planning template

The Headteacher advised that this had been revised with a view to simplifying it for more consistent use across the school. An area had been added, into which the names of SEND, Pupil Premium and EAL pupils could be added and against which teachers would record specific provision for these children. The Deputy Headteacher confirmed that most of the information in the template would remain the same week on week and thus it would not add significantly to teachers' workload. The Headteacher confirmed that staff were now using the planning template; implementation would be monitored and feedback would be sought in due course.

6. **SEN Update**

School SEN Profile

The Headteacher advised that the register had not changed significantly since the last meeting. She provided an update on children with SEMH whose needs had escalated since then, and reported that she had written to the LA regarding one pupil whose needs were beyond those which the school could adequately support. As a result, there had been the offer of extra support, including time at an Alternative Provision setting. The Headteacher considered that the additional support for this pupil as well as another pupil with SEMH would benefit these children.

The Headteacher provided further details on some individual cases, noting that the school had been using its allocation of Educational Psychology Service hours to support requests for EHCPs. Carolyn Ray had been managing the processes according to priority.

The Chair questioned whether the process of applying for EHCPs was hindered by Carolyn not being a member of school staff and challenged that this might have impacted the accuracy of the SEND register. The Headteacher responded that Carolyn undertook classroom observations, and whilst she was not always witness to all the challenges presented by children with SEND, she had been able to gather appropriate evidence for the paperwork which she had completed. Lindsay agreed that Carolyn's support was extremely valuable and that she knew pupils very well. A governor added that SEND support provided in this way was not unique to the school.

The Chair of Governors reported that she would be meeting with Carolyn this half term.

It was noted that the Deputy Headteacher would take over the SENDCo role from September but she would be working towards this during this academic year.

The Chair challenged the current process for identifying children with SEND, as he was concerned that issues might be missed. The Headteacher gave assurances that Carolyn was kept fully aware of SEND concerns identified in school and the school continued to maintain close links with the playgroup.

7. **Pupil Premium Statement**

Previously distributed.

The Headteacher noted that the document was based on a specific format set out by the DfE and whilst the "Statement of Intent" section was based on a DfE model text, the "Challenges" were specific to the school.

The Chair of Governors noted that the possibility of training playgroup staff to deliver the "Little Wandle" phonics scheme had been raised.

Under the section headed "Intended outcomes", the Headteacher advised that the DfE now permitted that PP plans could be in place for four to five years; she had thus added timescales to 2024/25. The Chair of Governors challenged that outcomes should be achieved much sooner. The Headteacher agreed but noted that the timescale would ensure that outcomes were achieved consistently over several years. However, the Chair of Governors highlighted that, in particular, the aim of achieving a "reduction in bullying" by 2024/25 did not read well. The Headteacher agreed to amend this timescale and also add a comment that all work towards all outcomes had already begun.

HT

The Headteacher referred to the details of the section in the report headed "Activity in this academic year" and also noted that there was no test data from 2020/21 to add to the section "Review of outcomes in the previous academic year".

The Chair commented that there was no mention in the paper of support for children with EAL. The Headteacher explained that EAL did not entitle children to PP funding in itself. She agreed to determine which pupils were EAL and also entitled to PP funding.

HT

The Chair thanked the Headteacher for her work on the Pupil Premium Statement.

8. **Behaviour Update**

The Headteacher reported that she had undertaken a pupil voice exercise around behaviour at the end of November, and also planned to undertake a pupil survey. The Headteacher highlighted the following outcomes from the pupil voice exercise:

- pupils reported that generally other pupils were well behaved, although low level disruption was an irritation
- they thought that other pupils were mostly caring and kind
- they liked rewards such as class Dojo and certificates
- they understood that pupils who behaved badly would be sanctioned
- they had a good understanding of what was fair and not fair
- they could work in class mostly uninterrupted, although disturbances caused by specific children were referenced; staff were already aware of these behaviour issues and incidents were documented on CPOMS.

The Headteacher advised that Adam Levick would contribute to a review of the Behaviour Policy as he was currently undertaking relevant CPD.

| | The Headteacher advised that this was a model policy which encompassed the statutory | |
|-----|---|--------|
| | guidance for exclusions. Approved. | |
| | Approved. | |
| | Marking and Feedback Policy | |
| | The Headteacher advised that the policy had been shared and discussed with all staff. | |
| | In response to a question, the Deputy Headteacher explained that the specific references to | |
| | marking in Years 2 and 6 were because these were statutory assessment years: pupils | |
| | needed to be able correct their own mistakes as evidence of their knowledge. A governor | |
| | commented that these might need further explanation for parents if the policy was to be | |
| | published on the website. It was agreed that a sentence would be added to clarify that marking would be different for Years 2 and 6. | нт |
| | marking would be different for reals 2 and 6. | |
| | A governor queried the use of green and orange highlighting, noting that these colours | |
| | could not be distinguished by colour blind pupils or staff. The Deputy Headteacher | |
| | explained that, if colour blindness was identified, a different colour highlighter would be used. | |
| | | |
| | The Chair asked how new members of staff would be made aware of the marking policy – | |
| | he suggested a pictorial representation. The Deputy Headteacher advised that this was already in place but agreed that examples of marking and feedback would also be useful. | |
| | ancady in place but agreed that examples of marking and recuback would also be useful. | Agenda |
| | Recommended to the FGB for approval, subject to the amendments discussed. | FGB |
| 10 | | |
| 10. | Any Other Business There was no other business. | |
| | There was no other basiness. | |
| 11. | Date and time of next meeting: | |
| | Tuesday 15 th March 2022 at 4pm | |
| | The meeting closed at 6.05pm | |
| | | |
| | Jo Patton 15 th March 2022 | |
| | Jo Patton (Chair) Date | |

ST BARNABAS' C.E. PRIMARY SCHOOL

Action Plan following the Meeting of the Curriculum Committee held on ${\bf 18}^{\rm th}$ January 2022

| | Action | Item | Person | Date |
|----|---|------|--------|----------------------------------|
| 1. | Make amendments to Curriculum Action Plan timescales as discussed. | 5a | НТ | By next Curriculum meeting |
| 2. | Amend timescale re: reduction in bullying in PP Report and also add a comment that all work towards all outcomes has already begun. | 7 | нт | By next Curriculum meeting |
| 3. | Determine which EAL pupils are also entitled to PP funding. | 7 | нт | By next Curriculum meeting |
| 4. | Add a sentence to the Marking and Feedback Policy to clarify that marking is different for Years 2 and 6. | 9 | НТ | ASAP |

Items for the next Curriculum meeting:

Items for the next FGB:

• Marking and Feedback Policy