



**Minutes of St. Gregory the Great Curriculum and Achievement Committee meeting held on Thursday 5th November 2015 at 4.00pm in the school**

	<p><b>Present:</b> Pita Enriquez Harris (PH) Foundation/Chair Khurshid Ahmed (KA) Staff (to arrive late) Robert Bennett (RB) Parent Myfanwy Brown (MB) Foundation David Forster (DF) Foundation Dervilla Maher (DM) Foundation Chris Skerry (CS) Staff Marcella McCarthy (MMc) Principal</p>	
	<p><b>In attendance:</b> Sandra Cromey (SC) Clerk Rodger Caseby (RC) Associate Principal Nick Rose (NR) Associate Principal Adrian Rees (AR) Associate Principal Marie-Therese Weston (MTW) Associate Principal Adam Easton (AE) Subject Leader for Science Pauline Wileman (PW) Assistant Principal <b>Apologies:</b> Hannah Forder-Ball (HFB) Assistant Principal (Primary) Margaret Madden (MM) Foundation <b>Absent:</b> Steve Jones (SJ) Associate Principal</p>	
	<p>Presentation – Science at 4.07pm</p>	
1.	<p><b>Welcome, Apologies, Prayer and quorum</b> The Chair welcomed attendees and presenting staff, Adam Easton and Pauline Wileman, to the meeting. <b>Apologies</b> were received and accepted. <b>Prayer:</b> The meeting opened with the school prayer. <b>Quorate:</b> The meeting was quorate and began at 4.07pm.</p> <p><b>Presentation – Science</b> AE gave a presentation on the work of the Science Department 2015/16 distributing a paper (<b>Appendix A</b>) with highlights of curriculum changes and results for the previous Year 11, the current Year 11, and way forward.</p> <p>RC left the meeting at 4.07pm and re-joined the meeting at 4.08pm. DM left the meeting at 4.08pm and re-joined the meeting at 4.09pm.</p> <p>Additional Science VA (Value added) had improved slightly compared with the previous year. Lower ability VA increased with LA students achieving a whole grade better than in the previous year. Similar to some other subjects, predicted grades were not as expected in Middle ability.</p>	



	<p>For Core Science 2014/15 (current Year 11) improvements had increased and the gap between PP (Pupil Premium) and non-PP had closed from 4 to 0 which was very pleasing. In Year 10, smaller mixed ability groups had been formed which had improved VA in all categories. This model of a top set and three mixed ability groupings had thus been adopted for all year groups 8-11. Current Year 11 Additional Science 2015/16 retained mixed ability groups with additional group with a 15:1 pupil/teacher ratio. Progress was being closely monitored and evaluated. Last year's disengaged students were now engaged.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Did they do core sciences after one year? (PH) <b>A:</b> Yes. (AE) <b>Q:</b> Where was triple science? (RB) <b>A:</b> Within half a unit of value-added. (AE) <b>Q:</b> Could the meeting have figures for these next time to see how they were doing? (RB) <b>A:</b> Separate sciences were actually shown on the Handout (photos). (AE) RB was in the final stages of his report for Science Link visit. He followed up what was happening with vacancy as a member of staff would be leaving. An advert had been placed for this post (which AE considered to be a crucial appointment). The preferred option was for a NQT (Newly Qualified Teacher) to be ready for September, ideally in physics.</p> <p>The Chair thanked AE for his presentation.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AE left the meeting at 4.20pm. MTW joined the meeting at 4.21pm.</p>	
<p><b>2.</b></p>	<p><b>Declaration of Any Other Urgent Business</b> PH announced that Patricia Simon had stepped down as a Foundation Representative from the Committee. Another Foundation representative would need to be elected.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Distribution list (Clerk)</li> <li>2. Directed time calculation (RC)</li> <li>3. SIMS (Schools Information Management System) database record of staff (RC)</li> <li>4. Primary School Report (HFB)</li> <li>5. Governors' Fund request (MM)</li> <li>6. SEN (Special Educational Needs and Disability) annual report (carried forward from 15 October 2015 meeting)</li> </ol>	
<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p><b>Declaration of interests</b> No interests declared for any items on the agenda.</p>	
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>Minutes of meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> October 2015</b> <b>Correction: p.1 Presentation – English</b> Question and Answer (last 2 lines of page) were manually corrected and</p>	



	<p>initialled by the Chair to read: “...course work (KS5). <b>A: Yes, for KS5.</b> ...iGCSE for English. <b>A: KS4 had course work for one more year. (MMc)</b>”</p> <p>The minutes were approved as a correct record of the meeting and signed by the Chair.</p>	
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>Matters arising from minutes of the previous meeting</b></p> <p>p. 2 Item 3: RB reported that one parent had expressed interest in becoming a Parent representative on the Academy Committee and would be speaking to MM.</p> <p>p. 2 Item 4: RC had e-mailed School Aspect about log-in problem.</p> <p>p. 3 Item 8: <b>Action 1: PH would send out new set of Terms of Reference.</b></p> <p>p. 3 Item 9: 5 profiles had been received to date.</p> <p>p. 3 Item 10: MMc reported that EFA (Education Funding Agency) had provided templates for the school to complete. MMc and Kerry Simmonds were working together on budget and staffing to plan ways of saving money. DfE (Department for Education) would be visiting on 26<sup>th</sup> November 2015 to investigate Teaching and Learning VFM (Value for Money) and how the school was improving. MMc had met the Prime Minister yesterday as the representative of a deputation of Oxford City Schools regarding School Finances. It had been a productive meeting.</p> <p><b>Action 2: MMc to send briefing paper to RB.</b></p> <p>RC queried why schools had to apply for Pupil Premium given that the DfE already had the data.</p> <p>p. 6 Item 12: It was decided that <b>KA did not need to send a report</b> on behaviour as he had given a very good oral report, which had been minuted in detail.</p> <p>p.8 Item 13: The Performance development policy had been modified and RC was waiting for the recommendations to go to committee.</p> <p>p. 9 Item 15: Google docs had been updated by PH. More <b>learning walks</b> to be scheduled.</p>	<p><b>PH</b></p> <p><b>MMc</b></p> <p><b>closed</b></p>
<p><b>6.</b></p>	<p>As MMc was unwell, item 7 of the agenda was brought forward before item 6.</p> <p><b>School Improvement Plan (SIP) – first draft and discussion</b></p> <p>As agreed at the Full Academy Committee meeting of 15 October 2015, MMc had e-mailed the link to the live SIP (emerging from Ofsted (Office for Standards in Education) comment and Self Evaluation Form (SEF) on School Aspect) document to representatives.</p> <p>The SIP was had become more detailed as action plans and budgets had been numbered up and linked in. Separate documents were thus being pulled together in one place.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Who had access to this? (PH)</p> <p><b>A:</b> All Senior Leadership Team (SLT) and those with a responsibility tying into it. (MMc)</p>	



	<p>It was going well and items relating to Term 6 last year and Term 1 this academic year had been completed.</p> <p>MMc felt that there should be a Research champion for Teaching and Learning and RC emphasised that research was endemic to all aspects of teaching from small projects by teachers in their own classes to more formal projects to which the school contributed e.g. research run by Oxford University. MMc wished to promulgate a more active research culture i.e. one in which newly introduced methodologies were evaluated.</p> <p>The SIP was translating Ofsted comment into how improvement could be achieved. Under the headings from the school's own evaluation, a lot of details had been supplied by KA e.g. in relation to the work being done regarding behaviour, and how it was managed so that there was a move to actively good behaviour. SIP involved planning ahead and so evaluation was built into the structure to enable this.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> How was the SIP kept up to date? (PH) <b>A:</b> There were two meeting per week (Core SLT on Mondays and SLT on Wednesdays). Themes from the Monday meeting were followed through on the Wednesday agenda e.g. this week, AR had looked at the area of line-management and put into place a structure to monitor departments and their line-management.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Where was this incorporated into SIP? (RB) <b>A:</b> It was directly imported into SIP as this was a <i>live</i> document on Google Docs and School Aspect. (MMc) RC, PH and MMc discussed the relative merits of School Aspect (which could be problematic) with Google docs. PH liked the SIP very much.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> How often would the committee be looking at the SIP? (RB) <b>A:</b> This could be a standing item which was printed out on the day for handing out to committees. (MMc)</p> <p><b>Action 3: SIP to be added as a standing item to the agenda.</b> <b>Action 4: SIP to be printed out by the school for distribution at meetings.</b></p>	<p><b>Clerk MMc/RG</b></p>
<p><b>7.</b></p>	<p>Item 6 of the agenda was taken after item 7.</p> <p><b>Review CPD (Continuing Professional Development) plan and target setting</b></p> <p>In the past, a list had been given to the committee of courses that staff had attended and the budget allocation for this training.</p> <p>This budget had been stopped to save on costs when it was realised that there were financial problems. The budget had been initially £15k which was reduced to £12k and now was set at £10k.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Is specialist subject-based CPD being delivered? (PH) <b>A:</b> A current example of this was that an academic was coming to talk to the English Department about Thomas Hardy. (MMc)</p>	



	<p>PW left the meeting at 4.50pm and returned at 4.54pm. RC described how AR planned additional CPD slot at the start of whole school subject meetings with a focus on teaching and learning. A lot of Inset was covering cross-curricular themes to apply to subject areas such as numeracy or literacy - as with the Oxford Gaining Momentum programme [collaboration between the National Literacy Trust and Oxfordshire County Council to improve Oxfordshire students' literacy specifically on the importance of language teaching and learning in every subject area. The scheme sought to address the county's attainment gap between disadvantaged and other pupils, with a focus on students in Years 7 and 8]. <b>Action 5: 'CPD Plan on one page' presentation for the next meeting.</b></p> <p>MMc left the meeting at 4.56pm.</p>	<p><b>RC</b></p>
<p><b>8.</b></p>	<p><b>KS3 without levels – a baseline for 2015/16 (Appendix B, C &amp; D)</b> PH congratulated PW on the three brilliant papers that had been received for the meeting. PW described large pressure of work but a lot of PiXL (Partners in Excellence) material was provided to support staff going forward with the new National Curriculum for Key Stages 1-4. This no longer included levels. Pupil progress would be tracked using an assessment model focused on key concepts and skills. <b>Action 6: Representatives to view PiXL webcast</b> <a href="https://goto.webcasts.com/starthere.jsp?ei=1044106">https://goto.webcasts.com/starthere.jsp?ei=1044106</a> <b>[Do representatives have access or need to register?]</b> In Years 7 and 8, levels reporting would be replaced with terms expressing where the pupil was in relation to targets e.g. from 'Exceptional' for exceeding target to 'Poor progress' for below target using a pro forma (like PLCs (Personal Learning Checklist). PiXL looked at key skills needed by students. These needed to be made at KS 3 (Year 7) and were key for diagnoses for improvement and informed interventions. Students were rated in a topic (i.e. caught pre- and post- the findings for each concept and skill. Most important was the flight path (i.e. in Year 7, the flight path could predict where the pupil would be in KS4/5 in Years 8 &amp; 9) in order to raise expectations and keep pupils on target. <b>Q:</b> If a pupil was said to be making 'good progress' when he or she was in line for a D, how would parents be alerted to the fact that the expectation for their child was that they would not meet the level required by many colleges for tertiary education? (PH) <b>A:</b> Looking at flightpath B, for example (in the handout), teachers determined how these would look like in their departments. It was recognised that pupils had different start points and therefore progress measured was relative to their own standard. At parents' evenings, feedback sheets would be used as the starting point for parents to see where the pupil's skills were and how they were developing. Where good year audits were done, Year Heads could target underachievement. Year 9 would continue with levels because it would</p>	<p><b>All</b></p>



be too disruptive to change. (PW)  
**RB** commented that this sounded great and **Q** asked what would happen with train-crashing (sic)? **A:** Teachers were making sure that concepts chosen for assessment were put into their schemes of work so that both schemes of work were tied in and it was clear where the assessment point was using traffic light systems (red, amber, green also known as RAG-rating). (PW)  
**Q:** How would this be bench-marked? (RB)  
**A:** Work was being done to train for checking consistence across subjects. (PW)  
**Q:** Where were examples coming from for English? (PW)  
**A:** From PiXL i.e. from the experts working on these. (PW)  
**Q:** Was it the school's policy that all subject leaders used PiXL? (PH)  
**A:** Teachers used templates but these could be customised. (PW)  
**Q:** Were external resources used to save time? (PH)  
**A:** Staff would use such resources but would change as needed according to the teaching for the particular year group. (PW)  
 According to CS, the biggest change was all about baseline testing e.g. in the Humanities, significance had been put into the baseline so that cause and consequence was feeding into the skills section. Adapting the current scheme of work after baseline skills from PiXL led to tiering of different levels of reasoning i.e. identify, describe, explain.  
 Thus, teachers were identifying where pupils hit the skills and the progress shown beyond that baseline.  
**Q:** How often would this happen? (PH)  
**A:** For example, where CS was teaching for one hour per week, significance and evidence set into the skills set for pupil performance would show on the trim out sheet so the pupils would see where they were in the bands with a description. (CS)  
**Q:** How or where would the pupils see this? (RB)  
**A:** On the trim out sheet from the 5 skills so the data would always be continually refined. (CS)  
 Some schools provided a booklet, for example for Year 7, so a record showed how attainment in subjects against the baseline were aligned. (PW)  
 These could be coloured in along the bands so that the data was more progress-focussed. (CS)  
**Q:** Did lower prior attainment pupils find it difficult? (PH)  
**A:** A lot of reflective time was built in for self- and peer-assessment which created an educational culture in relation to the need to improve. (CS)  
**Q:** Was there evidence of success for this new system? (RB)  
**A:** It was all new so PiXL would need to gather evidence but the foregrounding assessment was more helpful for students as they could see in advance the flight path progress. Now with learning checklists, it could be seen where progress was being made in terms of breadth as well as depth. (RC)



	<p><b>Q:</b> Who else used PiXL? (RB) <b>A:</b> Over a thousand schools were signed up to PiXL. (PW) It had increased from 800 schools. (RC) According to PW, 4Matrix would be compatible with the PiXL process. HFB and PW would be working on what data could be taken from the Primary for Year 7 to be secondary-ready. <b>Q:</b> If parents and students wished to change expectations around attainment, how would they go about it? (PH) <b>A:</b> It was a question of <i>when</i> to share information with parents regarding how an assessment related to GCSE (General Certificate of Secondary Education) achievement. To be told that a pupil was on target for grade E or F could either be demoralising or a call to buck up. (PW) RC added that 4Matrix had transition matrices too so that the flight path could be tracked in relation to attainment but it was difficult because the flight path was pegged between KS2 attainment and GCSE and it was not yet known what the KS2 test looked like yet so the flight path currently had two 'floating' points. RB observed that the key thing for parents was what grade their children gained and <b>recommended</b> that staff talked to the PTA (Parent Teacher Association) which was next meeting on Tuesday 10 November 2015.</p> <p>The Chair thanked PW.</p>	
<p><b>9.</b></p>	<p>Item 9 of the agenda was taken after item 10.</p> <p><b>Parent survey</b> E-mail with link to sample survey had previously been circulated by PH. RC explained how multiple parents could answer surveys from one computer at e.g. open evenings; or by mobile phone.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Could free-text comments be accommodated? (RB) <b>A:</b> These could be built in but analysing the responses was hard to deal with as the school did not subscribe to qualitative survey analysis from Survey Monkey. (RC)</p> <p>KA joined the meeting at 5.34pm.</p> <p>RC suggested topics for survey questions could be e.g. on behaviour; on whether parents found the school website accessible. MTW suggested survey on attendance. <b>Action 7: KA to assist PH in writing questions for parent feedback in a survey by Representatives.</b></p> <p>PH and MM were also due to meet with a group of students in January 2016. <b>Action 8: MTW to identify representative group of students from each year group (Yrs 7-11) to include PP/EAL (English as an Additional</b></p>	<p><b>KA/PH</b></p> <p><b>MTW</b></p>



	<p><b>Language).</b></p> <p>NR and PW left the meeting at 5.37pm.</p> <p>RC pointed out the PP numbers in year groups on the Handout previously distributed. RC and RB discussed the great variation in statistics between the years. PH stated that figures were lower than average in the Primary but RC asserted that the trend for Primary was becoming more like Secondary.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Which Primary schools have larger numbers of PP coming St. Gregory's? (KA) <b>A:</b> Rose Hill, St. John Fisher and Our Lady's. (RC) DM pointed out that as there was only one Secondary [i.e. St. Gregory's], numbers from Primary schools were not representative.</p>	
<p><b>10.</b></p>	<p>Item 10 of the agenda was dealt with before item 9.</p> <p><b>Pupil Premium Plan 2015-16 (Appendix E &amp; F)</b> RC explained that <i>Attendance</i> had been added to the Key indicators for KS 1 to create a baseline before the end of Foundation stage to the end of KS 1 for reporting on progress from the baseline. Post-16 Academic Value Added might be a better measure by next year. An additional spend would be on language teaching for unaccompanied refugee/asylum children with no English. The grant had increased from £306k to £315,920 for 2015-16. The asterisk following (32.3%) in line 13 of page 1 referred to the footnote showing the lag behind funding and pupil numbers because the data was based on the January 2015 census for free school meals when there had been 335 PP students compared with the current figure of 379. This difference would be backdated for next year where funding would be based on the January 2016 census. Although there was a shortfall of 44 pupils' worth of PP, there was still the obligation to provide for these students. <b>Q:</b> Was there any new initiative that had not been tried before? (PH)</p> <p>KA joined the meeting at 5.27pm</p> <p><b>A:</b> Four groups were being monitored (SEND - <i>Special Educational Needs and Disability</i>- Persistent Absentee, Risk of Exclusion and Vulnerable). Dinosaur School was new (P3 on page 3) and Aim for the Stars (A1 on page 5). P4-P7 (page 3) were a single line last year but were now separated out into four strategies. <b>Q:</b> What was the breakdown of the £42k (P5 on page 3) and were there significant issues in KS3 literacy? (RB) <b>A:</b> This was because there was more one to one support (i.e. this paid for extra staffing). (RC)</p>	



	<p><b>Q:</b> What were the success criteria or targets? (RB)</p> <p>KA left the meeting at 5.29pm and returned at 5.34pm.</p> <p><b>A:</b> Yes, there were targets e.g. for improving attendance. (RC)</p> <p><b>Q:</b> What were the most important things that had been learned from previous year's PP spend and how would they help to improve outcomes in 2016? (PH)</p> <p><b>A:</b> More generalised strategies were the hardest to monitor so now the school was concentrating on very targeted groups of need. (RC)</p> <p><b>Q:</b> How many staff were specifically employed towards the support of PP students? (PH)</p> <p><b>A:</b> No, most staffing was proportionate so people in departments e.g. TLRs (Teaching &amp; Learning Responsibility (Payments)) or Heads of Department were responsible for the disadvantaged and dealt with them in different ways. P4-P7 were supported by several individuals. (RC)</p>	
<p><b>11.</b></p>	<p><b>Review Complaints Policy (Appendix G)</b></p> <p>The policy was <b>approved</b> with no amendments. It was emphasised that this was a legal document and that it was important to follow the procedures laid out in the policy. Most enquiries regarding the process for complaints were received through advertised lines of communication (i.e. e-mail and telephone). Complaints were a rarity although two cases had been dealt with last year. In general, parents needing support when making complaints had access to Citizens Advice Bureaux (CAB) and Parent Partnership Network (if in vulnerable group).</p> <p><b>Action 9: RB to look at the Complaints policy on website to ensure clarity and to identify where links were needed e.g. for contacts page.</b></p>	<p><b>RB</b></p>
<p><b>12.</b></p>	<p><b>Any Other Urgent Business</b></p> <p><b>1. Distribution List:</b> It was <b>agreed</b> that agenda, papers and minutes be sent to all core SLT and representatives. Confidential minutes continue to be sent to Academy representatives but not to Staff representatives when relating to named staff or to pay.</p> <p><b>2. Draft Directed Time Calculation (Appendix H) (RC):</b></p> <p>It was recommended that schools publish their Directed Time calculation. RC corrected error in Break Duty (line 3 of 'Activity' category) replacing 2 with <b>1.5</b> x 25 mins x 38 weeks across all 3 columns in the row. This was due to the need for additional staff to cover emergency duties (e.g. when ambulance was called) as directed time. It was <b>noted</b> that the directed time averaged 32 hours per week and did not include time for lesson preparation or marking.</p> <p>The acronym NCT meant Non-Contact Time. There was general discussion of hours not included in the calculation for work out of school which could vary from 7 to 20 hours.</p> <p><b>Action 10: RC to find out hours worked by staff external to school from the Wellbeing survey.</b></p>	<p><b>RC</b></p>



	<p>KA stressed that additional cover was being carried out by staff because of the current financial situation and that a return to staff doing less cover for lessons should be returned to when finances (and thus staffing) improved with which AR concurred.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> How did cover compare with local schools? (DM)</p> <p><b>A:</b> Nationally, the average was 10% and St. Gregory's met this. (KA)</p> <p>RC explained that marking proxies could be employed. The advantage of this was the marker's objectivity as they did not know the students whose work they were marking but it meant salary costs. Photocopying also seemed to be an area which consumed staff time (as Reprographics statistics showed that only 38% of the school's copying was done in that department). Representatives were interested in the issue of how teachers could cut their workloads (PH).</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Was time given to teachers to design course work for the new KS3 assessment? (DF)</p> <p><b>A:</b> No. This big change was a massive job and time consuming to set up. (AR)</p> <p>3. <b>SIMS (Schools Information Management System) database record of staff</b> (RC): Staff records on the database in SIMS were not up to date. The disparity between the staff database and payroll had emerged because of the work undertaken regarding the school's financial position. Details such as names, work start date, length of service, point on pay scale, part-time and proportions of time worked were kept on the database. Some staff were reluctant for an update of information to go ahead. As the staff database informed the payroll, EFA returns and timetabling e.g. Steve Jones (SJ) had found that four part-time staff were recorded on SIMS as full-time. This inaccuracy would have a dire impact on designing the staffing structure.</p> <p>KA pointed out that there had been a miscommunication where staff had thought that the school intended to create its own database separate from SIMS.</p> <p>DF added that up to date staff details were also needed for migration of data whenever there was a change of payroll provider.</p> <p>The Committee <b>agreed</b> that the database record of staff on SIMS be updated.</p> <p>4. <b>Primary School Report (Appendix I)</b> (HFB): Questions to be held over until the next Full Academy Committee (FAC) meeting.</p> <p>5. <b>Governors' Fund:</b> It was <b>agreed</b> that a gift to thank Patricia Simon for her service be purchased by the FAC Chair to be paid for from Governors' Fund.</p> <p>6. <b>SEN (Special Educational Needs and Disability) annual report (Appendix J)</b> (carried forward from 15 October meeting): The report was <b>approved</b> and could be mounted on the school website.</p>	
13.	<b>Date of next meeting – 14<sup>th</sup> January 2016</b>	



	<p><b>Pay Review Committee</b> to meet one hour before Finance and Staffing meeting on 19<sup>th</sup> November 2015.</p> <p>The meeting closed at 6.15pm</p>	<p><b>RB, MM. PH. MMc</b></p>
--	---	-----------------------------------

**ACTION LIST**

No.	Actions	Responsible
1.	To send out new set of Terms of Reference.	PH
2.	To send briefing paper to RB (from presentation to Prime Minister).	MMc
3.	SIP to be added as a standing item to the agenda.	Clerk
4.	SIP to be printed out by the school for distribution at committee meetings.	MMc/RG
5.	'Plan on the page' presentation for the next meeting.	RC
6.	Representatives to view PiXL webcast <a href="https://goto.webcasts.com/starthere.jsp?ei=1044106">https://goto.webcasts.com/starthere.jsp?ei=1044106</a> [Do representatives have access or need to register?]	All
7.	KA to assist PH in writing questions for parent feedback in a survey by Representatives.	KA/PH
8.	MTW to identify representative group of students from each year group (Yrs 7-11) to include PP/EAL (English as an Additional Language) for meeting with PH & MM.	MTW
9.	To look at the Complaints policy on website to ensure clarity and to identify where links were needed e.g. for contacts page.	RB
10.	To find out hours worked by staff external to school from the Wellbeing survey.	RC

**Appendix A - Science Department 2015/16 (AE) [distributed at Presentation]**

**Appendix B - KS3 without levels – a baseline for 2015/16: Beyond National Curriculum Levels (PW)**

**Appendix C - KS3 without levels: The New KS223 Pro-forma (PW)**

**Appendix D - KS3 without levels: Assessment Statement – October 2015 (PW)**

**Appendix E - Pupil Premium Plan 2015-16 (RC)**

**Appendix F - Complaints Policy September 2014**

**Appendix G - Draft Directed Time calculation (RC)**

**Appendix H - Pupil Premium numbers (3/11/15) (RC) [tabled at meeting]**

**Appendix I - St. Gregory the Great Primary School (HFB)**

**Appendix J - Annual Report to Parents from the Academy Committee Members on the Provision for SEN at St. Gregory the Great School (JR)**