

# Rye Community Primary School Learning and Teaching Board

23 November 2015

## MINUTES

A meeting of Rye Community Primary School Learning and Teaching Board was held on Monday 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2015 at 4.30pm at Rye Community Primary School.

**PRESENT:** Niki Stuart (NST), [Chair]; Martin Dilworth (MDI), John Hart (JHA), Jane Howard (JHO), Sam MacNicol (SMa), Malcolm Wallace (MWA), Gwyn Williams (GWI), Ann Cockerham (ACO), (arrived 5.00pm).

**In Attendance:** Sally Welch (SWE), [Clerk].

**ACTION BY:**

### **1. Declarations of Interest**

1.1 Noted: that no member(s) had declared an interest in relation to any item(s) on the agenda.

### **2. Minutes of the Meeting of 21<sup>st</sup> September 2015**

2.1 Received: the Minutes of the meeting of 21<sup>st</sup> September 2015.

2.2 Resolved: to approve and sign the Minutes as a correct record. Progress against agreed actions was reviewed in the meeting.

### **3. Matters Arising**

3.1 Noted:

a) **Minute 4.1 (d):** contact details for LTB triad partners for the three schools were distributed in the meeting.

b) **Minute 9.1 (b):** a guide to the format of the accounts of an academy, prepared by JHA, were distributed in the meeting.

c) **Minute 9.1 (d):** JHO updated the meeting on progress with planning permission approval for the new building. The submission had gone in and a decision was awaited. Local residents had raised questions in relation to increased traffic flow and car parking and the proposed future designation and use of the existing nursery building. Responses had been submitted.

### **4. Progress, Attainment and Assessment**

4.1 Noted:

a) SMA outlined development of a new assessment system to better monitor and present the progress of pupils within the context of the removal of levels. The key principles for assessment are: identifying what children can and can't do, where the gaps are, what interventions are needed, and what next steps are required.

b) specific key objectives for Reading, Writing and Maths have been developed to enable teachers to assess whether a child is working at age related expectations. Teachers have been working with tracking spreadsheets across all year groups since last Christmas to record progress against these objectives on a weekly basis. Each child is scored from 1-3 (representing a child that is approaching the expected standard); 2 for a child that is at the expected standard and 3 for a child who is exceeding the expected standard.

c) the recording format presented problems with processing and analysing the data in a time efficient manner. Following a review of available systems on the market, the school has purchased FLiC (Framing Learning in Classrooms) tracking software which is in the process of being rolled-out across the school. The system operates on hand held devices which will enable teachers to input data 'live' data immediately.

The benefits of the system include ease of input of tracking data and the ability to customise the FLiC software for individual school use. SMA demonstrated use of FLiC in the meeting.

4.2 Noted: questions in discussion of the above:

- a) on Ofsted's view of FLiC, SMA responded that schools are expected to develop their own mechanisms for assessing pupils' progress towards end of key stage expectations. Ofsted do not have any predetermined view as to what specific assessment system a school should use. Inspectors' main interest will be whether the approach adopted by a school is effective. They will be looking to see that it provides accurate information showing the progress pupils are making. The information should be meaningful for pupils, parents and the LTB.
- b) on the breadth of subject coverage under FLiC, SMA confirmed that initially, the system is being used for English, Maths and Reading but will be extended across all foundation subjects in due course.
- c) on teachers' proficiency in using the hand held devices, SMA confirmed that teachers' confidence in working with the new devices is developing well.
- d) on whether teachers are able to use the devices to capture evidence to support tracking scores, SMA responded that the software is not designed to support this.
- e) on financial outlay on the new system, SMA reported costs of £700 for the software package and £180 for training on the new system. In the view of the meeting, these costs appeared reasonable, taking into account the absence of annual maintenance and upgrade fees. SMA reported that the software has been developed by an in-school company based in a teaching school in Yorkshire.
- f) on the level of take-up of FLiC across the sector, SMA reported that the system is being used in 80 schools across the country at present which provides a network for sharing practice and experience of working with the system.
- g) on the broader question of how the school can demonstrate progress following the removal of levels, JHO responded that the system will be able to show the progress made over time by each individual child. The measure of whether the school as a whole is improving will be measured against the national standard. The DfE is setting a more ambitious national floor standard for attainment. KS2 test outcomes will be reported as a scaled score, where the expected score is 100. Schools will be expected to aim for at least 85% of their pupils to achieve this measure. Those schools who do not get 85% of their cohort within a few scaled points of 100 will draw Ofsted's attention in relation to their proximity to the floor standard. The new system will have the effect that schools will not be focusing all their efforts at getting as many children over a single barrier (level 4) as possible, but boosting the performance of all children, to maximise their performance against the baseline.
- h) on how the new system will impact on reporting of progress to parents, JHO reported that there will be differences in reporting to parents at KS1 and KS2. Reports will use 'pupil can' statements according to whether a pupil is approaching, meeting or exceeding expectations in particular areas of the curriculum. Performance tables nationally will continue with the aim of showing each school's position in the country against headline measures:

- a scaled score, which will show whether each child has met the expected standard and is secondary ready;
- ranking in the national cohort (by decile); and
- the rate of progress from a baseline

4.3 Resolved:

- a) the meeting welcomed the adoption of FLiC and looked forward to further updates on how the system is embedding in due course.

b) NST thanked SMA for an informative presentation.

## **5. Action Plan for Improvement**

5.1 Received: the (draft) School Improvement Plan (SIP) for 2015-16, together with the Inspection Dashboard for RCPS. The documents were reviewed in detail in the meeting.

5.2 Noted: in discussion of the school improvement plan:

a) JHO explained the format of the SIP which addresses weaknesses identified in the Inspection Dashboard, priorities identified by RCPS and key performance indicators agreed by the RAT. The SIP has been developed with support from Nina Sidall, NCPS Support and Challenge Partner and school SLT. JHO drew attention to the emboldened priorities in the summary of RCPS 3 year priorities (pps 4-6) which indicate key areas of focus. These are further elaborated in the operational section of the plan which RAG rates the school's current position against the Ofsted criteria for Good (2) to show 'at a glance' where further improvements need to be made. ACO commended the plan's structure, informing the meeting that the format had been adopted in the plans of the Trust's two other schools.

b) the meeting reviewed the key priorities for RCPS as set out in the improvement plan. Actions to improve progress and attainment, close gaps in learning and secure and embed children's' learning were discussed.

c) JHO reported that evidencing how the school promotes 'Fundamental British Values' (FBV) within the overall context of SMSC provision is being addressed through staff training. For this reason, FBV is RAG rated 'Red' currently.

d) in response to a question concerning any increase of workload for named action-holders, JHO responded that the plan articulates actions necessary for ensuring outstanding provision for the children and therefore do not fall out with normal role/workload expectations.

e) in response to a question on how the school will be able to evidence progress against objectives, JHO reported that an impact evidence file is maintained and other forms of impact tracking are in place to evidence the quality of the school's learning environment.

f) JHO reported on the planned meeting with officers from ESCC (JHO, NST and ACO attending on behalf of RCPS) on 30<sup>th</sup> November, which has been called by the Local Authority to discuss RCPS's overall performance in 2014-15 and planned improvement actions, confirming that all issues raised by ESCC are referenced for action within the SIP. A report of this meeting would be made to the next LTB meeting.

5.3 Resolved: following discussion, to approve the RCPS Improvement Plan for 2015-16.

### ***LTB Monitoring of Improvement Priorities***

5.4 Noted: the meeting discussed how the LTB will monitor progress under the SIP. The importance of the newly established LTB being able to demonstrate that it is well informed and able to impact positively on school standards was noted. Monitoring visits will enable the LTB to triangulate evidence on the quality of teaching and learning by looking at the children's work, observing lessons, learning walks, and speaking to pupils and staff.

## **6. Headteacher's Report**

6.1 Received: the Headteacher's Report, focusing on actions being taken to address school improvement priorities. The meeting welcomed the report format. The full report was reviewed in detail in the meeting.

6.2 Noted: in discussion:

a) JHO reported the positive reaction of staff to the planned external consultant review by Tony Byrne taking place on 7<sup>th</sup> December.

- b) the meeting discussed the positive impact of Intervention Team support for Years 2 and 3 which had been implemented during terms 1 & 2 and the planned continuation of intervention for a number of children identified as needing further specific support.
- c) the current figure for attendance (95.56%) was noted in the light of the positive impact of the new system to reward attendance. The school is being proactive in holding to account parents and pupils in cases where absence is a concern.
- d) the figures for unauthorised and authorised absence presented in the report were discussed. JHO reported that the school takes a considerate approach towards advising parents well in advance of term and holiday dates through the newsletter to assist parents to plan family holidays accordingly. It was suggested in the meeting that the school attendance policy should be reviewed to ensure that the wording of the policy reflects how absence is managed operationally, without risk or compromise to attendance target.
- e) JHO reported on capacity building at Middle Leader level through the NPQML which was proceeding well with linked appraisal targets and action planning related to impact initiative for the course. In response to a question concerning staffing structure, JHO confirmed that an organisation chart is available in reception.
- f) JHO invited LTB members to the Learning Ambassadors visit on 25<sup>th</sup> November, the focus of which would be to analyse the impact Talk4Writing is having in KS1, Y3 and Y4.
- g) the meeting questioned adaptations to lunchtimes which were explained by JHO in the meeting and would be kept under continuous review on the basis of feedback.
- h) the meeting noted outcomes from the 30<sup>th</sup> October RAT Pay Committee which had upheld all recommendations put forward by the LTB following robust scrutiny by members from across the Trust's schools. An anonymised pay progression summary was reviewed in the meeting.
- i) all other aspects of reporting on progress against three-year priorities were noted as presented.

## **7. LTB Development Session – 12<sup>th</sup> November 2015**

- 7.1 Noted: NST reported on the above session which had been poorly attended due to insufficient advance notice. The session had, however, been valuable as a starting point for discussing how the LTB triads can work across the Trust, to provide support and challenge. The meeting had done some initial planning around SEN and Learner Progress triad working. It had been agreed to meet again in February (date tbc) and invite the SLT's of each school to showcase example(s) of good practice, and in July (date tbc) to evaluate impact of the triads and action plan forward.
- 7.2 Resolved: that it would be useful for members to make contact with their LTB triad partners using the contact information distributed in the meeting.

## **8. Safeguarding**

- 8.1 Noted: JHO reported on the recent presentation to staff on the Prevent Duty. The 18<sup>th</sup> December deadline for submission of the updated safeguarding audit toolkit and associated plan to ESCC was noted. JHO confirmed that she would be leading work to complete the toolkit and action plan and invited GWI (LTB safeguarding lead) to review the documents in draft for quality assurance.

## **9. Policies**

- 9.1 Noted: that a review of school policies will be undertaken. A report will be made to a future meeting.

## **10. Chair's Report**

- 10.1 Noted: NST confirmed there were no matters for report to this meeting.

**11. Date of Next Meeting**

- 11.1 Noted: that the LTB would meet on Monday 18<sup>th</sup> January 2016 at 4:30pm in the Headteacher's office.

*Meeting closed: 6.45pm*