



Minutes of St. Gregory the Great Curriculum and Achievement Committee meeting held on Thursday 14th January 2016 at 4.00pm in the school

	<p>Present: Pita Enriquez Harris (PH) Foundation/Chair Khurshid Ahmed (KA) Staff Robert Bennett (RB) Parent Myfanwy Brown (MB) Foundation (minute-taker in Clerk's absence) David Forster (DF) Foundation James Oates (JO) Parent Chris Skerry (CS) Staff Marcella McCarthy (MMc) Principal</p>	
	<p>In attendance: Rodger Caseby (RC) Associate Steve Jones (SJ) Associate Adrian Rees (AR) Associate Marie-Therese Weston (MTW) Associate Hannah Forder-Ball (HFB) Primary Kay Huntley (KH) Assistant Principal</p> <p>Apologies: Margaret Madden (MM) Foundation Dervilla Maher (DM) Foundation Sandra Cromey (SC) Clerk</p>	
	<p>Presentation – Safeguarding Kay Huntley (KH) The school's Annual Safeguarding Report had been distributed via email in December. KH talked through the highlights of the report. As a working document with space for a Governing Body Response at the end, KH requested that the governor with responsibility for safeguarding complete the relevant section. DF to do. Agreed that all governors would complete online training for Prevent Duty.</p> <p>Action 1: DF to complete Governing Body Response of the Annual Safeguarding Report</p> <p>Action 2: All Academy Reps to complete online Prevent Duty training</p> <p>KH left the meeting at 4.28pm.</p>	<p>DF</p> <p>All</p>
<p>1.</p>	<p>Welcome, Apologies, Prayer and quorum</p> <p>The Chair welcomed attendees. Apologies were received and accepted. Prayer: The meeting began with the school prayer. Quorate: The meeting was quorate and began at 4.10pm.</p>	



2.	<p>Declaration of urgent Any Other Business RC had request for Governors Fund. PH agreed to table at end of meeting.</p>	
3.	<p>Declaration of interests None.</p>	
4.	<p>Minutes of meeting held on 5th November 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RB queried transcript of comment made by him (top of page 6) "... asked what would happen with train-crashing (sic)". RB asked for clarity over what he had apparently said. RB to ask SC what was meant by this. • Item 11 p 9: RB recently looked at the Complaints Policy as it currently appeared on the school website. The Pro Forma Complaints Form (a separate document to the updated policy) was still on the website with John Hussey's contact details. MTW to remove. <p>The minutes were approved as a correct record of the meeting.</p> <p>Action 3: MTW to remove out-of-date Complaints Pro Forma from the school website</p>	<p>MTW</p>
5.	<p>Matters Arising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P3 Item 5: RB asked about the current status of School Aspect. RC reminded Reps that it had been agreed to abandon attempts for Reps to gain access to School Aspect, and utilise Google Docs instead for sharing strategic documentation. SJ was currently in the process of setting up log-in details for Reps to access FFT (Fischer Family Trust) data. RC to find an alternate way of sharing performance management data with Reps, then School Aspect could be discarded entirely. • P7 item 9: RB asked PH if she and MM had met with the student voice group. PH said yes, and feedback had been much more positive from these students about the school than at previous similar meetings. Report of this meeting to be circulated and discussed at next full academy meeting. • P9 Item 12, point 2: RC corrected Action 10 point to "find out hours worked by staff external to school from Wellbeing survey", clarifying that he had in fact asked staff in the survey in more general terms how often they worked in the evenings and at weekends; not for a specific number of hours. 	
6.	<p>RAISEonline exam data review</p> <p>SJ began by suggesting he provide Reps with an overview of the annual publishing schedule for performance data, and for Reps to agree how much detail they would like from these sources ahead of the arrival of agendas for meetings. Reps were in agreement to this suggestion.</p> <p>SJ to set up online access to RAISEonline for JO, RB and MB.</p> <p>SJ recommended FFT data as more comprehensive, RAISEonline data focusing on KS4 (Key Stage 4).</p> <p>SJ offered to run a short training session for Reps on FFT data interpretation.</p>	



SJ circulated performance data overview that Ofsted Inspector, Chris Woods, had been shown on his visit to the school in December 2015. Ofsted were now looking at data for the current academic year, no longer focusing on 2014/15 stats.

Q: When will governors have the chance to see the new form of reporting performance? (PH)

A: It already exists and consists of 4 key measures of KS4 performance: Progress 8, Attainment 8, A*-C English and Maths, and EBacc (English Baccalaureate). KS5 is changing too. Using Progress 8 measurements, the current Year 11 LA and MA students are doing better, with HA students less so. Staff are reluctant to predict A and A* grades at present. (SJ)

Q: What is the equivalent to the headline figure of 47% last year? (PH)

A: This measurement is gone. Attainment 8 is probably the best similar measure. The overall picture for Year 11 this year is looking positive overall. Attainment is looking similar to last year, but with improved levels of progress. The progress of Pupil Premium and Middle Ability students is improving – has been a strategic focus since the last Ofsted. Maths is likely to improve on last year, and English looking to do as well, if not better than last year. RAG-rating (Red Amber Green rating) highlighting Maths new interventions have been put into place. The next Year 11 PPEs will be in early March and data from these will subsequently be analysed. (SJ)

Q: What are the implications for curriculum, attainment and progress in the context of continuing changes in performance measures and qualifications? (PH)

A: Most schools give more time to English and Maths in their timetable than SGTG (St Gregory the Great). There is clear indication that more time needs to be given to English and Maths at KS4. This will mean dropping one option block. At present RE (Religious Education) is currently below the required 10% at KS4. Dropping an option block would give English and Maths 8 and 8 blocks of timetabling (in practice English could get 9) and put RE back to the required 10%. (SJ)

PH asked when the school would move to enact the reduced options at KS4, commenting that AR had experience of this model at his previous school, and stating that it had important implications.

Q: Is the number of prior higher attainment students entering the school dropping? (RB)

A: This was a variable picture, in any case affecting A and A* grades rather than A* to C. There are more MA students in the current Year 11 cohort. (SJ)

Q: Regarding absenteeism in the exclusion figures in the RAISEonline dashboard, is absence below average? How much is it diminishing? (RB)



A: Absenteeism is decreasing year on year. To Dec 2014, there were 57 persistent absentee students. To Dec 2015 this number was 44. Lots of initiatives in the school to encourage attendance. Tutors phone, write and arrange meetings with parents. Interventions are in place for every child by the time they are down to 85% attendance. Attendance is also on every SLT (Senior Leadership Team) agenda, flagged up in the staff room and tutors are encouraged to talk to students who have a tendency to absenteeism. Overall there has been a 0.3% improvement in attendance from this time last year. (MTW)

RC commented that regarding the level of exclusions, the 2014-15 figures recorded a higher level of fixed term exclusions than the national average, with a lower level of permanent exclusions than national. This is expected to change in 2015-16 with the figures for permanent exclusions up on last year. PH commented that when she and MB had spoken to Ofsted in December, the understanding was that this figure would go up in the short term whilst SLT consistency over behaviour impacted on the student body. Figures should come down after 6 months.

Q: Do similar proportions of advantaged/disadvantaged students continuing on to FE college make progress? (PH)

A: We know the vast majority make progress (RC). We have always had good links with the local college. Disadvantaged students coming into our Sixth Form have historically had good value added, although not last year. Normally we have better than the national average progression rates. (SJ) Colleges don't have the same data for PP students that we do, so it is problematic in analysing the information. (MMc)

Q: How far out do you build attainment targets? Do you project 5 years forward? (JO)

A: There have been 3 changes in the last 5 years as to how progress is measured. So ideally, yes, but measurement changes can be a challenge. FFT data is used to track progress. Attainment targets are set using externally rigorous data, and by Year 10 it should be possible to set realistic targets for a cohort of students. (SJ)

JO commented that if D plus is the average grade expectation for current Year 11 students, then grade C should be in reach. SJ broadly agreed, stating that in each subject students have individual grade targets to work towards.

Q: Looking at the FFT data you supplied us with before Christmas, black/Caribbean students seemed to be underperforming in terms of progress and absenteeism. Is this a group that have historically underperformed at SGTG? (RB)

A: Historically, no. Not since 2007. There are 20 students in that group, the second largest ethnic group in that year's cohort. (RC). Not aware that this



	<p>group present a particular issue. Would need to look more closely at individual student circumstances to understand this particular set of figures. (SJ)</p> <p>Q: RE was the second worst performing subject in pupil progress in 2014/15. As a Catholic school, is that a concern? (RB)</p> <p>A: Yes, it has been flagged up in the SEF (Self-Evaluation Form) and a plan is in place. Line management are aware, and there have been internal staffing problems with a high turnover of staff within the RE department. Plus RE was reduced by 1 timetable unit to give more time to English on the curriculum. (SJ)</p> <p>MTW described the interventions aimed at underperforming students in RE. MMc commented that as a Catholic school, RE is a core subject and therefore taken by all students of all abilities. MTW described the changes coming in to the new GCSE curriculum including a move to a new exam board. The new RE GCSE would be more skills-focused than content-driven, and this was being reflected in changes in teaching to current KS3. Clare Haly, Head of Department and currently on maternity leave, would be back in school in September 2016. PH thanked SJ and MTW.</p> <p>DF commented that there had been some criticism from the archdiocese this time last year about the equal weighting given to 6 world religions in the KS3 curriculum. MTW replied that this was now more like 4 world religions, with Catholicism being the focus for Year 7, and Year 8 studying world religions.</p> <p>Q: If a Section 48 inspection were to take place now, would they see the changes and be satisfied? (DF)</p> <p>A: MTW to check.</p> <p>Action Point 4: SJ to draw up annual publication schedule of data documentation and circulate to Academy Reps.</p> <p>Action Point 5: SJ to arrange online access for RB, JO and MB to RAISEonline, and for all Academy Reps to online FFT data.</p> <p>Action Point 6: SJ to arrange short training session for all Academy Reps on interpretation of FFT data.</p> <p>Action Point 7: MTW to check if current KS3 RE curriculum would meet Section 48 expectations.</p>	<p>SJ</p> <p>SJ</p> <p>SJ</p> <p>MTW</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Quality of teaching report (whole school, including governor evidence)</p> <p>MMc had circulated the report electronically via the Clerk in advance of the meeting. Not all Reps had received.</p> <p>MMc commented that the assessment of quality of teaching starts with students' attitudes to teaching and learning, rather than attainment. The visit from Ofsted in December had helped in the drafting of the report. Sharing of best practice was still improving, and therefore internal assessment by the SLT remained at RI (Requires Improvement) based on learning walks. Marking drops were still picking up on inconsistencies.</p> <p>Q: Were these inconsistencies departmental or individual? (RB)</p>	



	<p>A: There had been a move from departments to individuals. Assessment of quality of teaching was not just based on performance management assessment. Joint and cross-moderation, and talking to students all fed into the process. Progress was key to judgement and needed to be triangulated with the data available within departments. Getting staff to observe other staff teaching had been helpful, and CPD (Continuing Professional Development) and TACT (Teaching and Learning Culture Team) were instrumental in this. A new grid of recording judgements was helping to target needed support most effectively. 6 week plans of practical support for identified teachers were monitored by SLT both formally and informally. Where appropriate, external support was made available. Staff appreciated CPD, student voice feedback was positive and Ofsted had seen an improvement in the quality of teaching. CPD was one of the school's strategic areas for improvement. (MMc)</p> <p>Q: How often was teaching cover required and with what subsequent impact to the quality of teaching to students? (PH)</p> <p>A: Teacher absence was lower than last year. Cover was done firstly by staff below their allocated teaching hours and where possible by staff with knowledge in the appropriate subject area. (MMc) A quantitative answer could be supplied if required. As MMc had said, the aim was that the quality of cover should be appropriate to the taught lesson. (RC)</p> <p>Q: How often were cover lessons "taught" as opposed to students being left to "work independently"? (PH)</p> <p>A: This varied according to what was most appropriate to that student group. But Ofsted had observed a cover lesson in December and the inspector had been duly impressed. (MMc)</p> <p>Q: When would the next figures/judgements on lesson observations be available? (RB)</p> <p>A: Going into the next round shortly, should be "wrapped up" by Easter. Would go on a future agenda. (AR)</p>	
<p>8.</p>	<p>Monitoring of School Improvement Plan (SIP)</p> <p>MMc commented that the SIP is a live document on Google Docs, regularly monitored by the SLT at Monday and Wednesday meetings. SLT are trying to milestone more precisely the impact measures. The SIP has also been RAG-rated.</p> <p>RC commented that success criteria had changed to specific dates for consistency across formats.</p> <p>MMc commented that it was now easier to cross-reference between the SIP and the SEF. Although the focus of the SIP was still on the original Ofsted report, it might be updated in the near future to reflect the interim visit in December 2015. Both the SIP and the SEF were better tools for being live documents.</p> <p>Q: Are you happy for Academy Reps to ask questions on there? (PH)</p>	



	<p>A: Yes, comments are welcome – but not changes. (MMc) PH commented that any questions left by Reps on the SIP would need to have the answers minuted for the record at the relevant committee meeting.</p>	
9.	<p>Link Visit Reports – Maths (MM) Reps agreed to defer this item until MM would be present, and KA in the interim to double-check a couple of errors.</p> <p>Action Point 8: KA to double-check errors in Maths Link Visit report with MM</p>	KA
10.	<p>Review of SEN (Special Educational Needs) policy Circulated in advance by email. Not all reps had received. Q: Is this a whole-school policy that applies to both primary and secondary? (MB) A: Not seen by me beforehand. May, in any case, be superseded by a DBMAC (Dominic Barberi Multi Academy Company) SEN policy. (HFB) Q: How is the policy monitored and evaluated annually? (RB) A: It comes before Academy Reps, and outcomes for children with SEN go into the Head Teacher’s report. (MMc) HFB commented that specific reference to the primary was made on p. 3 of the report. Q: Who at the DBMAC formulated such policies? (MB) A: Sue McGarry did at the moment. Clarification from the DBMAC would probably be useful to remind schools which policies the DBMAC issued, and which ones individual schools were responsible for drafting. (DF)</p> <p>6.12pm Hannah Forder-Ball left the meeting.</p>	
11.	<p>Behaviour Report including progress since Sept 2015 (KA) Circulated in advance by KA. Summarising the exclusion figures, KA commented that 25 students had received fixed-term exclusions more than once, whereas 59 had not reoffended after one exclusion. There had been 4 fixed-term exclusions since the start of January. KA was optimistic that exclusion rates would be on a downtrend by Easter. KA commented that exclusion rates were not the only indicator of behaviour and that positive demeanour of students, correct wearing of the uniform and a huge reduction in internal truancy were all big improvements within the school. KA is to survey staff to see how they feel about behaviour. Use of the isolation room needs review – possibly could be used more. But was certainly going in the right direction. Initiatives were in place to support the small number of students who repeatedly offended. Phase 2 of the 2 year behaviour strategy was now in place with SLT detentions during period 5 recently implemented. In addition, a room had been set aside for students who “lose” their break and lunchtime. KA commented that for some</p>	



	<p>students this was working very well, giving them a space away from their peer group which they seemed to welcome. Phases 3 and 4 were to come in the future.</p> <p>Q: When can we expect to see exclusion figures down? (RB)</p> <p>A: By Easter – if not, then judge me. (KA)</p> <p>KA commented that incidents of verbal abuse to staff were greatly reduced – almost totally gone. As the current Years 10 and 11 feed through the school, should continue to see an improvement in standards of behaviour.</p>	
12.	<p>Pupil Premium (RC)</p> <p>RC noted that Pupil Premium (PP) students had already been discussed throughout the meeting in various different contexts. He circulated a handout with the latest attendance figures. SLT were considering messages to parents to tackle any increase in absenteeism due to student illness.</p> <p>2 new student groups, one non-PP, one PP, were being tracked in addition to the original groups from last term. These new students had been identified by KA and RC as students whose attendance had declined over the previous term. RC noted that their starting points were not as low as the 2 original groups.</p> <p>RC commented that a deterioration had been noted in the behaviour of some students at the end of the Christmas term, reflected in an increase in behaviour points. He highlighted two possible reasons for this: perhaps some students were anxious about the forthcoming holidays; or possibly it was a reflection of a perceived general relaxation within the structure of the school.</p> <p>RC commented that as with the absence figures, 2 new groups of non-PP and PP students were being tracked in relation to behaviour as of the start of January 2016.</p> <p>RC noted that on the Pupil Premium plan a new allocation of funds had been made to support mid-year PP student arrivals with very little or no English. PH commented that it was nice to see the data and noted that the SLT monitor this data at each of their meetings.</p>	
13.	<p>Any Other Urgent Business</p> <p>RC had a request from the Head of Sports and Head of Sixth Form: 3 Sixth Form students in receipt of a Sixth Form Bursary – would previously have been in receipt of FSM (Free School Meals) – wanted to attend a sports trip relating to their BTEC (Business and Technology Education Council) study. Any contribution towards the total cost for each student would be welcome. Reps confirmed that a maximum cap of £200 per request had been previously agreed on, and unanimously agreed to thus make a donation of £200 to each of the students towards the cost of their trip (a total of £600).</p> <p>[NB: how does this money get transferred to the staff/students in question?]</p>	
14.	<p>Date of next meeting – Thursday 28th April 2016 at 4.00pm</p> <p>The meeting closed at 6.30pm</p>	



**ACTION LIST FROM CURRICULUM & ACHIEVEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING ON
14 January 2016**

No.	Actions	Rep/Staff responsible
1.	To complete Governing Body Response of the Annual Safeguarding Report	DF
2.	To complete online Prevent Duty training	All
3.	To remove out-of-date Complaints Pro Forma from the school website	MTW
4.	To draw up annual publication schedule of data documentation and circulate to Academy Reps.	SJ
5.	To arrange online access for RB, JO and MB to RAISEonline, and for all Academy Reps to online FFT data.	SJ
6.	To arrange short training session for all Academy Reps on interpretation of FFT data.	SJ
7.	To check if current KS3 RE curriculum would meet Section 48 expectations.	MTW
8.	To double-check errors in Maths Link Visit report with MM	KA