

Minutes of the Morley Memorial Learning Committee

5 October 2015

Attendance: Anna Robinson (AR)
 Nikki Brown (Head)
 Nicky Odgers (NO) (Chair)
 Marc Neesam (MN)
 Melissa Ward (MW)
 Ruth Kershner (RK)
 Emma Linney (EL) (Clerk)

Apologies:

Venue: School

	Notes	Actions
1.	<p>Apologies</p> <p>There were no apologies.</p>	
2.	<p>Notice of AOB</p>	
3.	<p>Declarations of interest</p> <p>MN declared that he is part of the test review group for science.</p>	
4.	<p>Minutes of the last meeting, 11 May (circulated) and matters arising</p> <p>The minutes were agreed as a true record and signed by the chair.</p>	Clerk – upload minutes to school website.
5.	<p>Data 2014-15 (data analysis by year group circulated)</p> <p>The Chair gave some context. The Data Group (MW, AR, NO, MN) had met last week to go through the data in detail and decided that it was worth spending time on it at Committee level to ensure all GBs knew how to interpret the data in the new format.</p> <p>Full data would come to the LC termly, in a format to be agreed. It was also noted that there would be no APS data from this point, instead data would be 'banded'.</p>	

	Notes	Actions
	<p>There was a discussion about how to look in detail at small group data, e.g. PP or FSM, without identifying individual children. NO would ask governor services for guidance and NB would ask the NAHT. GBs agreed that the focus at Curriculum Committee level should be on progress of PP children in KS1 and KS2 and comparing this with progress of non PP children. The focus should be on whether the gap between the groups was getting smaller. The Pupil Premium link governor (RK) would then drill down in more detail. A GB reported that at a recent training session it was noted that the current national focus was on progress and attainment of children who received PP who also had SEN..</p> <p>There was a discussion about format of data. The Committee was in agreement that the data should come in the same format as it would do under an Ofsted inspection.</p> <p>The Committee then analysed the data in detail.</p> <p>A GB asked what was being done to improve levels of physical development in EY, particularly in boys. Head: Playground provision was currently poor, and would be difficult to address until the playground redevelopment project was underway. However, physical development would be part of the SDP 2016-17. She also noted that fine motor skills were slower to develop in boys than girls, which explained the data to some extent. In addition, there were three boys with statements in last year's EY cohort; without these children the differential between girls and boys reduces from 17% to 5%.</p> <p>A GB asked why maths progress appeared to be slower than other subjects in EY. Head: Children tend to start school with higher on entry data in maths particularly in number as aspects such as counting tend to be covered more thoroughly in the home and PVI settings. This is less the case with reading and writing, Higher on entry attainment means children have less progress to make to achieve ELGs</p> <p>A GB asked why the attainment of FSM, PP, EAL and SEN Support children was lower than average at the end of KS2. Head: Venn diagrams show that many of children in one group are also in at least one other.</p>	<p>Chair and HT – seek guidance on looking at data without identifying individual children</p>

	Notes	Actions
	<p>Again, she noted the small sizes of these cohorts. The data for one child can significantly impact the data for the group as a whole.</p> <p>A GB asked why progress in Y2 was less than in Y1, and what was being done to address this. Head: The objective in Y1 is to write in sentences and to read with phonics. In Y2 there is a significant jump to be able to write short narratives, and to think about character and plot. Expectations are far higher.</p> <p>A GB asked what was being done in Y1 to prepare children for this in Y2. Head: Reception teachers look at children’s books in the autumn term of Y1 to ensure that they are being sufficiently challenged and that expectations are high enough of individual children during the year so that they are ready for Y2.</p> <p>A GB asked how teachers were being supported in this. Head: Planning was being totally overhauled, and stronger links were being made with the new age-related expectations. Teachers were working with each other across year groups to ensure the curriculum was well mapped out, and moderating against the new bands. The Head stressed what a big journey this was. While Target Tracker has a few benchmarks, national ones are not yet available and so there will be inevitable issues around the reliability of progress data. This was creating anxiety amongst teachers around performance management based on pupil progress.</p> <p>A GB asked why many groups underperformed in Y6 Head: KS2 interventions were now in place, including class teacher time out with these groups in Y6. Last year the LA provided distinct funding for this in the Spring term, and the school plans to apply again if this is offered. There would need to be a discussion at the Resources Committee about whether this strategy ought to be funded within school if the LA doesn’t offer it. The Head’s view was that a long term approach needs to be to work more solidly with children in Y5 so that in Y6 there can be a focus on a wider curriculum which challenges the more able, rather than a narrower focus on getting everyone to L4+ by the end of the year.</p> <p>A GB asked for an explanation of the Y6 data. Head: Maths progress in Y6 was not as good as for other subjects, although high achievers did</p>	

	Notes	Actions
	<p>very well (20% L6), as did SEN children. Progress and attainment in writing had a boost last year because it was a particular focus of the SDP.</p>	
6.	<p>To review progress towards equality targets 2013-16 (summary sheet circulated)</p> <p><u>1. To continue to minimise the attainment gaps between boys and girls in writing throughout the school, particularly at the end of KS2.</u></p> <p>The Head advised the committee that this target was not being met last year because it had not been linked to the SDP, but that it would be this year.</p> <p><u>2. To improve the attainment of children with SEND with a particular focus on KS1, in order to close the gap.</u></p> <p>The Committee asked the Head to re-issue the summary sheet to include national data, and also showing the percentage of SEND children in each year group.</p> <p>The Head advised that the attainment of children with SEND at Morley is good in maths and reading, but less so in writing. The Committee asked why this might be. The Head advised that often children with SEND have specific learning difficulties, e.g. dyslexia, or speech, language and communication issues, and that these tend to impact more on literacy than maths.</p> <p>A GB asked whether speech and language practitioners work with SEND children at the school.</p> <p>Head: The School makes regular referrals, but therapists are in short supply at the LA and struggle to cope with demand. Unfortunately the school budget does not stretch to using independent practitioners. There was a discussion about how to better support parents to encourage children to speak and to write more. TAs in EY are trained in the Elklan system and use it to good effect in small groups. It was agreed that it was important to ensure the TAs were trained in observation and assessment too, in order to be able to report progress and therefore give the system value in the school.</p> <p><u>3. To promote spiritual, moral, social and cultural development through cross-curricular teaching</u></p>	<p>Head: expand data for target 2.</p>

	Notes	Actions
	<p><u>opportunities, with particular reference to issues of equality and diversity.</u></p> <p>A GB asked whether there were opportunities for drama in the curriculum. Head: Drama is used as a teaching tool, for example through role play in History. Teachers who are confident use it more than those who don't. There isn't space to add drama to the SDP at the moment, as the focus needs to be on embedding the new wider NC and on approaches to assessment.</p>	
7.	<p>Update on national changes to SATs (summary circulated)</p> <p>The Head gave an overview of changes and reported that teachers are starting to prepare for the new KS1 SPAG test now.</p> <p>She noted that EAL children may actually find the new focus on written arithmetic tests rather than mental maths easier. It was noted that there would be no Science KS2 paper but that there would be random sampling including in chemistry and physics. There would also be pre-assessment sampling for statistical purposes.</p>	
8.	<p>Update on changes to national reporting of assessment (summary circulated)</p> <p>The Head gave an overview. There was a discussion around parental anxiety about knowing where their child sits nationally, and also around how comparisons would be made between schools. It was noted that the assessment commission had not yet reported. There was also a discussion around how best to set progress and attainment targets using age related expectations. The Committee and the Head were in agreement that a strong, robust internal assessment system would be necessary.</p>	
9.	<p>Dates of next meetings</p> <p>Spring 2016: 4th February Summer 2016: 16th June</p>	

	Notes	Actions
	The meeting opened at 7.30pm and closed at 9.30pm	

All decisions pay due regard to the school's equality policy and the Equality Act 2010

Abbreviations: SL – Subject Leader, LA – Local Authority, A GB – A governor, The GB – The Governing Body, RAP – Raising Achievement Plan, YR – Reception, SEND – special educational needs and disabilities, FSM – free school meals, EAL – English as an additional language, PP – Pupil Premium, GLD – Good Level of Development. (Early Years). SPAG – spelling and grammar, TA – teaching assistant, NAHT – National Association of Head Teachers.