



## MINUTES

### OF THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE MEETING

<b>Date</b>	Wednesday 8 <sup>th</sup> June 2016 at 3:15pm	
<b>Venue:</b>	Classroom	
<b>Present:</b>	Andrea Fisher Dan Thomas Julian Goodier-Page Mark Jones Melvyn Latham Steve Lee Sylvia Siddorns Wendy Bloor	Parent governor Executive Headteacher Co-opted governor Parent governor Co-opted governor Parent governor Co-opted governor (Chair) Staff governor
<b>Apologies:</b>	Rachael Nicholls	Head of School
<b>Absent:</b>	None.	
<b>In attendance:</b>	Laura Nicholson	Clerk

The meeting met its quorum

<b>AGENDA ITEM 1</b>	<b>WELCOME &amp; APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b>
<b>Discussion:</b>	The Chair welcomed all to the meeting. Apologies of Rachel Nicholls were received.
<b>Decision:</b>	<b>RESOLVED: that the apologies of the above named governor be accepted.</b>

<b>AGENDA ITEM 2</b>	<b>DECLARATION OF PERSONAL &amp; PECUNIARY INTEREST</b>
<b>Discussion:</b>	Sylvia Siddorn's daughter is Y5 teacher.

<b>AGENDA ITEM 3</b>	<b>DECLARATION OF ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b>
<b>Discussion:</b>	None declared.

<b>AGENDA ITEM 4</b>	<b>PART ONE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING (23<sup>rd</sup> February 2016)</b>
<b>Discussion:</b>	Governors reviewed the minutes which were circulated prior to the meeting.
<b>Decision:</b>	<b>RESOLVED: that the minutes be accepted as a true and accurate record. The Chair signed the minutes.</b>

<b>AGENDA ITEM 5</b>	<b>MATTERS ARISING</b>
<b>Discussion:</b>	Item 9: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DT to email out the safeguarding report. <b>Action completed.</b></li> <li>• DT to follow up proposal to work with parents regarding internet safety. <b>Action not completed yet. DT invited the input of parent governors to make the sessions more appealing to parents.</b></li> </ul> Item 5: Residentials: these were very successful. DT thanked staff for giving up their time to attend the trips. DT highlighted the positive impact of the day trips on some children who have gained a great deal of confidence and who now want to attend residentials next year.

<b>AGENDA ITEM 6</b>	<b>UPDATE OF PUPIL PROGRESS &amp; ATTAINMENT 2015/16 IN CONTEXT OF NEW ASSESSMENT</b>
<b>Discussion:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To receive an update on 'life without levels' – new assessment. <b>See discussion below.</b></li> </ul>



- Are targets on track for 2015-16? What are the focus areas this year? DT stated that they are. Writing is the focus area this year due to changes in the national curriculum and only just receiving the information from the DfE that they didn't at last meeting.

Steph Watson presented an update on the Y6 data. This year, the teacher assessment is submitted prior to the tests.

- a) Assessments have now moved away from levels to judgements; 'working at', 'below' or 'above expectations'. 'Growing development' means a child is 'below working towards'. No guidance had been given from the government until February. It is not clear what the outcomes will be exactly.
- b) Schools will be measured on the % of children 'at expected' by the end of the year and excluding SEN, working at 'greater depth' and 'greater depth excluding SEN'.
- c) Data must be submitted by 30<sup>th</sup> June. It has been difficult to make judgements due to the last minute changes nationally. It is no longer a best fit. Moderation with other schools has identified that all schools are finding the new system problematic.

**Q: Governors asked what the data shows? Is the School expected to meet floor standards?**

A: DT explained that 65% is the floor standard for expected progress this year. If any school is below this next year, it would be a problem. For Shavington, 73-80% is the expected outcome for 'expected'. In 'old money', previously 20% of children were expected to be at the higher level, 60% at expected (L4) level and 20% below. The School considers this forecast to be accurate to the best of their knowledge.

- d) Regarding the numbers of children achieving 'expected', Cheshire East are applying a figure of 90% meaning 'most' will achieve 'expected'. LCC are applying two thirds as 'most'. Therefore, there is ambiguity amongst Authorities. Moderation is considered to be professional judgement between an external person and the teacher.

**Q: As a teacher, were these figures easily attainable?**

A: SW advised that it has been a difficult year given all the changes and the cohort were identified as a weaker cohort generally. 11 children had extra time for SATS.

- e) There will be a scaled standardised score, but this has not been announced. DT explained that if a child achieved a L2b at KS1 last year, they would be expected to achieve a L4b at the end of KS2. L4b is now the equivalent to a L5.
- f) It isn't clear what the progress measure is going to be but will be based on a scaled score at 117 at the end of KS2.
- g) Governors noted that under the new system, a child could meet all but one target and be judged at working towards.
- h) DT has lodged a complaint to the NAHT regarding the inconsistencies around the moderation of KS2 based upon feedback. From professional dialogue between cross-school moderation all agreed that 90% is unfair.
- i) The School is confident that it has done all it can to achieve strong data. Writing is self-assessed, the other subjects are externally assessed.

**Q: Could the School have helped pupils to achieve higher results?**

A: DT advised that it could not have as the system is new. The only way the School could have done anything different is to have been told what the government's expectations are earlier.

- j) The feedback from the School's moderator was that writing is of quality. The School is teaching the child, not just teaching to tests.

4/10/16




Governors thanked Steph for her report. SW left the meeting.

- k) Y2 – Wendy Bloor: Outcomes are a snapshot. The reading test is set to give an idea of whether pupils are working towards or not.
- l) DT advised that the School is currently looking at standardised scale scores out of 100 which is 24 out of 30 which is 80%. All children match the predictions but one. However, this is only a snapshot. The tests were not done before.

**Q: What do the outcomes demonstrate?**

A: Nothing new; only that some children don't cope with test situations.

- m) Teachers observed the wording of the tests to be very challenging for such young children. However, the tests were undertaken in a way that children weren't put under pressure.
- n) Maths: 66% is the expected standard. For Shavington it is likely to be 75%. Scaled scores are between 85-115. If no marks are achieved the pupil makes 85 and if they achieve the maximum marks they achieve 115. 100 is the mean. Most children achieved 100. A few achieved less. If a child makes 115 at the end of Y2, there is no room for accelerated progress at the end of Y6.
- o) Overall, children are working hard and produce good quality work. Governors noted that cross moderation between schools has been useful.

AGENDA ITEM 7	SSDP PRIORITIES / ACTION PLAN UPDATE
<p><b>Discussion:</b></p>  <p>Governor of the Month - SS.doc</p>	<p>DT reported that SLT are now at the point of writing the SDP for next year. Rachael Nicholls will lead on this. However, the School is waiting for the new budget to be set so will tie in both.</p> <p>Rachael Nicholls is now officially Head of School as of 6<sup>th</sup> June. This is due to her knowledge of the School and children on a day-to-day level and that DT doesn't have the capacity to do this in his role. DT is managing HR and Finance in both Wheelock and Shavington.</p> <p>Key areas on the new SDP will be writing and reading. Outdoor learning is a key feature. All staff have received outdoor learning experience on a recent residential. A Lottery bid has been submitted for an outdoor classroom (tipi) in the top corner of the playground. This will be a key feature next year, tying into learning.</p> <p>Governors were asked to consider the following points;</p> <p>a) <b>Outcomes of any external/internal monitoring visits influencing the SSDP - including Link Governor monitoring visits (governor of the month).</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A moderation report was received from Lancashire County Council. Also, Wendy Bloor and Steph Watson have attended a course which has assisted in accuracy of judgements.</li> <li>• Governors noted SS's link governor report.</li> <li>• ML has also recently completed a report.</li> <li>• AF has attended an English visit.</li> </ul> <p>With regards to report writing, it was agreed that all draft reports are sent to Rachael Nicholls.</p> <p>b) <b>External visits / external consultants/SIP reports</b> None to report. <b>Action: DT to email out the SIP report to all governors.</b></p> <p>c) <b>Review SSDP Priorities and action plans</b> Not applicable.</p>

*[Handwritten signature]*  
Date: 4/10/16



	d) <b>SEF review</b> No changes since the last meeting.
--	--

<b>AGENDA ITEM 8</b>	<b>QUALITY OF TEACHING &amp; LEARNING UPDATE</b>
<b>Discussion:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DT reported that Mrs Rivers has been working on a project for the School regarding Professional Development in relation to teaching and learning. Mrs Rivers is working with Dr Sean Warren at Warrick University who has been remotely monitoring/coaching Mrs Rivers on her teaching and learning, using a device which records her work and only accessed by her. The coach advises on areas of development and strengths.</li> <li>The focus is to raise standards for the children in the school.</li> <li>DT explained that the impact of traditional observations was often not constructive and not true to usual practice. Therefore, traditional lesson observations are not used in this school. Dr Warren has some ideas for improving techniques by giving teachers more control of their learning. The technology used to monitor T&amp;L is excellent. Teachers can see the impact of teaching and can monitor children's behaviour too. The system is being used for NQT mentoring.</li> <li>Ofsted don't judge the quality of T&amp;L using Good/outstanding terminology. They make an assessment on whole school teaching and learning. In this school, performance is judged to be not less than good.</li> </ul>

<b>AGENDA ITEM 9</b>	<b>SAFEGUARDING UPDATE</b>
<b>Discussion:</b>	There was no update.

<b>AGENDA ITEM 10</b>	<b>PARENTS/COMMUNITY</b>
<b>Discussion:</b>	<p>a) ML reported that he has undertaken some work on this. The focus has been on road safety. ML confirmed that speed signage will be installed on the top road and Crewe Road. There are proposals for a crossing. DT and ML met with the Borough Council to show what support will be given. The response has been promising.</p> <p>b) DT advised that the Anderson Shelter is a great project and will be used to seat a class. It was noted to be a great community link. The School is making good links in the community.</p> <p>c) DT advised that the PSA have organised some successful events and are working hard to raise money.</p>

<b>AGENDA ITEM 11</b>	<b>POLICY REVIEW/APPROVAL</b>
<b>Discussion:</b>	There were no policies to review.

<b>AGENDA ITEM 12</b>	<b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b>
<b>Discussion:</b>	There was no AOB to discuss.

<b>AGENDA ITEM 13</b>	<b>DATE &amp; AGENDA OF THE NEXT MEETING</b>
<b>Discussion:</b>	FGB meeting: 23 <sup>rd</sup> June 2016 at 6pm Committee dates to be confirmed.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 4:50pm