



Learn. Enjoy. Achieve.



Little Paxton School Governing Body

Minutes for the Curriculum and Standards Committee Meeting held on Monday 14th May 2018 at 6.30pm

The meeting was preceded by a presentation from Jordana Watts gave on how Maths Mastery is becoming embedded at Little Paxton School.

Ellen Barrett	Co-opted Governor Curriculum and Standards Chair		
Penny Conway	Authority Governor	Neil Donoghue	Co-opted Governor
Oliver Poulain	Parent Governor	Paul Warmington	Parent Governor
Rebekah Jenkins	Associate member	Natasha Stott	Staff Governor
David Jones	Parent Governor	Jeannie Marshall	Clerk

1. Apologies for absence – all members in attendance.
2. Declaration of changes in interests – no changes.
3. Minutes of the last meeting (15/01/18) and matters arising – signed off at FGB 30/04/18.
4. Report on pupil progress – Spring Term

Governors had been supplied with anonymised data of pupil attainment and progress for the spring term and invited to submit any questions in advance of the meeting. RJ, in consultation with other staff, had prepared answers to these questions and presented these and further information to governors (see attached report below).

QU: How do we identify under achieving students?

RJ - Phase Leaders normally identify pupils who need support. Staff are working very hard to plug the gap if the children do not get support at home.

QU: Do the majority get support?

RJ - It depends on the year group, in some year groups the number of students needing additional support is very high. For example, in year 1, we have 13 children out of 40 who are either PP or SEN and require additional support.

QU: What social and educational support is being provided?

QU: What are we doing to enable them to learn?

RJ: We provide one to one help where possible, the wellbeing project which includes playing games, joining the children for lunch, organising exercise and getting active. Providing class treats for motivation. These things are all done naturally throughout the day, time is also taken to interact with the parents and this can involve some tough honest conversations.

QU: Do we have evidence of narrowing the gap?

RJ - It is shown in the year 6 data.

QU: What is the picture for other year groups?

RJ - We have a high percentage of PP/SEN in year 3 and we do need a more strategic approach. Next year, years 1, 2, 4 and 6 all have high numbers of PP pupils. RJ was not in a position to provide any more specific data at this point about these year groups.

It was noted that the new HT may have her own ideas as to how this information will be tracked and presented. It was also mentioned that there appears to be a changing

demographic in the village which is affecting the percentage of children with additional needs and this needs to be addressed and discussions need to be held by the SLT to look at how we can best cope with these changes especially as we are losing some experienced members of staff on Maternity Leave. RJ and NS requested support from the GB.

RJ also asked if the SENCo, Mrs S England, could attend future meetings to present on PP as she has all the information required. All governors present agreed that the SENCo could be invited to attend future meetings.

QU: Will we have end of year data at the next FGB?

RJ - Yes.

QU: There appears to be a big miss match in the EYFS data – do we know why?

RJ - There appears to be a big slip in knowledge over the summer between reception and Year 1, we are putting in moderation which will help. We need an Early Years TA.

QU: Do we have an experienced Early Years TA?

RJ - Yes and we will need to redeploy the right staff member to the right position when looking at staff for next year.

It was noted that whilst many questions were being asked this should not be taken as a criticism or lack of confidence in staff, rather that governors wanted to fully understand the challenges currently facing the school, the steps being taken to address these and to gain a detailed picture of what is going on.

The committee thanked RJ for the information provided and all her hard work.

5. Policy review:

- Marking and Feedback policy – with school for amendments - deferred.
- Teaching and Learning Policy – with school for amendments - deferred.
The above two policies have been deferred due to Nikki Moore the New Head starting in September.
- SRE – awaiting St Neots Forum Collaborative Policy – awaiting information from St Neots Forum.
- EYFS Policy – awaiting information from EYFS.

6. Governor visits reports, Social Capital (EB)

- Those with outstanding reports please get them sent in asap

7. Governor visits for Summer Term:

Maths Mastery, follow up meeting to be arranged (EB & TL).

New Pupils visit to be during the summer term, prior to the visit PW to liaise with teachers to obtain information required. PW.

Reading visit to be arranged to look at impact of Reading Recovery specialist Nikki Colledge and other strategies in place. Writing visit to be arranged to look at what is in place for writing and the effects it has on pupils. PW/OP to arrange, with NS support.

PC will forward a Governor Meeting template document to Governors to assist with visits

Dates of visits to be confirmed to committee chair as soon as possible.

8. Governor Visits – It was proposed that autumn term visits be discussed at the next meeting once our new Head is in post. This was agreed by all Governors present.

9. There is NO presentation planned for the Early Autumn Term meeting as this additional meeting is being held to allow a timely report on 2017/18 data including provisional KS1 & KS2 SATS results and actions arising from that data

10. Any other business – Through discussion between EB and NM, NM has mentioned she currently uses a paid for data service called Target Tracker and finds this a very effective tool

for tracking and producing data. NM is keen to continue using this package when she takes up her post at Little Paxton and asked if this would be possible.

QU: What is the cost of Target Tracker?

EB - The cost of this product is £1153 plus VAT per annum, the cost for training staff would be £520 for a half day training session for up to 24 staff.

It was felt acquiring this package would be a good show of support for the new Head and will be brought to the next Finance meeting.

11. Next meeting date - Monday 17th September (tbc).

Meeting closed at 20.45.

Agreed actions.

Who	Action	When
EB & TL	Maths Mastery, follow up meeting to be arranged	asap
PW	New Pupils visit to be during the summer term, prior to the visit PW to liaise with teachers to obtain information required.	This term (Date of visit to be confirmed to committee chair as soon as possible)
PW/OP (with support from NS)	Reading visit to be arranged to look at impact of Reading Recovery specialist Nikki Colledge and other strategies in place.	Next term (Date of visit to be confirmed to committee chair as soon as possible)
PW/OP (with support from NS)	Writing visit to be arranged to look at what is in place for writing and the effects it has on pupils.	Next term (Date of visit to be confirmed to committee chair as soon as possible)
PC	to forward a Governor Meeting template document to Governors to assist with visits	asap

**Data Questions
Spring 2018**

Question	Response
General - Story time phonics - Community service reading for Yr1	- Ordered but not arrived - Awaiting confirmation (have a named person allocated) we have put in 2 sessions of extra TA support for 1:1 reading in Year 1

<p>- First class @ writing - TA to be trained to support both YR3/4</p>	<p>- No course available, in house training, will continue to look for new releases for Autumn Term. Train Year 3 TAs in advance once we've decided who is where</p>
<p>RJ to help YR3 with 'The Write Stuff' resource. Has this been requested? Is it the right book? Has it been used yet? Is anything else needed to support the intervention here?</p> <p>Q: Are we are improving outcomes for this group enough?</p> <p>Q: Why has it been so difficult to obtain data with the correct groups input?</p> <p>Q: Is it lack of staff, under use of staff/lack of efficiency, lack of external support etc.</p>	<p>Resources given to staff and is already being used. Year 3 have been much more creative in their planning for English, including a visit from a cat to start their new text.</p> <p>We are working to achieve outcomes for all our children including the PP group. If we reflect on last years year 6 results we can see we don't have a massive gap between the PP children and the non PP children. The trend is the gap narrows significantly by the end of KS2. SENCo is putting into place things that will enable her to more closely measure progress of SEN pupils (this will include those who are PP as well)</p> <p>Groups was not the focus of the meeting but under achievement and those working below ARE. Perhaps it would be best to contact SE for PP data as she is available and does not have a class base. It can be easy to forget what is needed with whatever is happening in the life of the school, as I am sure you understand it has been a very busy and emotional term for us as a team. We were not informed that the boxes did not work or RJ would have followed this up with PW.</p> <p>The focus was only on those children underachieving or going to be below</p>

	<p>ARE at the end of the year. Without our fantastic team, especially our skilled support staff, this picture would be worse. It is a comment on we cannot split ourselves in anymore ways and if TAs are running an intervention then they can only run one at a time (which will probably be only a group of 6 max)</p>
<p>EYFS</p> <p>Q: Are you saying that 26% will not meet GLD whatever the intervention is and 31% may make it following interventions?</p> <p>Q: as we have no data for EYFS including cohort characteristics (number of children, EAL, FSM, LAC, PP) it is difficult to comment on anything properly, could you let us have a little more detail please a.s.a.p</p> <p>Q: Are these children reading at home/ doing home learning as set?</p> <p>Q: What is the plan for this cohort as they progress to Y1 assuming target will not be met?</p>	<p>Yes, unfortunately there is a big group of children in this cohort who will not achieve GLD due to their immaturity, high percentage of summer born children and lack of home support, they are just not ready for learning. They will of course be a focus group in Year 1.</p> <p>We will ask the team to provide you with the information they have. There are no children with EHCPs.</p> <p>As with most classes, some children do and some children don't. Where they don't we aim to plug the gap in school.</p> <p>The plan will be to focus on the children who, with a boost, will achieve ARE in Year 1 (GLD target is 72%)</p>
<p>Year 1 - What interventions can be enforced by both teachers in the last half term to enhance the opportunity for</p>	<p>In the last half term we have put into Year 1 the following for a final boost ...</p>

<p>children to move from <ARE to =ARE?</p> <p>- Are plans in place for the inheriting Yr2 teachers to develop these pupils to =ARE or >ARE?</p> <p>- On reflection could more have been done to support the class teachers to develop the children's learning to achieve higher =ARE by the end of the school year? What objectives were set? What reviews took place? How closely was this tricky year group monitored?</p> <p>Was the NQT given as much guidance as possible to assist him?</p> <p>Q: Why is more support going into</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Extra BRP sessions 2. Extra TA to support with reading 3. 4 new pupils on Reading Recovery 4. ERT in class with those children who need it 5. Streaming for phonics to ensure a many as possible pass the phonics check. 6. Keywords being sent home as spellings 7. TAs and parent helpers attended phonics and early reading training. 8. 1:1 Reading as much as possible 9. A-Z second group of children completing this intervention. <p>RJ will continue to work in Year 2 with a new colleague. A long time will be spent on the transition day to ensure the Year 2 team can get started quickly with boosting performance next year, as we do every year.</p> <p>The children have made good progress during their time in Year 1. Their progress was reviewed in Autumn at pupil progress meetings, and during Performance Management Target Setting, informally reviewed half way through spring term (actions were reviewed and amended as necessary), writing has been moderated within school and as part of the no more marking course, lesson observations.</p> <p>The NQT has been very well supported with an experienced Year 1 colleague and regular meetings with his experienced mentor.</p> <p>Support in Year 1 is across the classes</p>
--	--

<p>one of the classes?</p> <p>Q: What is being done about the lack of reading at home?</p> <p>Q: Were last term's interventions successful? What have we learned from them?</p> <p>Q: Why is EAL flagged as a particular problem?</p> <p>Q: Are the children that have been identified as having one or more of the characteristics we track as a possible barrier to learning been equally split between the two classes and has the fact that one class has an NQT and the other has a more experienced teacher been taken into account (i.e. correct support and TA staffing level)</p>	<p>from NC, SM, VS, LT, GH. During mentoring time particular targets were identified for the NQT so extra time has been allocated to support him in these.</p> <p>Drafted in extra TA support to address those gaps, volunteer reader will also pick up on this. In house phonics and early reading training for staff and parent helpers.</p> <p>Some were and some were not – where they weren't children did not expect progress and so alternatives interventions are being tried.</p> <p>EAL children flagged as the focus was on under achievement and those children working below ARE</p> <p>Yes, classes and children are considered carefully at the end of the previous year once we know which teachers are where, especially where an NQT is a class teacher.</p>
<p>Year 2</p> <p>- A comment of 'Lacking support at home'. At sats evening we were praised for our amazing children, and also the support we are giving as parents. Slight contradiction, can this be explained? is it a small group that needs more help at home, or a year group?</p>	<p>Those who turned up at the SAT meeting are those parents who support learning in school. It is a small group who lack support at home and the Year 2 team are doing everything they can to plug the gap.</p>

<p>- What does the comment in red '<i>children have entered the year band this academic year and therefore the % is skewed</i>' mean? According to the data only 3 NIY pupils are in the year.....not enough to skew data....unless I'm misinterpreting it? Of the 15 pupils in groups, 7 are <ARE and 5 are >ARE, so the groups as a whole aren't as negative to the figures as other years.</p> <p>Q: What specific issues do the two PP children you are concerned about have, what interventions have taken place, what's planned and what PP Funding has been allocated if appropriate?</p>	<p>Skewed data was a comment as the percentage at the bottom does not reflect the target for the end of year.</p> <p>Social care involvement with both families. Lots going on in both households! Small group support for core subjects. 1:1 reading, spelling, keyword bags put in place. Both have had sessions with the Inclusion Worker, Suzanne Else, to support their wellbeing.</p>
<p>Year 3</p> <p>- It appears that many children have struggled with the step up to KS2 in yr3. From arriving after the summer many have dropped from either >ARE to =ARE or =ARE to <ARE in one core subject (19 pupils in total) What are the observations around this? Maths seems most affected.</p> <p>Q: What specifically are the issues with timetabling in writing interventions?</p> <p>Noticeably fewer c'ren making accelerated progress and more making less than expected progress than in Y2 data – although c'ren often slip back a little on entering KS2 this seems to have remained the case – any particular reason for this?</p>	<p>As you can see from the commentary the children have made good progress from Autumn to Spring.</p> <p>With the new curriculum, new key stage and new expectations we have seen a trend (as do most other schools) of children's attainment dipping in Year 3 and picking up in Year 4 or for some children in Year 5.</p> <p>TAs not having enough hours to do everything they could. 1 TA moving between KS1 and KS2 who also supports lunchtimes and needs a break.</p> <p>Year 3 is a high need year group – with 1 child on an EHCP plan and another who we providing in school</p>

	support for as though he has an EHCP.
<p>Year 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A large proportion of the class are <ARE in each of the core subjects. There has been some movement up to =ARE from this group, but there has been only 1 child move up to >ARE in a core subject and they moved from <ARE in the first term. Has enough resource been given to those in the =ARE to push themselves up to >ARE, or has all the focus been on raising the <ARE and maintaining the =ARE and >ARE? (obviously I don't know the cohort, these are observations looking at data only, just wanting to understand how the year has gone, has it been a huge achievement to get so many at =ARE?) - What are the overall targets for this year group? 70% across the board? - Has maths mastery worked on this year group? Q: Why are you most concerned about writing given the reading figure of 59% = and/or > ARE compare with 71% = and/or > at the end of Y3? And maths is only at 63%? 	<p>We have to admit we do probably prioritise getting more children to ARE than to GD. We recognise this and look to address this in the future.</p> <p>End of Year 4 Targets: Reading 71% ARE+ Writing 73% ARE+ Maths 61% ARE+</p> <p>Maths mastery has supported all the children but in particular addressing the children working towards ARE to give them the secure foundations in their learning.</p> <p>Want to ensure that the content of their writing will enable them to achieve well across the curriculum and at the end of Year 6. Strategies that are already in place are working well for Maths and Reading and we want to ensure writing doesn't drop.</p>

<p>There are comments in reading and maths that evidence is lacking – is this a comment that evidence has not been collected and recorded (but the children may in fact have achieved more than is recorded) or that the evidence indicates low achievement in some cases?</p>	<p>With the evidence that has been seen and collected the Year 4 team do not feel that the children are secure ‘yet’ to achieve ARE.</p>
<p>Year 5 14 in 'Group', 10 <ARE, quite a high % of pupils, I can't word my question right here..... I want to ask - is this the reason that overall results aren't high in this cohort? but that's sounds negative, what were the expectations at start of year, how are things going against the target?</p> <p>Q: How is the move back to sets in Maths working? Doesn't seem to be a massive change considering other interventions are taking place...</p> <p>Q: how effective have the Maths interventions been? Q: What are the issues?</p> <p>Q: Given that the group is behind target in all three areas, has any consideration been given to starting Y6 style after school / lunchtime interventions once the current Y6</p>	<p>Yes, any children who are working below ARE will have an impact on data.</p> <p>Again, these children have made good progress whilst in Year 5.</p> <p>Move back to sets is to ensure the needs of all children in the Year 5 cohort are met. This also allows an experienced TA to give 1:1 or small group support for Maths. As this cohort have been streamed throughout their time at Little Paxton the gaps are very wide, unlike those we are targeting with mastery in Year 1 for example.</p> <p>The issues in Maths have been identified as problem solving and reasoning which have now become a focus. Two key skills in the mastery approach which these children haven't had throughout.</p> <p>We always put support into Year 5 once SATs are over. This happens every year (ST).</p>

<p>have completed their SATS?</p> <p>This year there have not needed to be as many interventions for the current Y6 but presumably more booster groups (including breakfast clubs etc) can be run next year?</p>	<p>Year 6 currently have a booster Maths club run by TD. This could be started earlier as there will be more children to support.</p>
--	---

Summary for the C&S Meeting Headlines

1. The data meetings with the SLT and phase leaders was a focus on children at risk of underachievement this year (going from ARE at the end of the previous year to below ARE this year for example. This means that the children/groups who are talked about may not be the focus groups and groups who look like they are doing well may be mentioned in the commentary.
2. **Support from home** – the children who were the focus of our discussions were those who were working below ARE and those at risk of not meeting their end of year target. This is why one of the reasons discussed was parental support, as with any child we do our best to plug the gap for children who do not receive the support at home for reading, home learning and spelling.
3. **Outcomes for PP group** – we are working to achieve the outcomes for all our children including the PP children. If we reflect on last year’s Y6 results we can see we don’t have a massive gap between the PP children and the non PP children. The trend is the gap narrows significantly by the end of KS2. The SENCo is putting into place things that will enable her to more closely measure the progress of SEN and PP children. We have been able to organise another trip to the farm for these children using PP funding.
4. **EYFS** – cohort are expected to meet their target by the end of the year and will have a moderation visit. It will be important to ensure we have experienced TAs in EYFS next year with the change of teaching staff.
5. **Year 1** – low cohort, progress in attitude to learning and behaviour has improved. Tracked attainment in various ways including moderation (internal and external). Support for NQT has been provided as a result of his mentor meetings (for example support in teaching of reading). Drafted in extra TAs to support reading and phonics. In the last half term we have put into Year 1 the following for a final boost ...

- *Extra BRP sessions
- *Extra TA to support with reading
- *4 new pupils on Reading Recovery
- *ERT in class with those children who need it
- *Streaming for phonics to ensure as many as possible pass the phonics check.
- *Keywords being sent home as spellings
- *TAs and parent helpers attended phonics and early reading training.
- *1:1 reading as often as possible within the class
- *A-Z intervention with second group of children

We will use the handover day in June for RJ and her new colleague to get to know this cohort well and to be able to get started quickly when they arrive in Year 2.

6. **Year 2** – skewed data is only that with children arriving in year group have changed the target at the bottom which does not reflect the target set.
7. **Year 3** - With the new curriculum, new key stage and new expectations we have seen a trend (as do most other schools) of children's attainment dipping in Year 3 and picking up in Year 4 or for some children in Year 5.