



HuishEpiscopi

MINUTES OF THE TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE MEETING Tuesday 17 October 2017 at 5.00 pm

Directors Attending:

Mrs S Wright
Mrs C Ahmed

Mrs S Harris
Mr R Clark

Also Present:

Mr R Vaughan (Vice Principal)
Mr A Brooke (Assistant Principal)
Mrs A Eastwood (Clerk)

Mr R Madge (Assistant Principal)
Mr A Woodward (Assistant Principal)

Apologies:

Mr C Wade, Mrs S Baker, Mrs C Mortimer-Ford and Ms L Robson

ACTION

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Mr Wade, Mrs Baker, Mrs Mortimer-Ford and Ms Robson. These apologies were accepted.

2. ELECTION OF CHAIR

Mrs Baker was nominated for the position of Chair of the committee and duly elected.

3. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR

Ms Robson was nominated for the position of Vice Chair of the committee and duly elected, subject to Ms Robson confirming her acceptance.

Mrs Wright chaired the meeting in the absence of both Mrs Baker and Ms Robson.

4. DECLARATION OF BUSINESS INTERESTS

There were no business interests to declare.

5. MINUTES OF THE TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 23 May 2017 AND MATTERS ARISING

Minutes of the meeting of Thursday 9th February were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting, with the following amendment:

- Directors attending - Lois Robson did attend the meeting.

Matters arising:

Item 3: It was clarified that the reference to Verity Stoffell not being replaced related to her teaching and learning role, not her position as Head of Music. This post would be replaced. Currently Mr Brooke was acting Head of Music.

6. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The only amendment to the terms of reference was the following:

- In the absence of the Chair or Vice-Chair, the committee will elect a replacement for the meeting.

A discussion followed regarding the available resources and whether the National Funding Formula would allow increased expenditure on staffing. Mrs Wright requested that a short agenda item on budget setting and curriculum be included on the spring agenda.

RV

7. EXAMS ANALYSIS (KS4 AND KS5)

Mr Madge introduced the exam analysis for Key Stage 5. The detailed information had been circulated at the Full Board meeting. He had since met with the Heads of Departments regarding the progress of the current Year 13s and the necessary steps required to secure better outcomes for students. The data that was currently available was last term's data. There would be a data drop the following day, which would indicate how the current students in Year 13 are performing.

The key actions for Key Stage 5 were to focus on History, Sociology, and Design Technology, which had consistently underperformed and had been in the bottom quartile over the past few years. History had recently seen an improvement in results across the range. There was a new sociology teacher with a proven track record and design technology department was developing. The most experienced A level teacher was this year teaching the majority of lessons.

Mrs Ahmed asked what would be done with the data produced the next day? Mr Madge said that it would identify which students are underachieving and in what subjects. Mrs Wright asked what whether the issue with students is lack of effort or lack of ability? Mr Madge said that some lacked ability and this could possibly involve advising students to select another course. Where there were issues with attitude to learning, then parents would be involved in the discussions as to the way forward. Mrs Harris asked if any provisional exam analysis had been published in order for directors to prepare for Ofsted. Mr Madge said this information was not yet available for A levels.

Mr Clark said that he did not feel he had a handle on the detail. In terms of predicted results compared to outcome, he asked whether as directors, they should have been more aware of any issues. Mr Madge said that that the grade boundaries had not been produced until after the results and it was hard to measure accurately going through until we get to the end point. Mr Clark asked how close we are to predicting accurately. Mr Woodward said that the school is currently doing a lot of work on improving predictions, including a recent team leaders meeting. More work was required on assessment and moderation. He also said that there was not a lot of guidance available with new A levels in terms of predictions. Mr Vaughan said that science was very good at predicting because of constant testing and updating predictions. It was planned that following each data drop there was a plan to randomly select 15 students and follow them through the grade prediction process with the Heads of Departments.

17.45. Mr Madge left the meeting.

Mr Woodward said that the ambition was for Huish Episcopi to be in the top 5% of schools in the country and that all students should be encouraged to aspire to this.

Mrs Wright asked if following the 15 students with Heads of Departments was not detracting from their main role. Mr Vaughan clarified that he does the work around the data and then reports back on findings to the Heads of Departments. Mrs Ahmed said that the progression needed to be towards the autonomy of HODs in terms of confidence around

predicted grades. Mr Woodward confirmed that this was the point we needed to get to.

Mr Vaughan reported on Key Stage 4 data. Middle ability progress was not good at the moment and the focus was currently on supporting this group. Dedicated groups had been set up for mentoring. The focus was on completing good quality work. There was an expectation that students would stay behind after school and repeat work until it was completed satisfactorily. The hard core of students in this category were those who had joined us in year rather than starting their secondary education with the Academy. There would possibly be amended curriculum plans and the plan was to move away from the expectation that every student would achieve 8 qualifications (Progress 8).

In looking at last year's results, some subjects had been 'hot' and some 'cold'. Hot – Music and PE. Cold – Business Studies. There was a new head of department for food technology. MFL continued to be a concern. A team review had been carried out last week that had indicated that the teaching in the MFL department was not good enough for this school. Hugo Gardner, as head of the MFL department had been held to account at the post examination MIG meeting and it had been made clear by directors that the outcomes in the department needed to improve. The quality of teaching within the department ranged from very good to poor. Students were also not being prepared effectively for their exams. Reading and listening exams are where students fall down. Mrs Wright asked that Hugo Gardner attended the next round of MIG meetings to report on progress.

HUG/AW

Mr Vaughan informed directors that RE was no longer running as a GCSE and was only offered as a twilight session after school. The format for Core Meetings had also changed. These meetings had been focussing originally on Maths, English and Science. It was planned to refocus these and bring different teams into the meetings following data drops. The Head of Maths, English and Science would continue to join SLT at these meetings.

8. PROGRESS OF GROUPS AND SUB-GROUPS

Mr Woodward said that he assumed that everyone has read the information circulated. The SEN results were good, the progress towards targets were better than anyone else. In terms of the results of the disadvantaged group, these had stalled last year and did not improve this year. In terms of the lower ability group, the results had been poor. However, there were lots of actions going forward.

Mr Woodward was currently evaluating interventions that we currently fund through PPG. A pupil premium review had been scheduled for the following day with the deputy head from Uffculme where disadvantaged students achieved a +0.9, this was almost a grade more across each subject in progress 8. Huish Episcopi were half a grade below.

In terms of the lead learner group, higher ability lead learners all did really well.

Mrs Wright said that it appeared that the students that do well are at the top and bottom of the ability scale. Mr Woodward suggested that maybe Rita Peasland (who currently focusses on lead learners) spent some time focussed on middle ability students.

Some of the interventions planned for disadvantaged students in Year 7. This included the Achievement for All programme. 35 parents of disadvantaged students had been contacted by Year 7 tutors. Further face-to-face meetings had been planned for autumn. It was planned to change the structure of the English intervention session and to the expand the groups from last year. English, Maths Science, Art, History and Geography have significant numbers of disadvantaged students so will be the priority in terms of intervention.

9. TEACHING AND LEARNING UPDATE

Mr Brooke circulated a paper. In terms of lesson observations, Ofsted had got rid of grading. We have maintained grading in lesson observations, this had now been modified to good or better, the target now was to have consistently good. The lesson observations had now been amended to good or not yet good. However, the grading was getting in the

way of feedback, so it had been decided after the appraisal process had been completed, we would be removing all grading. Mr Clark asked if we were still tracking some kind of grade, but not using it in feedback. Mr Brooke said that we used a teacher tracker and RAG rating.

Mr Brooke reported that the trainee programme for this year had 5 GTPs, one of whom was a very good MFL teacher. In terms of the teaching and learning team, we were trying to get more staff involved, as it was currently a very effective, but small team. The CPD training programme was up and running, whilst still focussing on the five pillars of wisdom, but now also included growth mindset.

In terms of marking and feedback, marking was still not very good. In most schools, the expectation was that marking was completed once every 6 lessons, or once every 3 weeks. On Friday's inset day, it was planned that all teaching staff would participate in a 'Big Book Look'. This would allow discussion between all staff on how a more effective marking policy could be established. Ofsted will judge us against our own marking policy. Mr Vaughan said that students would work better for staff who mark well. Mrs Ahmed said that as a parent, she had been able to clearly see the differences in levels of marking between subjects.

Mr Brooke circulated a paper on the growth mindset. He agreed to give a presentation to the Full Board Meeting in December. Directors were also invited to the Bradley Busch presentation at Huish on 9 February.

AB

10. FEEDBACK FROM EXAMINATIONS ANALYSIS MEETING

Mr Vaughan confirmed that he had been through the feedback with departments,.

Mrs Ahmed confirmed that she had found the meetings very interesting. Mrs Wright said she thought the MIG meetings were one of the best initiatives that Mr Davis had introduced as Principal. She asked Mr Vaughan to say thank you to Mr Wade for arranging the meetings.

RV

11. KEY STAGE 3 MASTERY CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT

Mr Woodward said that as the mastery curriculum had been running for a year the Academy was now in a position to review it. Two meetings of the Key Stage 3 working group had been held. They were in the process of introducing the growth mindset to the mastery curriculum. Some staff seem to think we are struggling to understand mastery steps, although students seem to understand it. Overall, the curriculum in Key Stage 3 is better. A working party has been established to agree the language we use when we talk about progress in Year 7, 8 and 9 and whether or not it should be linked to GCSE grades. Mr Woodward asked Mrs Ahmed if she, as a parent, would want to know this in KS3. Mrs Ahmed responded that she would. The focus of the mastery curriculum is to ensure all children are 'secure' in their progression. This would at least guarantee them their target grade at KS4. The Deputy Head of Uffculme is visiting in November to discuss the KS3 curriculum.

12. RISK REGISTER

- 1.4 Exam results. Reviewed at SLT. Our attainment will always be better than county and national average. No change.
- 2.5. Impact of students' behaviour. Remains the same. Mrs Ahmed said there was a lot of impact of a small number of students. It was agreed that there was no changes to the risk. Mr Vaughan said that additional interventions were being considered.
- 3.3 Non compliance with JCQ regulations. Risk rating remains the same. Mr Vaughan said that there were lots of changes to administration and new guidance around the security of exam papers. Added control measure - . "Review and implement new guidance."
- 4.15 Impact of changes to SEND funding. Banding applications had been submitted and

we were awaiting the outcome in order to understand the new SEND funding structure. The risk would be reviewed following this.

13. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

There was no additional urgent business.

14. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

5 February 2018.

The meeting finished at 7.20 pm.