

# BASSINGBOURN VILLAGE COLLEGE

## Minutes of the Local Governing Body meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> May 2017

<b>Present:</b>	George Lynn (GL) (Chair)	Stephen Morris (SM)
	Alison Butterworth (AB)	Ken Murphy (KM)
	Peter Bolton (PB)	Peter Nussey (PN)
	Dushy Chetty (DCh)	Vicky Poulter (VP)
	Rachel Dix-Pincott (RD-P)	Chris Roope (CR)
	James Dow (JD)	Simon Sagers (SSag)
	Kate French (KF)	Sue Speller (SSp)
<b>In attendance:</b>	Jeremy Brock (JBr) (Deputy Principal)	
<b>Minutes:</b>	Hilary Forrester (Clerk)	

	ACTION
<p><b>1. Apologies and welcome.</b></p> <p>Apologies were received and accepted from Duncan Cooper and James Dow.</p>	
<p><b>2. Declaration of Interests</b></p> <p>There were no declarations of interests.</p>	
<p><b>3. Minutes of last meeting/matters arising</b></p> <p>The Minutes of the meeting on 30th March 2017 were approved and signed. The budget and personnel items would be discussed at the meeting on 18<sup>th</sup> May.</p> <p><u>Reserves:</u> KM had spoken to the EFA and was now awaiting a MAT decision.</p> <p><u>Agenda format:</u> Agendas now identified who was leading on each item.</p> <p><u>Kate Evans' presentation:</u> This had been circulated to governors and staff.</p> <p><u>Admissions:</u> KM informed governors that the Barracks intake would not be going ahead for this academic year. The admissions policy had been placed back into the review cycle for consideration next year.</p> <p><u>MAT Update:</u> Interviews had taken place for a new COO and a strong candidate had been appointed. He would be able to start shortly as Duncan Hambidge, who had held the position in the interim, would be leaving on 16<sup>th</sup> June.</p> <p>Interviews had also taken place for the Executive Principal of the Primary Hub. Two of the four candidates had dropped out. One of the strongest candidates was unable to attend for personal reasons and so, with the agreement of the other candidates, the formal interviews had been deferred until this candidate could go through the first stage.</p> <p>The Primary Hub now consists of four definite schools, with a fifth joining the Hub in the New Year. A further four schools were engaged in serious discussions.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Is there a maximum number of primary schools in the Hub? <b>A:</b> No, but probably not more than eight to start with. With the schools coming in, we are trying to keep a certain amount of</p>	

autonomy. There will be discussions with the new Executive Principal about how big each Hub could be.

SSp informed governors that all the MAT policies were being worked through and the next ones to be considered were those relating to pay and performance management. The tenders for catering and cleaning contracts for the MAT would be shortlisted at the end of May.

Safeguarding: VP updated governors on safeguarding. The link to the safeguarding training module was sent to governors last week. Copies of the information booklets and confirmation of training memo were available at the meeting. VP encouraged governors to complete the training and hand signed memos to Sue Smith as soon as possible.

#### 4. KS3 Data Discussion

JBr introduced the Y7-9 Data Point 2 report, previously circulated. (*Governors Report Year 7 to Year 9 March Data Point*). He explained that for Year 8 and 9 the scores had been converted from the old National Curriculum levels (reported since these students joined the college) to the new GCSE grades which were being used across all year groups. Targets were set on this basis in September. The major change for the Y7-9 report was that the student and subject progress now use the same system and are tracked against Key Stage 2 test results rather than the targets set in the college. The target at end of Y7 now relates to the GCSE Grade which is incorporated into the Doodle.

JBr explained that each student has two scores. The first score reflects E-Bacc subjects with the addition of Religious Studies and the omission of French and Spanish. The second score reflects the average for all subjects. The process allows identification of both students and subjects where expected progress is not being made. There are plans to create a third score, combining English and Maths in order show progress in relation to the entry levels for those subjects.

**Q:** Is it worth doing the scoring on the best 8 subjects? **A:** It depends on the subjects. When we were trying to do it for students across the board it was difficult because not all subjects start at 0.

JBr reported that CAL input had previously focussed on Y10 and 11. The new CALs starting after half term, would be looking at the achievements and those not making expected progress. Ten pupils had been identified as having problems in specific areas, eg subject topics, attendance etc.

The Y8 March Data Point was discussed. The colours identified students who had not made expected progress from entry.

**Q:** Where students have not made the expected progress and have had their names passed to the relevant CAL for investigation, what action typically follows? **A:** VP explained how the different interventions were identified and addressed through the Heads of Department or the CAL, giving some examples. It was noted that this identification process relied on the correct use of Doodle which involved a lot of work in the departments.

**Q:** Are the figures indicative rather than definitive? **A:** Yes. The assumption is that the scores that come in at KS2 are indicative of other subject areas. Building up a database of progress across the years, will provide more information about what progress is expected for pupils on different types of subjects from one data point to another. English and Maths make better than expected progress. In future we will have three scores, including one for just English and Maths. We are identifying disadvantaged students now and have good information on their interventions and progress.

**Q:** So in a few years' time, when the cohort has gone through, this will enable us to identify good predictors of progress? **A:** Yes. There was a meeting with team leaders to discuss the

form, and how individuals are identified for actions/interventions. The form identifies pupils who have made the most progress in each year group so that their success can be celebrated.

The tracking data for Y7-9 was discussed (*Y7 to Y9 Analysis spreadsheet*).

**Q:** Where do the expected progress figures come from and why are they different for each year? **A:** This questions was answered by JBr during the discussion. He explained that the data tracks progress across all subjects, but the format was still being developed. There are plans to do separate analysis for Maths and English. It was noted that pupils are not exposed to geography, RE and history, as much at primary school and so there is a period of catching up which accounts for the lower progress scores in these subjects.

Governors thanked JBr for the comprehensive information.

Pupil premium review: VP introduced the Pupil Premium Review 2017 (circulated at the meeting). Pupil premium priority cards had been sent out to teachers earlier in the year and the review asked teachers about their day to day experience and how effectively the school uses evidence to identify approaches to interventions. Drop-ins were done by SLT and work scrutiny completed in faculty training sessions. Kerry Sage the pupil premium coordinator from Sawston carried out a review and Phil Church performed a data analysis. Ten students, two from each year group of mixed gender and abilities, also took part in the study. Some of the key findings were that the seating plans were appropriate, TAs are aware of PP pupils and raised attainment. Feedback from the work scrutiny was very positive, in particular, written feedback was high quality and students were very eloquent at discussing the feedback they received. There was no difference in marking between PP and other students.

PP progress compared to whole cohort shows that at KS3, progress is the same for PP and non-PP students. There is still an attainment gap in Y10 and 11 and a gap in progress. The size of the cohort is a factor in this as one or two pupils can affect the data. There was a gap in Y11 results last year, but their progress was positive in comparison with national PP students.

**Q:** What is the breadth of the range for pupil attainment. **A:** For PP some have very high attainment, so the average is only a crude measure. This data is for our monitoring purposes, and is not reported outside the school. We are judged on what our disadvantaged students get compared to the national average.

The pupils of service personnel would get tracked on a separate line because they attract additional money. Every year group is tracked in terms of expenditure, actions and input. The context and background details are recorded. This gives a snapshot for each student.

The review concluded that there is no specific evidence that PP students are planned for separately, but their experience in the classroom and the level of feedback they are given is of a high quality and in-line with the experience and feedback of other students in the school. There was also some evidence that the presentation was not as good for PP books, or that they were targeted for additional feedback.

**Q:** Is this just for information? **A:** Yes, the review was done as part of the quality assurance process and findings would be fed back to teaching staff.

## **5. KPI: Year 10/11 Data, Behaviour and attendance, pupil premium review and report**

### Y11 Tracking Data

JBr introduced the *Governors Report: Year 11 - Data Point 4* (previously circulated)

All measures show an increase from the February Data Point (DP3) with the exception of students passing English and Maths at grades 4 to 9. Other areas are getting close to target. Science is furthest below target, due to some students with a controlled assessment of D, although they were close to the C boundary and others with a low grade C who are forecast D. All students are being targeted for revision at lunchtime sessions as they will need to perform

better in the exam. They have been given personalised learning checklists, revision guidance and interventions have been put in place.

For the EBac measure, English and Maths are below their target measure. The scores are doubled for those subjects, so this would be 8 in English and 9 in Maths. Teachers are cautious about predicting the higher grades at this time due to uncertainties about where the grade boundaries will be.

Pixl Curve paper has helped to show where students have struggled and we can target them for interventions in relation to specific questions. In Maths, Pixl have produced material to help with the new style questions on problem solving. 250,000 pupils were involved in the benchmarking exercise.

**Q:** So were the results we got back from the benchmarking where we thought they would be?  
**A:** Yes, the information has been used in the projections.

**Q:** Are the problem solving questions in maths the only difference? **A:** No they have brought other topics down from A level. The whole style of paper is very different, for example, the questions do not get harder throughout the paper as previously, so there could be a hard question first.

#### Y10 tracking data

JBr introduced the *Governors Report: Year 10 - Data Point 2* (previously circulated) The report showed subject tracking on the second data point, including learner groups. JBr explained that all headline figures had fallen since the last Data Point. Tracking of Y10 is a unique circumstances, and is very difficult to track and judge how accurate it is. There have been curriculum changes between Y10 and Y11 and a lot of subjects are now 100% exam with no controlled assessment. The data point went out just after the Y10 exams had been marked, at which time there were no raw scores or grade boundaries for marking.

**Q:** How do you identify pupils for interventions if the figures are difficult to interpret?  
**A:** We look at Y10 and 11 figures for the progress 8 target score (across the board and in individual subjects). **Q:** When will we see the next phase of Y10 data? **A:** At the end of the academic year, in July and then again in October. **Q:** For Statistics, are the children sitting the unreformed exam? **A:** Yes, the unreformed GCSE will run until 2018 examination and the current Y9s will sit this in Y10. The first sitting of the reformed GCSE is 2019.

**Q:** Has the ECDL been withdrawn for Y10s? **A:** It no longer counts in the performance table. There is a cost element and we are checking whether there is an alternative qualification in a vocational subject for those students.

**Q:** Are Y10s were going to be offered the ECDL as an extra in the summer term. **A:** This has not been discussed yet as the budget meeting is next week. It is running within the curriculum for specific pupils who will benefit.

Governors confirmed that the questions that were emailed in advance, had been covered in the discussion.

#### Attendance and behaviour

The *Behaviour Report Spring 2 2017* and *Attendance spreadsheet ytd* were circulated prior to the meeting. There were no questions.

### **6. Maths Plan**

The *Maths Review and Additional Planning* document was sent out in advance.

**Q:** Are all of the activities listed new, i.e., have not run before? We are interested mainly in differences in provision/support this year compared with previous years.

**A:** Yes, they are all new activities.

**Q:** What is the GCSE maths/statistics provision for years 10 and 11? **A:** Four groups are doing Statistics in the current Y10 and the other two groups do GCSE maths.

There were no further questions

## 7. CIP review

The CIP Review Front sheet appeared on the back of the Termly Review. Two areas were still 'red' and VP reported on progress:

- i. *"Using Doddle to inform planning and differentiation – Doddle classrooms (differentiation 80% at least good)"*

It was felt that the college would not achieve the 80%. The most recent data showed up to 72%. This was because lesson observations were not looking for different types of differentiation and so it was being marked down incorrectly by not being properly identified. Some CPD was done with staff, illustrating the types of differentiation and the percentage identified was now increasing.

**Q:** What do the teachers think of Doddle? **A:** RD-P and PB responded that it was useful having the RAG system for reporting. Provision for optional subjects, eg computing, is not quite as comprehensive as Maths and Science. It has been a learning process for staff, but people can see the benefit and feedback is good. RD-P noted that assessment for languages was poor and the resources and assessments had to be created to RAG the skills. It was a lot of work for the department, in terms of moderating the assessment, the skills and doing this for every data point for both languages. However, as this is developed going forward it will become quicker and easier. Pupils like being able to see what they can do and what they have to work on. Staff have created sheets to go in the front of students' books at the start of each term so they can look back at their progress over the year.

**Q:** Should we talk to Doddle about the resources? **A:** The Doddle part is the RAG rating of the statements. The resources was a bonus part that will not be centrally updated. It will improve as more people use it. **A:** Are we sharing this across the MAT? **A:** No, we are the only school using Doddle at the moment. There have been talks at MAT level with Heads of Departments for core subjects. RD-P noted that her department shares resources with other schools (via external subject meetings). JBr said it was up to the teacher to identify the expectations, rather than have them dictated. KM noted that the MAT was trying to get some commonality of data reporting across the different schools.

- ii. *70% of students complete the BVC challenge*

The lack of progress was due to staffing problems. The forthcoming curriculum day would be a Charities/Pledge Day at which a lot of the challenge would be covered. However, the target would not be met this year.

There were no further questions.

## 8. Curriculum update

VP reported that she attended a MAT meeting with DC to look at core subject time across the schools. BVC had less allocated Maths time than the other schools. Feedback from the Maths Department was that they would like more time, in smaller chunks. We can see benefit of 100 minute lessons, but are considering some 50 minute Maths lessons within the timetable.

The proposal is to increase the Maths time in Y10 and Y11 by having 50 minutes less of core PE time and 50 minutes less of Science time. The Science Department are confident that as they no longer have controlled assessments, they can manage with 50 minutes less over a fortnight without it impacting science delivery and outcomes.

BVC is over the national requirement for PE time and the proposed reduction would bring us in line. We have the resources because the new CALS have expressed an interest in teaching Maths, and they have the necessary skills.

<p><b>Q:</b> What is the impact of reducing PE – will pupils mind? <b>A:</b> They won't mind because the pupils doing PE are taking it as a GCSE anyway. <b>Q:</b> Will it be for everyone in Y10 and Y11? <b>A:</b> Yes, it is not possible to make it more targeted for individuals. <b>Q:</b> Isn't maths taught as part of science? <b>A:</b> Yes, but it is not focussed enough. <b>Q:</b> Was this on the Maths Plan? <b>A:</b> No, but investigating the timetabling for KS4 was mentioned. The Maths Plan finishes this year and this is for next year. <b>Q:</b> The PE time for Y11 was used for subject revision previously, will that be detrimental for students catching up with other lessons. <b>A:</b> That was individual working, not a taught session. This is a better use of the time.</p> <p>Governors voted on the proposal to increase the Maths time in Y10 and Y11 by having 50 minutes less of core PE time and 50 minutes less of Science time. The proposal was approved.</p>	
<p><b>9. Lockdown Procedure</b></p> <p>The revised Lockdown Procedure was not available in time for the meeting.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> SS to send the procedure to governors for comment by email.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Will the procedure go on the website? <b>A:</b> It does not have to.</p>	SS
<p><b>10. AOB</b></p> <p>SSag asked whether there was any information about the types of questions that come from parents relating to particular subjects, and if that would be discussed by governors?</p> <p><b>A:</b> It would be difficult to gather that data because it comes via different channels. Informal queries would be dealt with by the teacher or Head of Department. This is not collated centrally unless it goes through senior managers via the complaints procedure.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> How would a person know who to contact with a query? <b>A:</b> They can contact the school to find out the most appropriate person to address their concern to. The staff list is also on the website.</p>	

Meeting closed at 21:06

**Next meeting:** 18<sup>th</sup> May 2017 at 6pm – Chair: Sue Speller

Chair .....