

**MIDDLEWICH HIGH SCHOOL
PROGRESS & ATTAINMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
PART 1 MINUTES**

Date:	Monday 30th November 2020 at 4:30pm	
Venue:	Virtual Meeting using MS Teams	
Present:	Alan Dixon (ADI) Catherine Broadhurst (CBR) Colin Price (CPR) Heidi Thurland (HTD) Julie Brandreth (JBR) Mike Finney (MFI) Stuart Mayhead (SMA)	Co-opted Governor Co-opted Governor Parent Governor Head Teacher Co-opted Governor (Chair) Co-Opted Governor Co-Opted Governor
Apologies:		
Absence:		
In attendance:	Rebecca Dale (RDA) Mark Edwards (MED) Karen Holt (KHO) Katy Cottrell (KCO) Janine Barton (JBA)	Clerk Deputy Headteacher Assistant Head: Curriculum Assistant Head: Head of Maths SENDCo

The meeting met its quorum and started at 4:30pm

AGENDA ITEM 1	WELCOME & APOLOGIES
Discussion:	<p>The chair opened the meeting and welcomed the committee members.</p> <p>There were no apologies received.</p>

AGENDA ITEM 2	DECLARATION OF INTEREST (PECUNIARY OR OTHERWISE)
Discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JBR is a governor at Sir John Deane's Sixth Form and Chair of Governors at Barnton Primary School. • MFI declared that he is a Learning for Life trustee • SMA declared that he is a Governor at Middlewich Primary School and an Exam Invigilator at Middlewich High School. • CBR is an employee of Sir John Deane's Sixth Form
Decision:	The governing body accepted the declarations.

AGENDA ITEM 3	TERMS OF REFERENCE / SCHEME OF DELEGATION FOR P & A COMMITTEE
Discussion:	<p>The Chair of the Committee referred to the TOR agreed at the FGB meeting and reminded the committee that the governor Scheme of Delegation applies to the committee.</p> <p>The purpose of the committee is to oversee educational performance; therefore members must be clear about their remit: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) Decision making powers B) What needs reporting back to FGB

	The chair offered the opportunity for the committee to ask questions and provide any feedback.
	The Chair of Governors reiterated that the TOR is a live document and can be updated as required.

AGENDA ITEM 4	GOVERNOR VISITS AND REPORTS (INCLUDING STEM REPORT FROM MED)
Discussion:	<p>The governor visit reports were circulated to the committee prior to the meeting.</p> <p><u>STEM</u></p> <p>ADI reported that he held a good meeting with Claire Anderson (CAN), and that following the meeting a calendar of meeting dates has been agreed.</p> <p><i>Q) Have we identified anyone to attend the STEM ambassadors training course?</i></p> <p><i>A) Not yet, this is to be advised. CAN was looking to see if there was IET subsidy for training, however ADI has confirmed that STEM training through the IET is provided free of charge.</i></p> <p>MED reported to the committee that the importance of STEM is embraced across the teams and that MHS needs to raise the aspirations and visions of pupils with regards to what their future could be. ADI will help to enable the school to lead out on STEM effectively. There is already 1 colleague in each of the STEM curriculum subjects working on STEM, and one may be an ambassador going forward.</p> <p>A governor referred to the Intentions in STEM doc circulated prior to the meeting. The school also needs to create a sustainability culture across the school, especially with the government now looking to remove petrol vehicles from the roads by 2030. The governor also suggested that the school works more with the local community to see if they could offer any experience relating to STEM to pupils.</p> <p>MED confirmed that the school is already undertaking work with student leaders who work with community, especially with the Middlewich Pledge programme.</p> <p><i>Q) What impact can the committee expect to see in Short/Medium/Long term if an Ambassador undertakes this role? How can the committee be assured that this will not become a distraction from the curriculum?</i></p> <p><i>A) The STEM paper states they cannot be bolt-on activities, and CAN is very clear on this. Curriculum must have STEM and careers interleaved – Science has careers and STEM interleaved within the curriculum work and this relates to the GATSBY benchmark. 100% of PP students receive STEM and careers advice. There is also enrichment for focused groups of students for example Y9 female PP students were given the opportunity to attend a STEM activity at Sandbach High School (which they won).</i></p> <p><i>Q) What will the impact on learning be? Will the school need to see an improvement on grades for students to be able to undertake such visits?</i></p> <p><i>A) Yes, we will need to see a positive impact on learning for such visits.</i></p> <p><i>Q) What is the Middlewich Pledge?</i></p> <p><i>A) Its run by Local employers and shows how they support young people within the community. For example, the Pledge recently gave a talk on how our students can access such jobs going forward, with the focus on softer skills as well as academic ability.</i></p>

A governor agreed that active involvement between teachers and those in industry is required for schools to understand how industry works, as this is not always apparent. A close relationship between the two is essential.

ADI offered to support MED with this going forward.

A governor remarked that the paper was excellent in providing an update and was pleased that SEND pupils were also included in the report.

Health & Safety

Report from CPR circulated prior to the meeting, along with Phase 2 paper.

In consultation with staff and students phase 2 will not be implemented as planned and will be put back until a more appropriate time, however the plan is in place should phase 2 become appropriate.

The head consulted with staff in relation to staff wellbeing and curriculum. To date there have been no positive student test results, with MHS being the only school in CEC to have this. If things are not broken, then why fix them? Sustainability is still a question and will be revisited during the first week back in January, with a view to moving to whole school bubble. Feedback from the community is that people are very happy with the way that the school has managed bubbles, therefore the school will need to gain trust that this is the correct way forward.

Q) What has been the impact on subjects like science? Are pupils missing out?

A) The accumulative impact on year groups is minimal as all pupils have been on site and have not needed remote teaching. Current advice from the Consortium of Local Education Authorities for the Provision of Science Services (CLEAPSS) is that schools should not go to an increased bubble and if they did, they would need to quarantine equipment for 72 hours. CLEAPSS have stated that there is less risk to science curriculum than anticipated, therefore nothing will change for the foreseeable future.

Q) What will the impact be on exam questions? How do we make that experience available to the exam boards?

A) The Y11 curriculum is preserved as they are based in science labs. Practical assessments have been removed from the curriculum this year, but a full curriculum is still being delivered. Y11 are participating in workshops. The biggest impact will be on the current Y10. Once Y11 no longer require the lab space then Y10 will be moved into the labs – plan C is in place!

A governor commented that there are lots of STEM teaching resources available on the IET website including many educational projects that may support the school with science.

SEND & PP

MFI / SMA held a productive SEND / PP meeting with the SENDCo. The information was shared via email by the chair of governors prior to the meeting. However due to issues with the school email this was not received by committee members.

Accordingly, MFI reported to the committee that during the meeting key aspects of focus were discussed, i.e., attendance, curriculum, training and development. It was agreed that the department need to focus on 1 or 2 key aspects initially that impact all students. Attendance is the logical place to start with; if a student is not in school it is difficult to assist them.

	<p>The chair of governors confirmed that he will upload the report to GovernorHub after the meeting (into this meeting's folder)</p> <p>Governor reports need to be completed immediately following meetings, along with an action log from the SLT member; however, SLT do not need to write minutes for the meetings as this has an impact on time. SLT have already been provided with a copy of the action log for completion.</p> <p>The Novus support email address is support@novus.co.uk – any governors having issues with accessing emails should email Novus directly.</p>
Decision:	The committee resolved to accept the reports and the H&S paper.
Action:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intentions to be updated in the STEM report to reflect the above by: Deputy Headteacher • Whole school bubble to be revisited when appropriate by: Headteacher • SEND Meeting report to be added to GovernorHub by: Chair of Governors • Novus to be emailed directly if anyone is having problems accessing their school email by: all governors

AGENDA ITEM 5	INTENDED STRUCTURE OF MEETING
Discussion:	<p>A paper detailing the intended structure of committee meetings was circulated to the committee prior to the meeting by the chair of the committee.</p> <p>The paper contains key areas from the last Ofsted report – governors need to be confident in these areas. Progress and attainment need to be a key focus, and the key areas need to be linked to the school development plan (SDP) to ensure focus on the quality of education at MHS.</p> <p><i>Q) With reference to targets, should these be like a pyramid? Everything looks upwards towards the top and we build down individual areas to achieve this. Is there a structure that reflects that? How do we understand that an action completed by a teacher at a certain level is having an impact on the top of the pyramid?</i></p> <p><i>A) The “pyramid” is the SDP and does not require duplication from the SLT. There is a difference between the SDP and whole school targets. However, the school needs to be aiming for a positive P8 score at the top – zero is the goal. A score above this is even better. The positive P8 score is the number 1 target.</i></p> <p>The headteacher confirmed that once the target setting training takes place later in the meeting, governors will have a better understanding of this process. The school was using FFT50 targets however, has now progressed towards FFT20 targets. SLT are now looking at how to refine this to move the school forward even more. This work links directly into the SDP to demonstrate how this will be achieved.</p> <p>The chair of the committee asked governors to confirm that they were happy to accept the proposed structure of meetings.</p>
Decision:	Governors resolved to approve the proposal.

AGENDA ITEM 6	CURRICULUM – RAISING ACHIEVEMENT PLAN (KHO)
Discussion:	<p>The raising achievement plan was circulated to the committee prior to meeting.</p> <p>KHO referred to section 1 of doc, HT1 to HT2. The document has been updated again this week.</p> <p><i>Q) The plan refers to the continuous review and evaluation of the curriculum. How is this done and how is it recorded?</i></p> <p><i>A) This is done through line management meetings – SLT meet with Heads of Department (HoD) and identify any gaps. EGR also carried out work reviewing the curriculum process with HoD (this is referred to in the paper). EGR collates the information from HoD where they have been asked to identify key areas for review. HoD have agenda items and hold meetings with their departments on weekly basis to review the curriculum. The reviews are happening at all levels throughout the school. Curriculum training is given in CPD sessions. For example, CPD has recently focused on Christine Counsell direct training with senior and middle leaders. Staff understand the thinking behind the review and evaluation. The head is working with EGR to provide subject summaries and narrative around each department to give a position of where the department is currently at. This information will be presented at the next committee meeting once completed – it is currently being mapped across the whole school.</i></p> <p>Having identified gaps, EGR is now working with staff to address them – lesson planning, 5-year plans and topics for example. Weekly timelines are discussed with staff to ensure implementation.</p> <p><i>Q) Where there is variation identified, has this been dealt with?</i></p> <p><i>A) Yes.</i></p> <p><i>Q) The PP gap will widen over time if vocabulary is not addressed. Is this now part of the monitoring?</i></p> <p><i>A) Yes, this is part of that process and staff are being given training on whole school vocabulary and literacy by the literacy lead.</i></p> <p><i>Q) Do students have work planners? If so, is it possible to provide pre-printed vocabulary for subjects?</i></p> <p><i>A) They do not have work planners but do have knowledge organisers. This could be investigated.</i></p> <p>The chair of the committee suggested adding examples of vocabulary and literacy to the paper, and thanked KHO for producing the report.</p> <p><i>Q) With regards to curriculum work conducted over the last 18 months, Y11 are starting their trial exams today. Are the outcomes going to be better than last year?</i></p> <p><i>A) Students had their heads down during today’s exams; they are a disciplined group and have put effort into the exam papers.</i></p>

Q) Does the SLT think that there will still be work to be done?

A) Yes. We have just come out of a second lockdown. This year's learning experience is very new, and this can distract from the overall results. It is a starting point on which to build for the remainder of the year. Y11 are currently only two exams in so it is too early to know the impact just yet.

Q) Is the school happy that the curriculum will have an impact going forward?

A) It is an improvement on where it was at Easter 2019. However, there is still room for improvement. No-one knows the impact of lockdown going forward, and the impact will be more apparent for the current Y8. The discipline of Y11 students is different this year and the focus of teachers is improved. SLT recognise that the school will not have a positive P8 score after this set of mocks. However, it will give a starting point for improvements that need to be made. Trial exams are not realistic as they identify what pupils don't know in order to address this for the final exams.

Q) There needs to be focus on attendance for the trial exams, especially with PP / disadvantaged students. Will they be made to sit trial exams if they miss them?

A) Yes, there is already a catch-up plan in place for these students.

Q) In the paper you refer to "comparative judgement". What is this?

A) This is currently being trialled in the English Department, where staff are assessing pupils' work by comparing them side by side. The school is looking to adopt moving forward but lockdown has prevented this being reviewed as planned. Comparative Judgement is part of the no more marking initiative run by Daisy Christodoulou (<https://daisychristodoulou.com/comparative-judgment/>) and is a process where judges compare two responses and decide which is better. Following repeated comparisons, the resulting data is statistically modelled, and responses placed on a scale of relative quality. Staff literally decide which piece of work is better than the other, and this is internally moderated across the team. It enables HoD to rank top PP boy V Top PP girl for example by looking at targeted comparisons of work. A national programme that is underway. It is efficient, reduces teacher workload and enables staff to dig down on why students have a misunderstanding of something.

Q) The paper refers to the KS4 "desired" 6th form provider, where Natalie Edwards-Clark is pastoral lead. Can you expand on this?

A) Natalie worked at SJD prior to working at MHS and provides a link to SJD where appropriate.

Q) Is it right to refer to a "desired" 6th form provider? This isn't just SJD? MHS needs to be impartial in the KS4 advice offered to pupils.

A) Yes, the school uses other providers such as Cheshire College South & West, Reaseheath etc. KHO will update the paper to reflect this.

Q) The paper refers to a small number of SEND identified who are accessing Step Up to Maths? (Y9 pathways process). Can you expand on this?

A) The school needs to ensure that the curriculum is appropriate for each student. The paper needs to be amended to reflect that students will be guided to appropriate learning.

*KHO to send updated paper to the clerk to circulate to the committee.

	<p>Q) The NEET figure is stated as zero. Is this correct? A) It was 4% - 1 student wasn't accessing any FE but he now has a place, so it is correct at 0%</p>
Decision:	Governors resolved to accept the Raising Achievement plan.
Action:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paper to be amended to reflect all KS4 providers by: KHO • Paper to be amended with regards to guided learning where appropriate by: KHO • Updated paper to be sent to the clerk to circulate to the committee by: KHO

AGENDA ITEM 7	KS4 OPTIONS PROCESS
Discussion:	<p>The KS4 options proposal paper was circulated to governors prior to meeting. KHO gave a brief overview of the contents.</p> <p>Key points raised were: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Going forward students will be invited to undertake triple science based upon their aptitude. • A poll has been conducted using Google forms regarding languages to give starting point on options choices in the New Year. Students will have an informed choice around what they will study come Sept 2021. <p>Q) What is the difference between students being invited to undertake triple science and students being guided? What criteria do they need to meet? A) The HoD will identify students who are high attainers. These students will then need to sit an exam at the end of the year to demonstrate aptitude. They will be a group of students who are "invited" by the SLT. Students need to be able to meet the requirements of the course in order to be able to sit the exam. Different schools have been consulted on their models to ensure fair process. An invitation will create a focus for the year group. The SLT will also look at career aspirations and this will form part of the discussion with the students. Current Science and Computer science results are disappointing. Therefore, this is a way to address this and provide the best experience for the pupils.</p> <p>Q) Is "invited" the correct term to use? A) Yes. Students will be made aware of the process, and it will be communicated to parents also. Triple science is 6 papers on top of the English papers and the maths papers. By offering an invitation this may help some students understand the work that is required of them to achieve the qualification. Combined science is still a perfectly acceptable qualification.</p> <p>Q) Will this be a cause for concern with stakeholders? A) The EBacc entry will increase as a result of this process and we are appropriately guiding students using a rigorous process. MHS is setting students up to succeed and enabling them to make the appropriate choices that are right for them.</p>
Decision:	Governors resolved to approve the proposed changes to the KS4 Options model.

AGENDA ITEM 9	TARGET SETTING PROCESS
Discussion:	<p>The chair of the committee welcomed KCO to the meeting.</p> <p>KCO ran through presentation circulated to the committee prior to the meeting. The members were given the opportunity to ask questions after each slide.</p> <p>The SLT have identified that target setting is a key process and therefore it needs to be correct. Fischer Aspire, whilst an old system, has a lot of research underpinning it. Therefore, KCO has confidence in the data it provides (personalised subject specific assessments). The data is weighted for the past 3 years, and provides benchmarks for the 50th, 20th and 5th percentiles.</p> <p><i>Q) With regards to the benchmark document, is this an approved standard?</i> <i>A) 75% of secondary schools in England use this to set their target baseline data from a huge national database. Performance data is from the last 3 years and comes from the schools' management information (MI) system. Ofsted are aware of this benchmarking.</i></p> <p><i>Q) Is the percentage change overall or for individual areas?</i> <i>A) It is both subject and student specific - we go with the grade with the greatest percentage for that pupil.</i></p> <p><i>Q) It used to be that schools could use the 25th percentile for non-pupil premium students and the 20th percentile for pupil premium. As this option no longer exists, is there a percentage chance behind the probability graph to give PP students a higher percentile in order to narrow the gap?</i> <i>A) There is a PiXL strategy that alludes to this – FFT50 and FFT20 only give a small grade change, for example a FFT50 target might be a 5- and a FFT20 target might be a 5+ - both are still a grade 5. The current target setting is aspirational for all, so if pushed too far it may become unrealistic.</i></p> <p><i>Q) If all students are set a target on the FFT20 20th percentile and all students are taught well, then the gap between PP and non PP will still remain. If PP have a higher target and if resource is used to support achievement of it, then this narrows the gap.</i> <i>A) This needs more investigation to see if there is an opportunity to push the targets higher for some pupils.</i></p> <p>Another governor also noted that if all students have the same target from the same percentile it may lead to the gap being maintained despite all pupils progressing.</p> <p><i>Q) Is it FFT20 for all from Y10?</i> <i>A) Yes</i></p> <p>The committee agreed that it is important for <u>all</u> pupils to endeavour to take their exams.</p> <p>A governor queried the reference to case profile adjustments. KCO clarified that some targets set as a minimum are over ambitious and the school has evidence (i.e. from the SEND team) that the student may struggle to achieve that target. The baseline score may be low but Fischer sets target</p>

higher so this allows the school to investigate and ensure that students are in the correct learning groups.

Q) There is concern that targets should be reduced rather than increase support. Is this the right way to address this?

A) These students are individual cases and have very complex needs. There is significant evidence available to support the decision. It is very much on an individual basis and not just targeting all SEND students. An example would be a student who is a school refuser and has already attended 3 schools this year. The target grade may be overwhelming for the pupil and add to their anxiety, therefore it is better for the student to reduce the target thus the pressure on them.

Q) If the target is reduced, is this when it is first set?

A) Yes, although there is the opportunity to review this where necessary.

Q) How many pupils will this apply to in total?

A) 5 is probably the maximum number of students this applies to and it is not done without a full and thorough assessment.

A governor expressed their reservation that if a pupil is downgraded then it negates the point of using FFT.

Resource Provision students with communication and learning needs may be highly complex and vulnerable. "Downgrade" is the wrong term to use. This is the exception rather than the rule and only applies to those who need it.

Q) Where lies the accountability for reaching targets – is this part of performance management process that students achieve these targets?

A) No, data is not used in targets, effective curriculum is used. The head wants staff to focus on pedagogy; if the curriculum is correct then the rest will follow.

Governors discussed the correct terminology for setting targets – realistic or achievable. It was agreed that "attainable" is a preferable word. The paper will be amended to reflect this.

KS4 targets; KCO gave an overview of the Y11 headlines for 2020/21

This cohort has a lower prior attainment than last year's, and their progress not linear – the school does not just teach to the test. Levels were removed from KS3 for that reason. The work around curriculum secures culture wide learning and prepares students for their GCSEs.

Q) Is the current Y8 cohort the perfect scenario to achieve an improved P8?

A) Yes

Setting targets in this way prevents staff from focusing on attainment grades and encourages them to focus on the P8 instead. It is a long term piece of work with a high curriculum offer.

	<p>Q) Do the figures add up – there is a different total for English than Maths? A) 125 English and 119 maths. This is possibly a typo. All students have been accounted for in the data, which is a mock up. Bands are being allocated.</p> <p>Governors thanked KCO for the presentation</p> <p>Q) Given this is a large piece of work, what happens when you go on leave? A) KCO is currently shielding at home. However there is still a significant amount of work which she is undertaking before starting her maternity leave. This will then be picked up by the SLT / HoD in her absence.</p> <p>The head confirmed that the school has secured a science advisor for 1 day per week to support the science team in KCOs absence.</p> <p>The head is pleased with the amount of work already achieved with regards to targets and curriculum.</p> <p>Q) Are there now only two data drops? A) Yes, in KS3. There are still 3 in KS4</p>
Decision:	Governors received training on target setting
Action:	Update training log on GovernorHub to add target setting training by: all governors

AGENDA ITEM 10	POLICIES
Discussion:	<p>The policies below were circulated to the committee prior to the meeting and amendments were made following feedback provided: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access Arrangements Policy 2. Examinations Contingency Plan 3. Examinations Policy 4. Non Examined Assessments Policy <p>Q) The policies look standard. Is there anything specific from a covid perspective that needs to be included? A) The school adopts the examination board's policy, which is why it is standard. Governors need to keep in mind that the head is working in a dynamic situation and until Gavin Williamson can confirm what is happening with regards to exams in 2021 it is impossible to reflect this in the policy. The policies can be amended to reflect any changes once a decision has been made. Current policy has been written on the assumption that exams are happening; addendums will be added to reflect any changes to this if necessary.</p>
Decision:	The committee resolved to approve the above-named policies.
Action:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies to be formatted and “draft” removed before being published on the school website by: the clerk

AGENDA ITEM 10	ANY OTHER BUSINESS
Discussion:	There was no further business to discuss.

AGENDA ITEM 18	STATEMENT OF IMPACT
Discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Received, discussed and approved reports on governor visits • Received, discussed and agreed the proposed structure of meetings • Received, discussed and approved the raising achievement plan • Agreed training topics • Received, discussed and approved the detailed curriculum report • Received, discussed and approved the KS4 Options plan • Received, discussed and approved policies listed in item 10 • Received target setting training.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 19:17pm

The next meeting of the Progress and Achievement committee will take place using MS Teams on Monday 22nd February 2021 at 4:30pm