

Minutes of the Meeting of the Standards Committee of Ivydale School, held on Tuesday 8th October 2019 at 6:00pm.

Present

Helen Ingham (HI) (**Head**)
Kimberley Starke (KS)

Jessica Skinns (JS) (**Chair**)
Anna Townsend (AT)

Also Present

Nicole Galea
Lynne Gravatt (LG)
Judith Lambert (JL) from 6:50pm

Clerk
Observer – Chair of Govs
Observer

PART 1

GOVERNOR BUSINESS		
1	<p><u>Apologies for Absence</u></p> <p>The Clerk advised that all committee members were present and that the meeting was quorate.</p> <p>LG stated that she had asked to attend the meeting as an Observer to gain a wider understanding of all aspects of the Governing Body. The committee members welcomed her.</p>	
2	<p><u>Declarations of Interest</u></p> <p>JS reminded Governors of the need to declare any interests for items on the agenda. There were no declarations.</p>	
3	<p><u>Election of Chair</u></p> <p>It was noted that JS had agreed to take on the role of Chair in a temporary capacity at the September FGB. Governors thanked JS for taking the Chair.</p>	
4	<p><u>Minutes of the last meeting –</u></p>	
4.1	<p>Approval of minutes</p> <p>The minutes of 6/6/19 had been distributed in advance. It was RESOLVED that they were an accurate reflection of the meeting; JS signed the minutes which were retained by the Head.</p>	
4.2	<p>Actions Log</p> <p>Governors reviewed the actions log and provided updates where appropriate (attached). The following actions were discussed in greater detail: -</p> <p>From 6/6/19</p> <p><u>Item 7: Levels of GDS</u></p> <p>HI reminded Governors that progress is tracked from EYFS to the end of Y2. It is relatively easy for pupils to achieve GDS at the end of Y1 but the structure of the curriculum makes this harder for the end of Y2. GDS was introduced as a very high level for only the top attaining pupils but schools tend to drive for larger numbers of pupils to reach this point than the curriculum was planned for. However, the school continues to be mindful of the number of pupils who achieve GDS.</p>	

	<p><u>Item 8: SDP Priorities</u> HI advised that the SDP was discussed at the summer term FGB in terms of the Standards Committee continuing with the Improvement priority (Leadership and Wider Curriculum) but that there should also be a priority for maintaining the improvements made. HI added that the wider curriculum was considered to be appropriate at the last Ofsted inspection but this area has a higher focus under the new framework and it will need to be secure.</p> <p>From 22/1/19 <u>Item 6: Teaching and Learning Handbook</u> JL reported that the handbook developed from the Teaching and Learning Policy and combined several policy documents (including the Marking and Feedback Policy). Staff were informed of the handbook and how to access it in September; it will be revisited and Leaders will check that it is being implemented through book looks and classroom practice etc.</p> <p>From 27/11/18 <u>Item 3.2: Data comparison with local schools</u> HI stated that this information is still not available. It was agreed to retain this as an aspirational action.</p>	<p>HI</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>Review Terms of Reference and annual work plan</p> <p>Terms of Reference</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Committee reviewed the current document which had been circulated in advance and RESOLVED to recommend the inclusion of 'intent, implementation and impact' to item 5.2 • To include the Homework Policy as a responsibility of the Standards Committee. <p>The Clerk undertook to update the TOR and present it to the December FGB for ratification.</p> <p>Work Plan The work plan had been circulated in advance. HI undertook to review the document to ensure that it is in line with the school's teaching and learning cycle and the changes to RSE guidance. HI to circulate the revised document by email for committee approval.</p>	<p>Clerk</p> <p>HI</p>
<p>STANDING ITEMS</p>		
<p>6</p>	<p>Review Performance Data (Summer 2019)</p> <p>HI referred Governors to the provisional data that had been circulated in advance: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Southwark Super School Profile – EYFS to Y6 • ASP 2018 / 19 – currently only KS2 (non disadvantaged) data is available • Internal Pupil Attainment and Achievement Report (July 2019) <p>HI highlighted the following points from the provisional data in the Super School Profile which shows that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As anticipated, the 2019 results were generally lower than the previous year. This is a reflection of the profile of that cohort as it moved through the school and was discussed by the committee at the summer term meeting when ARE was predicted as 72 – 76%. The actual result was 73%; unlike some schools this is unlikely to change as there were no cases for adjustment submitted. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EYFS, Phonics and KS1 results were all healthy and above average when compared to national although were lower than the previous year. • At KS2 Reading, Maths and GDS were positive and Writing was only a slight dip • Progress at KS2 was reduced in Reading and Maths but remained just above the national levels (Southwark present their information to 1 decimal place instead of the 2 decimal places used in national data) • The actual percentages were as expected at : Reading 72%, Writing 76%, Maths 73%, GPS 78%. By comparison, the disappointing combined R/W/M score of 63% shows that it was different children across the 3 areas who performed less well. In an effort to identify common themes all pupils and subjects were analysed, but none could be established. Reasons for poorer performance included careless errors and running out of time in maths to vocabulary issues and not having a secure and rich language base for PP and EAL pupils in reading. JL stated that there has been some training on closing the vocabulary gap and encouraging measures for pupils to be language rich; this will be followed up at the November INSET alongside work on the wider curriculum and use of Knowledge Organisers. • KS2 writing was moderated in the summer. The English Action Plan has identified that better writers need additional opportunities to be more independent at a higher level, especially at the older end of the school. • Ivydale will be taking part in a national writing moderation project this year using comparative judgements. Pupils in Y1-6 are anonymously assessed against a national piece of writing over the autumn and spring terms for which there is no pre teaching. The work is uploaded to a central website; it is checked internally and nationally; each piece is then ranked nationally into cohorts. This is very different to how moderation has been traditionally carried out, but it has proved to be an accurate way to benchmark. Internally, and in conjunction with existing systems, it will be used to identify next steps. Other benefits include that it is good for teacher workload, it reduces pupil over reliance on adults scaffolding their learning, which will not be the case at secondary school and illustrates that the school is using alternative forms of moderation. HI stated that an update on the project will be available for the spring term meeting. <p>Governors asked if the project increases pressure on teachers. JL confirmed that it will not as it is carried out during a usual literacy lesson which teachers would usually mark; this system is quicker and SLT will also take part by linking with a year group to be part of the assessment process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Vulnerable Groups – Average Progress at KS2 Score data (page 19) clearly identifies which groups are faring better or worse: 0 is the expected standard. The data shows that boys’ progress outperformed that of girls in Reading and Maths. Unusually, when at KS1, 6 of the 9 low achievers were girls. HI stated that this does not match the school’s internal data and skews the PP data; it will be reviewed in greater detail at the next meeting with the PP report. • The ‘Year Joined’ line in the data clearly shows the difference in progress made when pupils join in Year 5/6. Of the 9 that joined in this period, 5 had multiple hat flag indicators (SEN / PP / attendance below 90% / BME) which impact on different aspects of the data. • It is difficult to measure progress at national curriculum standards for pupils with SEN. 2 of the 3 pupils with EHCP made poor progress were also pupils with multiple hat indicators including LAC and transferred to special schools. 	<p>HI</p> <p>HI</p>
--	---	---------------------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HI and JL stated that there may be a number of reasons why the multiple hat children may not be making progress. Staff are aware of these children but the national curriculum is measured by progress. At Ivydale, the progress of PP and lower ability pupils remains the biggest issue with no simple solution at hand. Recognised approaches are being used but they are not redressing the issues. It was agreed to analyse PP progress further at the next meeting. <p>JS asked if any other schools have cracked the problem. JL stated that they have asked the LA for information on this but have not had a response. The gap is more visible this year but there is no common thread why this is so. Ofsted were happy when they viewed these pupils' work recognising that the school was doing all that it could. There is no discernible difference in the work found in books but there is a difference in tests and outcomes.</p> <p>ASP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This document provides data as a 3 year average which acts to even out any cohort differences • Ivydale is exceeding LA and national ARE in Reading Writing and Maths, the greater depth and scaled scores but it would be good to see similar graphics for disadvantaged pupils but frequently this group is too small statistically. • It is anticipated that there will be an improvement in the current Y6 for both progress and achievement. • The current Y6 is the 1st cohort to have had the new national curriculum throughout and the low / middle / high descriptors for ARE were not used. <p>Target Setting</p> <p>HI stated that it is not statutory to set targets for the end of KS2 but based on the tracking from KS1 the aim is to achieve 80% in each subject. These are challenging but achievable targets. It was agreed that the committee would track the data at the November and January meetings to review the progress towards these targets.</p> <p>AT queried the Y2 Phonics headline target. HI stated that there is a lack of consistency in how the phonics data is reported (Y1 & Y2 or separately) making it difficult to compare over time. She undertook to adjust the headline target to the percentage of pupils entering Y3 having passed the test.</p>	<p>HI</p> <p>HI</p>
7	<p>School Development Plan</p> <p>HI referred Governors to the SDP which had been circulated in advance. She advised that the targets are all set above the national averages and have been based on:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End of key stage information • The previous years' data • National data • Each child should be making at least expected progress as measured by the national curriculum. Some pupils will not make this (eg SEN) but generally, pupils with an EHCP make good progress against their own targets <p>JS asked how this transfers to the SDP. HI stated that it does so perfectly; the lower ability children are not at that point yet but the middle and higher ability are.</p> <p>LG asked what progress looks like for the lower ability pupils. HI stated that this year they are working with Cherry Garden School looking at smaller steps of progress. KS advised that these smaller steps are partly linked to EYFS progress</p>	

	<p>markers which are less linear and more like branches of a tree. Progress is more easily identified by using a grid system to record it.</p> <p>HI undertook to include an item on progress for the lower ability pupils in the committee work plan and for the Inclusion Lead to report on it at committee and FGB level.</p>	HI
<p>ITEMS FOR REVIEW</p> <p>Strategic Priority: Consistently good or better teaching</p>		
8	<p>Teaching Quality Data</p> <p>HI reported that the PLP data is not available yet; it was agreed to move this item to the Autumn 2 meeting on the work plan.</p> <p>HI noted that she had not provided an organogram for the meeting but was pleased to report that there are no temporary teachers in school and all classes are fully staffed. There are no staff currently on maternity leave (for the first time in 5 years); there will be a maternity leave during the spring term and cover arrangements (class and Literacy Lead) are being considered; the Literacy Lead role is currently shared between Phase 1 and Phase 2 which will enable someone to take this maternity cover on as a career development opportunity whilst benefitting from support from the other phase leader. There is flexibility within school thanks to the slight over recruitment in the summer term.</p>	HI
9	<p>Literacy Link Governor report</p> <p>HI noted that the Literacy Link visit that was circulated was carried out in January and referred to the previous Ofsted Report. HI undertook to organise a schedule of Governor visits.</p> <p>Governors asked how the Library project is progressing. HI reported that the listed status of Bellwood has added to the slight delay to the building work but it is hoped that the work on the mezzanine floor will start after half term. The book donation received a good response, books will be sorted for appropriateness. In addition, £1,200 was raised for books at the school fair, Bartley Shaw has provided a useful link with Harper Collins and a parent has links with Penguin Random House. Unfortunately, the grant was not successful due to the schools low PP numbers and good data but other options for funding and publicity are being explored.</p>	HI
10	<p>Review of CPD</p> <p>HI reminded Governors that the information on in house and external CPD opportunities and the links with the SDP had been included in her summer term report. She stated that much of the 2019 / 2020 CPD will come from the School's Alliance.</p>	
11	<p>Marking and Feedback Policy</p> <p>HI referred Governors to the policy (circulated in advance) which sits within the Teaching and Learning Handbook had been updated to reflect date changes.</p> <p>It was agreed to that the implementation of the policy should be reviewed annually and that Link Governors should be guided to consider this during their visits where appropriate.</p>	

	<p>JL and HI commented that Ofsted has an influence on marking but feedback must be meaningful within the context of teacher workload.</p> <p>AT stated that, as a parent, she has found there to be a noticeable improvement in the consistency and embedded responses</p>	
<p>12</p>	<p><u>Dates of Future Meetings</u></p> <p>26/11/19</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • initial PLP data • PP Report / PP progress & Vulnerable Groups data • Review progress towards end of year targets <p>21/1/20</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • national moderation project • Review progress towards end of year targets • <p>–</p> <p>5/5/20</p>	
<p>13</p>	<p>Urgent Business</p> <p>There were no further items and the meeting concluded at 7:30 pm.</p>	
<p>Signed:.....</p> <p>Date:.....</p>		