



MEETING OF THE TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE ON FEBRUARY 11TH 2020 AT 7.30AM IN THE HEAD'S OFFICE.

Present: Hilary Priest (HP), Head, Mike Waterson (MW), Karen Jarvis (KJ), Suzanne Bryant (SB), Chair, Sam Gothard (SG), Neil Maslen (NM).

In attendance: Debbie Horton (Clerk)

Minutes

1	Welcome & apologies for absence There were no apologies.
2	Attendance & declaration of interest Those present signed the attendance form. There were no declarations of interest.
3	Approval of minutes of last Teaching and Learning Committee meeting on 19th November 2019 They were approved as a correct record.
4	Matters arising from minutes of last meeting including progress made on the actions raised 9. Communication plan to be sent to all governors - HP - done 10. Committee to read and email any comments re website SEND report - done 11. To circulate climate change document to committee - SB - done
5	<p>School Improvement Plan (SIP) A proposed (work in progress) SIP for next year and an annotated update on progress on this year's SIP action plan were sent with the agenda.</p> <p>HP reported that work to be completed after half-term focussed on enrichment, a pupil premium audit and collaborative work with the cluster group schools. Some areas requiring more work were carried over to the new SIP, for example, the monitoring of teaching quality. Sam Wilkinson and HP plan to go into classrooms next term to look at what is being done. For example, to monitor the effectiveness of interventions and consistency of teaching across classes. HP reported that a staff meeting on mixed ability reading had shown a difference in approach amongst staff.</p> <p>Q: SG asked if there was an emotional impact on the children who found reading difficult, in a situation where the whole class was working from the same book. A: HP said that despite difficulties in de-coding, they could discuss the book and contribute, and feel more integrated.</p> <p>Q: NM asked what HP was most pleased with. A: The reskilling of subject leaders and the deeper, hands-on understanding that they had developed as a result of work in that area. Also, the collaborative work with the cluster group schools.</p> <p>Q: MW asked, with regard to the curriculum, how the Grove compared to other schools in the cluster group. A: HP said that the schools had looked at each other's curriculum intents, which were all very different. She thought that at the Grove, curriculum subjects were more integrated, and more integration was planned.</p> <p>MW reported that subject intent had been the focus of the recent INSET day which he had attended. Most had been clarified and had been put onto the website for parents to see. HP said that with regard to integration, ICT for example, was incorporated into as much of the curriculum as possible. HP said that new subjects, such as Ancient Islam, were now on the curriculum and new resources were needed. This had been looked at by the Resources committee, and funds had been allocated.</p>

	<p>Q: SG asked where the challenges had been.</p> <p>A: HP said that there hadn't been any major blocks, but some things had taken longer to improve than she would have liked, for example, in Spanish. Consistency across the curriculum was a challenge, and also understanding why some individuals were off target.</p> <p>The Head asked governors for their contributions to the new SIP. MW had already sent in some suggestions which had been incorporated. SB suggested an item on climate change, perhaps taken from the document that she had sent to the committee after the last meeting. HP said that climate and biodiversity were already in the curriculum, and KJ said that she approached the subject from a 'what can be done at home' angle, and she encouraged children to take care of their possessions, for example, so that they could be encouraged to be less of a consumer.</p> <p>NM asked if phonics had been included in the SIP since predictions in this area were currently disappointing. HP said that the school had just introduced a new phonics strategy, designed to be fun, which would be monitored for effectiveness once it had been in use for a while.</p>
6	<p>Pupil data</p> <p>To include consideration of attendance, exclusions and part-time timetables. Follow-up to FGB question around gender difference at greater depth.</p> <p>HP tabled the HT report, which had not been sent earlier as there had been a question around Year 4 data. This reported that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance had just dropped below 96% as a result of illness. • FSM attendance is good. • There had been no exclusions. • Behaviour had been good. • The school had an above average number of EHCPs. <p>HP said that she was looking at how the school could be more dynamic around children with EHCPs.</p> <p>Q: MW asked why there were more EHCPs after Year 2 than in the early years.</p> <p>A: HP said that this was often because cognitive difficulties tended to become clearer after this age, but also this had been as a result of in-year admissions.</p> <p>SG wondered if there was any way of picking up signs of need earlier than Year 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender difference – HP, Sam Wilkinson and MW had met to discuss this issue and data had been included in the Head's report. HP said that there was work to be done in this area and she didn't yet feel secure about presenting the reason for the differences.
7	<p>Pupil premium</p> <p>Points to consider: how much funding received and how it has been/will be spent. Follow up to pupil premium audit, which included looking at barriers faced by pupils. What is strategy for the school's use of the pupil premium? How impact will be measured? Date of next review?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NM's Pupil premium visit (Oct 19) attached FYI. • HP said that some pupil premium children had fallen below their targets, and the audit was designed to reveal why. Year 6 and Year 2 children would be audited first. Interventions would be looked at, how effective they were, and what might work better. <p>Q: NM asked how much improvement could be expected before the SATS tests.</p> <p>A: HP said that Year 6 children could be moved up a few marks, and perhaps more could be done with the Year 2 children.</p> <p>Q: NM asked how many pupil premium children were on the SEN register.</p> <p>A: HP said approximately a third, but none should be below target.</p> <p>NM observed that greater depth was very good. HP said compared to the national average it was, but her aspirations for the school were higher.</p>
8	<p>Sports and PE funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How much funding received and how has it/will it be spent. Strategy? Measurement of impact?

	This monitoring was postponed until the next Teaching and Learning committee. ACTION: Katherine Kneebone and KJ will meet after half-term to discuss and prepare a report for the committee.
9	Subject leaders Analysis of self-evaluation forms and improvement plans. Discussed above at item 5.
10	Policies None for this meeting
11	Governors' monitoring visits from this committee Reports from visits which have taken place: MW – Spanish 14.1.20. MW had met with the subject leader and his overview was that consistency between classes was an area to be looked at. HP reported that governor visits were really helpful to teachers. They were able to gain an overview and answer questions from a different point of view.
12	Matters brought forward by the Chair None.
13	Date & time of next meeting T&L Committee Tuesday 28 th April 2020 at 7.30am
14	Subject leader presentation None at this meeting. Sam Wilkinson would be invited to come to the next meeting to talk about her new role. HP suggested that SW should come to all the T&L meetings to report on her role as it develops.

The meeting ended at 8.40am

Summary of Actions

	To do	By whom	By when
8	PE and sports funding report	Katherine Kneebone and KJ	Next T&L meeting