

## Gillespie School Learning Committee

4<sup>th</sup> October 2022

Attendees: Jodie Reed (Chair), Mandy Leatham, Hafsa Abokar, Katrina Moses, Mark Owen

Apologies: Claire Bolderson, Fin Craig

Mark introduced the draft School Improvement Plan, which had been circulate in advance. He stated his ambitions to get achievement back to where it was pre-pandemic at end of Y6 this year, taking into account specific needs cohort. He highlighted the need for the school to continue to build a rich and vibrant curriculum with effective application of reading and maths threaded right across that curriculum. This is a school priority and the focus of Ofsted. Strong subject leadership across the curriculum is a key part of this.

Hafsa asked about the audience for the School Improvement Plan. Mark explained that it is primarily a tool for leadership and staff, and that it is complemented by a more detailed action plans in every subject. It will also go on the website and be available for all parents and should be accessible to them. Should the schools be visited by Ofsted, they will also want to see it.

Governors felt it was a strong initial draft, outlining the schools approach with impressive detail and breadth. The rest of the discussion was dedicated to going through each of the priority areas in turn, raising specific questions. Individual governors had each been allocated two sections to review in detail in advance to ensure a balance of scrutiny and oversight. Key points to come out of the discussion were:

1. The request for a slightly shorter list first page of priorities, more clearly bringing into focus top priorities such as writing. 14 detailed points were felt to be too much. Claire had suggested (by email) an alternative much shorter list. Mark will incorporate many of the suggested changes, whilst keeping detail in the body of the report. Some specifics however, for example in relation to maths, will be kept in to reflect ongoing but nonetheless priority work.
2. The need to differentiate across the report where activities are 'new', 'building on' or 'intensifying' past approaches, or are simply a 'continuation' but nonetheless a key priority. For example, greater clarity was requested on what whether the daily phonics catch-up sessions are sometime new (Mark

explained they are), and how the embedding of the new EYFS, now in its second year, will differ to what happened last year.

3. It was widely agreed that all core activities do not need to be included within the SIP, even where important mainstays of the approach - instead a lot of non-priority activity can be moved to action plans and a cross-reference made. For example across 1.4.
4. The need to draw specific, measurable success criteria from more general descriptors of 'What we will see' against each priority. Both were felt to be valuable and worth having within the SIP, but it was agreed that in relation to each priority there should be at least one metric that could be base-lined and governors and others could return to. Many of these are already in the plan but could just be pulled out in bold or a separate column. In other cases it could be a case of harnessing existing data creatively, for example by incorporating more information from child voice and parent feed back, observations or teacher assessments that take place. For example, might it be possible to develop a more specific measure of reduction of reluctance in reading (1.2) based on pupil participation in optional reading schemes. And might the a measure for tracking the impact of 5.1 and 5.2 on inclusive play experiences and the creation station be based on frequency of playground incidents? Shelley will have an initial look at this.
5. Within EYFS, to make a some more detailed distinctions between plans in nursery Vs plans for year one, and also between plans/success criteria for teachers Vs teaching assistants. It was acknowledged that in EYFS there is much more emphasis on team teaching but it was felt a clearer articulation of the Teaching Assistant role/expectations/parameters and development needs within that would be helpful. It was also suggested that it could be good to be more explicit about the schools approach/success criteria around supporting children for whom their first language is not English, and to draw out how Tapestry is being used to build collective learning.