

**The Minutes of the Curriculum Committee Meeting  
Held on Thursday, 26<sup>th</sup> April 2018 at 5.30 pm**

**Present**

Tahir Darr (TD); **(via Skype)**  
Steven Mackay (SMK) Headteacher;  
Michelle O’Doherty (MO);  
Ruth Henry (RH);  
Verity Lewis (VL);  
Nick Regan (NR) (Chair of Curriculum Committee);  
Stuart Weatherall (SWe).

**1a. Apologies were received and accepted from** Duncan Giles (DG).

**1b.** The meeting was **Quorate**.

**1c.** There were no **Declarations of Interests**.

**1d. In attendance**

Patrick Heuff (PH), Deputy Headteacher;  
Jessica Lobbet (JL), Assistant Headteacher (departed at 6.30 pm);  
Lucy James (LJ), Assistant Headteacher (departed at 7.25 pm);  
Jan Malt (JM), Head of Communications (departed at 6 pm);  
Marya Marriott (Clerk).

**1e. Notification of Any Other Urgent Business.** There were no additions to the published agenda.

**2. Presentation: Head of Communications Faculty, Jan Malt**

JM advised that:

**2.1 Data Analysis**

**a. Year 11 Predictions**

P8 (Progress 8) scores of -0.12 were predicted for English language; -0.05 for English literature. Due to ‘best of either’ counting in the English P8 slot the P8 score for English in bucket 1 is +0.06 (the strongest core performer). Currently, predictions were 91% 4+; 80% 5+; 30% 7+. P8 scores for MABLE (more able) students: -0.07.

The team was not predicting grade 9, although some were likely, there were some in 2017. Grade 9s could move the school to a positive P8 score for the MABLE.

There was a gap in performance between boys (-0.27) and girls (+0.43), which was not in line with other school subjects. The gap was greater between MABLE boys (-0.45) and MABLE girls (+0.32).

Staff were cautiously optimistic. Measures to address issues: after-school revision sessions were offered to students on a targeted basis; regular exam practice in examination conditions; individual student feedback.

JM advised that Year 11 PP (Pupil Premium) was a success story. There was a gap of -0.19; when some non-attenders were taken out of the data the gap was almost eliminated.

## b. Year 10 Predictions

There were some broader issues for this group, who were a third of the way through their course.

Predictions for P8 scores for English language: +0.07. 90% 4+; 75% 5+ 26% 7+.

Gender gap: boys -0.54; girls +0.48%.

Pupil Premium gap: -0.58 for PP as opposed to +0.22 for non PP.

Identified action:

- a. Proposed additional group for weaker Band B students in the next academic year (staffing available).
- b. Continued use of PiXL Tracker and appropriate interventions.
- c. Trial of PiXL Classroom App (assessment tool) in T6 with extension if successful.
- d. Continued regular contact with parents.
- e. Focus on pushing through literature texts and ensuring language skills taught.

The course plan was more heavily exam based to, students found that a challenge but was necessary to ensure that they had exam skills. The Department was using realistic grades so that students were clear how they were doing.

## 2.2. Changes to GCSEs

Data for Years 10 and 11 was circulated at the meeting.

JM advised that there were no tiers in English. The reading age for exams was 16+, the school had worked to improve weaker students reading age as well as reading speed and accuracy; 120 words per minute was needed, which was daunting for some students.

Exam boards used prescriptive marking criteria, which counted quotes rather than students' analysis skills or ability to write well; staff had had to adjust in response.

Component 1 Language was a very time-based paper – which allowed little reflection time. Speaking and listening had been lost as an examinable element. Students had to learn an anthology of poems (18), which the school then helped them cut down to a core of 6-7 from which they could quote.

In 2017 the school had lodged a number of exam result appeals. All literature grades except 1 had moved up – one student had gained 12 marks. Language appeals had moved down but that had not affected overall grades. We called back a lot of papers so that we could understand the marking and check whether there were any issues with our preparation of students.

There was a general (professional) view that the focus on exam preparations could limit students' ability to apply knowledge independently. The Department had built in activities at KS3 to address that issue, and to increase pleasure and the desire to read. The school did not want to become an 'exam factory'. Analysis of papers, exemplars and the knowledge of experienced staff, who had been markers, had influenced this year's teaching.

### **Governors asked: Is there a gap between PP language and literature?**

A: Yes. We need faster progress – it is easier to address in literature than language.

### **Governors asked: Why is that?**

A: Because language marking is more pedantic; it is easier to gain marks in literature.

### **Governors asked: What is the literature and language uptake at A' level for next year?**

A: 22 and 19

### **Governors: That's very positive – what's prompted the increase to numbers?**

A: The curriculum has changed and is more attractive. There is also a smaller number undertaking film studies.

- 2.3 The English Department review, in term 1, had been very positive. Behaviour was good. However students needed to take responsibility for their own learning.

The Committee thanked JM for her very informative presentation.

### **3. Presentation: The More Able. Assistant Headteacher, Jessica Lobbett**

As part of her NPQH (National Professional Qualification for Headteachers) studies, JL was (a) leading a school change programme to improve pupil progress and development and had (b) designed an action plan to meet the resourcing needs of one of her placement schools.

The programme centred on enhancing MABLE learners engagement and behaviour for learning.

The following documents were circulated at the meeting:

- Acceleration Programme presentation handout.
- A Mentoring Progress Book
- Kotter: 8 Step Transformational Change Model
- Oldfield School Acceleration Programme 2018: Lectures and Workshops.

The Committee thanked JL for her very thought-provoking presentation.

[Post meeting note: it was agreed that JL would be asked to make her presentation at the next full governing board meeting. **Action: SMK**]

### **4. The Minutes of the last Curriculum Committee Meeting (18<sup>th</sup> January 2018**

The minutes were agreed to be a true record of the meeting; they were signed by the Chair of the Committee.

### **5. Matters arising from the last meeting. (Please see page 6.)**

### **6. Whole-School Headlines**

The Data Dashboard, 2015-2019 had been circulated in advance of the meeting. Data from the assessment point 3, for Year 10 (2019 results), Year 11 (2018 results) and Year 13 was included. Absence data for 2017-8 was also circulated.

SMK advised that further analysis was needed but

- a. P8 data should be viewed with caution. The relative performance of groups was useful data but all schools were uncertain about what the P8 would actually be; the impact of the new GCSEs and also the effect of ECDL not counting any more were factors. The English and maths P8 data was likely to be more reliable.
- b. The attainment data was reliable (assuming that the predictions are robust).
- c. Progress 8 data for Year 10 data was also not at all reliable for Progress 8 - other than to compare groups. Action was being taken to address that issue.
- d. The ALPS data for Year 11 gave a score of ALPS 5 and moving towards 4. (In 2017 the school score was ALPS 6 - almost 7 last year). The picture was improving but Progress 8 data would not be released until October 2018. The targets were very aspirational.
- e. Intensive work with some groups would continue; SEN, Pupil Premium and Year 10 boys. A significant portion of Year 10 had not joined the school at Year 7 – and they were all boys. Interventions with these groups would be examined by Ofsted. However, overall attainment was holding up.
- f. Pupil Premium Year 10 data was in line with the national picture. However, in school the picture was affected by hospital stays and non-attendance. Sarah Mills was focussing on Pupil Premium.

- g. Year 10 SEN outcomes were not strong enough; this was a legacy of insufficient early intervention; all should make good progress.
- h. The issues for the current Year 10 were different from last year's cohort.
- i. The picture in relation to standards and marking was one of improvement, the Oldfield Standard was being applied. C85% of staff were meeting the standard but the data was drawn from Leaders of Learning; some of it was subjective.
- j. Preparations for exams were on track. Homework was set regularly and to a high standard; the findings of a recent audit had been used to set the standard and timetable.
- k. Most eligible students had indicated that they would remain at Oldfield for their 6<sup>th</sup> Form studies.
- l. Data on participation in extra-curricular activities would be shared with the committee. Action: SMK/JL
- m. Enquiries with Bath Further Education College had been unproductive; it did not offer courses at the level required.
- n. C60% of student intake for 2018/19 would be from Bath; applications to Oldfield were increasing.

**Governors asked: What about English and maths – how do we compare?**

A: Things look much better, which gives us confidence, particularly in relation to English. Some improvement in maths is needed. Ebacc and the ECDL have gone.

**Governors asked: Is the quality of cover staff good?**

A: Cover has been used far less than in the previous academic year. SLT have been monitoring; Leaders of Learning have reported that the quality of cover is better but it is never ideal. But if permanent staff set the work to the right level there are fewer problems.

**Governors asked: How many are likely to join 6<sup>th</sup> Form next year?**

A: C70 – but we won't be sure until they arrive in September.

**7. SEF (Self Evaluation Form); Consideration of School Adviser's Report**

The confidential report had been circulated in advance of the meeting.

Chris Healy, School Adviser, had visited the school on 7<sup>th</sup> February 2018. The main focus of the visit had been the MABLE. A discussion centring on data, a learning walk, lesson observations and meetings with Lucy James and SLT had been undertaken. There had been thoughtful discussions. Chris Healy had suggested some areas for development, which would be explored further by SLT.

**8. School Improvement Plan – Progress against KPIs (Standing Item)**

The plan had been updated and loaded on GovernorHub prior to the meeting.

**9. General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) Action Plan**

PH reported that good progress had been made:

- a. The school had contacted all organisations to which it sent data.
- b. Training for staff was planned for June 2018.
- c. The school had used templates supplied in the DFE's GDPR Toolkit.
- d. There would be a focus on improving password strength in Term 6.
- e. Th policy for use of CCTV would be revised to bring it in to line with GDPR requirements.
- f. ICT device storage would be moved to Microsoft 365; all staff would be directed to sign up.
- g. School servers were secure.
- h. Remote access encryption would be addressed.
- i. Ishbel Tovey, Executive Assistant, was preparing the school's Retention Schedule.

It was noted that GovernorHub was GDPR compliant. The Clerk provided details of the data held on governors for the purpose of carrying out their duties, and a draft privacy notice for governors.

## 10. Review of Policies

The policies had been circulated in advance of the meeting.

### a. Careers Policy

#### Governors asked: What has changed?

A: Alterations are mainly in relation to Gatsby Benchmarks (for good career progression). This is not a requirement but it was a standard the school wanted to meet. There are no other substantial changes. The committee agreed that the policy would be adopted. The next review would be scheduled for 2021.

Action: SMK

### b. Teaching & Learning Policy

LJ advised that the policy had been revised to bring it into line with key aspects of the the Oldfield Standard; lessons judged, quality assurance and lesson grading. As a result, Core Principles (section 4) had been amended. There were no changes to the principles but some additional guidance for staff had been included.

#### Governors asked: How will the policy be embedded?

A: Most staff are familiar without being aware of it - because it mirrors the Oldfield Standard.

#### Governors asked: Are the Core Principles embedded?

A: Yes; they are the Oldfield Standard, and they reflect the Code of Conduct for students ie uniform requirements, punctuality etc. They are generic points but important nonetheless.

#### Governors asked: Is the Oldfield Standard available as part of the policy – should it be an annex?

A: Yes. Action: LJ

#### Governors asked: Will there guidance on quality assurance document?

A: Yes, we have planned for that. Action: SMK

It was noted that staff would be provided with a summary document; the work defined by the policy was largely embedded and was a real success story. Staff understood that the policy genuinely encompassed the school's expectations. The committee agreed that the policy should be adopted. It would be scheduled for review in 2020. LJ left at this point (7.25 pm).

## 11. Review of Risk Register (Standing item)

#### The committee was advised that:

Action to ensure compliance with GDPR was on target.

Robust school self-evaluation indicated that the school was 'good' as defined by Ofsted criteria.

The Sixth Form judgement should change to '2'.

Safeguarding procedures were secure.

It was agreed that Lockdown Procedures would move to the Finance & General Purposes Committee's remit. Action: SMK

The meeting ended at 7.30 pm.

Dates of the next Curriculum meetings: To be confirmed. Action: Clerk

#### Items for the next agenda:

- Presentation by Head of Humanities: Action PH
- SEF – SMK
- Review of Home-School Agreement - SMK
- Review of KPIs (Standing Item)
- Review of Risk Register (Curriculum Items) (Standing item)

#### 4. Matters arising from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2017

##### Item 7. Review Terms of Reference (TORs) and Scheme of Delegation

It was agreed that **ToR 3** would be amended:

“To ensure quality of opportunity and support for all students, ensuring there is appropriate challenge for both MABLE and SEND students”. **Action complete.**

The committee agreed that ‘quality’ should read ‘equality’. **Action complete.**

**ToR 9** To recommend to the Governing Body the times for start and finish of the school day.....

It was agreed that the Governing Board would approve any change but detailed discussion about the impact of changes would take place at the Curriculum Committee.

The Clerk had identified some adjustments to procedural items. **Action: Clerk.**

##### Item 7. KPIs (Key Performance Indicators)

It was agreed that the KPIs would be reviewed separately to ensure consistency with the Terms of Reference, the SDP and school terminology e.g. Heads of Faculty. **Action: NR/SMK.**

##### 2017-2018 Schedule for Head of Faculty Presentations

**3.1 Mathematics Faculty – 18<sup>th</sup> January 2018**

3.2 Communications Faculty – 26<sup>th</sup> April 2018

3.3 PE, English, Humanities or Arts for 5<sup>th</sup> July 2018.

**Action ongoing: PH.**

##### Item 9. SEF (School Self Evaluation Form)

It was agreed that this item would be deferred to the next Curriculum Committee meeting. There would not be major changes; the school’s key priorities would remain the same. **Action: SMK**

##### Item 10. SDP (School Development Plan)

It was agreed that monitoring progress against KPIs would be a standing item on the Curriculum Committee’s agenda; the focus would be on ‘red’ items i.e. those not on target. **Action: SMK/NR**

##### Item 11.2 Attendance

**Governors asked: Of which type of absence do we have too much?**

**A:** Further analysis will be needed to answer that question fully. The school does not have much absence due to term time holidays. **Action carried forward: S Mills** (Head of Inclusion).

##### Item 12. Pupil Premium Update

The new Pupil Premium Statement identifying how the funding would be spent in 2017-2018, together with an evaluation of the impact of interventions used in 2016-2017, was ready for publication on the school’s website. It was agreed that the finalised statement would be circulated to the Committee.

**Action: SMK** [Both items had also been loaded on GovernorHub.]