

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS
GOVERNING BODY OF HARBINGER PRIMARY SCHOOL

MINUTES OF CURRICULUM & STANDARDS COMMITTEE MEETING

Date of Meeting	6 th May 2021
Venue	Virtually Via Zoom
Chair	Caroline Hurley
Clerk & Minutes	Suzette Nicol
Time	5:00 p.m.

MEMBERSHIP:

Governor	Category
Caroline Hurley (Chair)*	Co-opted
Martin Young*	Co-opted
Kiran Rahman	Parent
Susannah Abdelouahed*	Parent
Jasmine Islam	Parent
Rebecca Abrahams (Executive Headteacher)*	Staff (Head)
Nimesha Nagahawatte*	Head of School
Charlie McKnight	Co-opted
Edmund Miller*	Staff
Lawrence Houldsworth*	Associate Member

Also In Attendance	Role/Title
Fiona Keogh (Year 6 Phase Leader)	Observer
Tom Bem-Hodgkinson (PSHE Lead)	Observer
Jackie Garner (Foundation Stage Coordinator)	Observer
Emily Fawcett (Year 3-5 Phase Leader)	Observer

* Denotes attendance

PART 1 – OPEN SECTION

	ITEM
1.	Presentation Of PSHE And RSHE Policy (For Approval) By PSHE Lead
	Tom Bem-Hodgkinson, PSHE Lead, was welcomed to the meeting. He introduced himself as a Year 2 teacher and the PSHE Lead and said that he had been tasked with developing the Harbinger PSHE (Personal, Social, Health and Education) and RSHE (Relationships Education, Sex Education and Health Education) Policy. Tom went through the policy and said that the policy outlined how Harbinger developed the curriculum. The policy had been developed because from September 2020 elements of the PSHE curriculum became statutory. The policy had been developed after reviewing the statutory

requirements and following a staff consultation and training. The policy was being shared with Governors today for approval, after which it would be shared with parents. A parent consultation would be starting in the week commencing 17 May where parents would be shown the curriculum map and any questions they had around the RSHE curriculum would be answered. This was expected to develop a culture of acceptance due to the contention related to sex education.

He mentioned that PSHE was not a statutory subject. However, RSHE was the statutory element of the PSHE curriculum which would be taught using the Jigsaw scheme, which was used across the country. He highlighted the purpose of the curriculum which was listed in the policy. He said that Jigsaw was a spiral scheme of work where each year group would have the same theme ('Puzzle') for the half-term which was comprised of six lessons (Pieces). Each of the six Pieces of each Puzzle was designed to progress in sequence and work towards an 'end product'.

RSHE was the contentious part of the curriculum and not all of its elements were statutory. He mentioned that the DfE guidance recommended that all primary schools should have a sex education programme tailored to the age and the physical and emotional maturity of the pupils and that it should prepare them for the changes that adolescence would bring. Governors were told that RSHE would be taught within the personal, social, health and economic (PSHE) education curriculum. Biological aspects of RSHE would be taught within the science curriculum. It was recommended that schools teach children about conception but this was non statutory at primary school. There were parents who would be concerned that sex was being taught in the classroom. He said that it was the school's job to show that they were not teaching children to be sexually active but were teaching them about staying safe and having healthy relationships with friends and families.

Tom said that RSHE was split into 3 areas and relationship education was the area which would be taught this half term. LGBTQ was thought to be another contentious area for some parents. He added that this area would focus on respect and regard between people and would teach more about respect and understanding.

Tom went on to outline all the different areas of the policy and the curriculum. The last element was sex education. He highlighted the fine line between what was statutory and what was not and gave an overview of the curriculum for each year group. The bulk of the sex education would be delivered in Year 6 and the content would be taught in a safe and open way which prepared the children to go into secondary school where the content would be greater.

Governors thanked Tom Bem-Hodgkinson for his presentation and put some questions to him.

Q&A: We need to carry parents with us even if they want to withdraw their children from the non-statutory aspect and we need to be ready in case of external agitation. Do you think we should start thinking about having a contingency in place?

Part of what I have been asked to do is to develop the culture around this subject and the more communication we have with parents, the more we are reassured that more opportunities to answer any questions will nullify those misconceptions so that we can develop cooperation.

The Executive Head acknowledged that this was a contentious issue, which was why the school wanted to press ahead and start the consultation as quickly as possible. The school would be open to the feedback it received and having the consultation in the next few weeks would allow the school to hear the views of the immediate community. If there was a need to come to Governors to discuss the findings from the consultation, this would be done.

Q&A: The question of non-binary sexual identity came to the fore in the last 5 years. Is this something that needs to be addressed at primary level in our school because the policy seems to focus on binary questions and on reproduction? In primary school, we are not teaching about sexuality explicitly. The curriculum teaches about how to accept, respect and appreciate differences among everyone in the community, which is what creates a community. This might happen more in a secondary school.

The Chair said that elements of the curriculum where it dealt with the children's relationship with themselves would lend to any issues arising with that and the school would decide on what was appropriate if and when that arose.

Q&A: Does this overlap with safeguarding, understanding what is and is not permissible and being in control of your own body for the children in an appropriate way?

The whole Jigsaw curriculum is enabling children to safeguard themselves. It goes from understanding the names of body parts to understanding what is right and what is wrong and what constitutes a healthy and respectful relationship. It gives them the tools to understanding what is right and wrong.

Tom gave an example of the lesson on touch that he had just delivered to Year 2 pupils where the class looked at negative and positive touch and categorised all physical contacts with human beings into positive and negative contact. They also looked at what to do if they did not like something being done to them that someone else did not know about. This was a common theme in every year group.

Q&A: Based on the previous year, what percentage of parents opted out of the conception aspect? (*Tom asked Fiona to answer this question*)

I think in the last few year, it has increased. That is largely down to the media and big things happening else where in the country. Some parents started watching things in the media and withdrawing their children from the classes.

Q&A: What is the policy on when a child is taken out and is there a discussion with the parent as to whether they will have this conversation at home with the children as the children need to know this?

In the past that has been the case. It is the expectation that it will be taught at home if it is not taught at school.

	<p><i>As Susannah had lost connectivity during this item, she said that she would put any other questions that she had in an email to the school.</i></p> <p>The Executive Head said that as the Government had not made sex education statutory at primary level, the school's policy clearly stated that they would want to meet with families who wanted to withdraw their children to clearly understand why they wanted to do so. She noted that the school could not force the issue as it was not mandatory.</p> <p>Susannah suggested that leaders in the community could be identified and taught how to counter the negative things that parents said. The Executive Headteacher said that Parent Governors could help in this aspect. She added that the LA's Healthy School team had been doing a lot of work with the community groups in the borough.</p> <p>Following the above discussion, Governors RESOLVED to approve the PSHE and RSHE Policy and to recommend it to the governing body for ratification on the basis it was approved for consultation and subject to further consideration should that become necessary after the consultation.</p> <p><i>Tom Bem-Hodgkinson left the meeting at this point.</i></p>
2.	<p>Phase Leaders To Present Writing Levels</p>
	<p>Jackie Garner, Eddi Miller, Emily Fawcett and Fiona Keogh gave a presentation on writing levels in their year groups. The presentation was in chronological order starting with the EYFS and ending with Year 6.</p> <p>It was agreed that the presentation would be sent to Martin Young by email as he had to leave the meeting at this point.</p> <p>Action: Rebecca Abrahams</p> <p>Fiona presented the key points of the presentation focusing on what writing at the national expected level looked like. The presenters based their presentations on the exemplification material from the DfE website. The exemplification material provided examples of pupils' work to support teachers in making judgements against the statutory teacher assessment frameworks at the end of the key stage. Teachers would assess writing using the school's assessment policy and they were expected to use the statutory teacher assessment framework to make a judgement at the end of each key stage. Assessment would however be done internally before the end of each key stage assessment. Judgement would be made based on day to day classroom evidence and not just on individual pieces. The exemplification material was available for teachers to use online and within the school network. Teachers should not produce evidence specifically for moderation but a sample should be used to support their judgement. Evidence should be based on independent work.</p> <p>Jackie Garner presented the end of nursery expectations which followed Development Matters (the new non-statutory curriculum guidance for the new EYFS framework). Before going to Reception, the children were expected to give</p>

meaning to their marks, be able to draw lines and circles, hold a pencil, use one-handed tools like a pair of scissors and copy some letters. She presented some examples of what writing at that level looked like. At the end of Reception, children were expected to have met the early learning goals for writing and to use their phonics knowledge to write words and to write using irregular words. New early learning goals would be introduced in September. The children were also expected to write simple sentences. They would be expected to use equipment successfully. At this level, emphasis was placed on finger spacing to enable people to read the writing.

Eddi Miller presented what writing at the expected level looked like at KS1. At this level, the children moved into the national curriculum. By the end of year 1, children were expected to be able to put sentences into short narratives, to be able to say what they wanted to write before they wrote it and also be able to talk about it. He gave examples of these. At this level, children were expected to capitalize proper nouns and use conjunctions. The children were expected to edit with an adult and make adjustment to their work.

In Year 2, which was the end of key stage 1, the children were expected to take their SATs exams. They were expected to write simple, cohesive narratives, write about real events, use correct tenses and a greater amount of conjunctions. The children were expected to use descriptive techniques to engage the reader. Examples from at writing and writing at greater depth were presented. Using joined up writing was part of the issues at greater depth.

Emily Fawcett presented a grid developed by the Borough which showed everything that the children were expected to know by the end of Year 3. It showed the number of examples of writing that the children were expected to show with evidence of these points. Although the children were expected to make mistakes, the expectation was that most of their writing should be accurate and that when they did make mistakes, they were increasing their ability to spot when they made mistakes. They were expected to use punctuation correctly and write in paragraphs. Examples were shown of writing at the expected level and at greater depth.

In Year 4, most of the expectations were similar to those of Year 3. However, the children were expected to use tenses, punctuation and conjunctions not some of the time but most of the time. They were expected to be more accurate with their tenses and punctuation and for their writing to be more coherent. At greater depth, the children were expected to have an awareness of the audience, to make more considered word choices and be more accurate.

In Year 5, the children were expected to be more accurate and more confident. They were expected to use everything that they knew alongside the new things that they had been taught. The vocabulary at this point was expected to be more sophisticated and the children should be using more selected choices. They were elected to use a rich and varied vocabulary with precision. To write at greater depth, the children were expected to be doing all of the above all of the time. The children's handwriting was also expected to be legible.

	<p>Fiona Keogh said that in Year 6, it was about using the knowledge gained in Year 5 to work on the structure of sentences and how they can be put together coherently to make an exciting narrative. The children were expected to work through different text types and make selective choices in their vocabulary. They were also encouraged to do editing and to use different sentence structures, use commas and semi-colons to create an effect. Examples were shown of what it was to write at greater depth in Year 6.</p> <p><i>Lawrence Houldsworth joined the meeting at this point.</i></p> <p>Governors thanked the Phase Leaders for their presentation and they left the meeting at this point.</p>
3.	<p>Welcome, Apologies For Absence And Declaration Of Pecuniary Interests</p>
	<p>The Chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting.</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Kiran Rahman and Jasmine Islam.</p> <p>There were no declarations of pecuniary interests in any of the items on the agenda.</p> <p>The Chair asked whether committee members had any urgent business that they wished to add to the agenda. There were none.</p>
4.	<p>Minutes of the Curriculum Committee Meeting of 25th February 2021 And Matters Arising</p>
	<p>The minutes of the committee meeting held on 25th February 2021 which had been circulated prior to the meeting were reviewed and agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: To approve the minutes of 25th February 2021 as an accurate record to be signed by the Chair.</p> <p><u>Matters Arising:</u> Page 3 agenda item 3 – Safeguarding Audit – The Executive Head said that the safeguarding audit had now been submitted to the Local Authority. The SENCo had contacted Father Tom Pyke, Safeguarding Link Governor, to arrange a meeting. The feedback would be shared with Governors when it became available. She reported that the safeguarding team would be coming to visit the school for a second review. After the feedback and the review the outcome would be brought to Governors for discussion.</p>
5.	<p>Standards Update</p>
	<p>The Executive Headteacher spoke to the Harbinger SDP Spring data. The data was presented in a grid and compared against the autumn data. She reported that when the data was reported in autumn, the school had not envisaged another national lockdown. On average during lockdown, the children had not made as much progress as they had been expected to make in school. She reported that research into the impact of lockdown had shown that younger children had been</p>

hit harder by the lockdown as they had not been able to independently engage with remote learning. This pattern of achievement reflected the facts nationally.

The overall data revealed that although the children had made some progress since the autumn term, on average, they had not reached the new benchmark for this time of the year. Attainment was lowest in Years 1-3 and the spring outcomes were lower than those of the autumn term. Reading outcomes in Years 4-6 were maintained and targets remained achievable. In Year 6, the reading outcomes had been achieved already. With the exception of Year 6, the data for Maths had marginally improved. Writing across the school remained a vulnerable subject as it was difficult to teach this remotely and also because it was difficult to provide a clear evidence base for this subject. The teachers had not had the independent evidence base needed to be able to assess the children. As a result, the children had been held back until the data became available. She said that on average, children in Years 1, 2 and 6 were now between 1 or 2 terms behind in their learning, according to the data. Children in Years 3, 4 and 5 were a term behind.

In order to address this, in terms of KS1, the school had introduced a programme, Daily Supported Reading, to teach early reading in KS1. The school had invested a lot of training into this programme and the programme existed along with the systematic training of synthetic phonics. The impact of this would be felt in the summer.

The school had maintained provision of 4 KS1 classes. There were closer to 20 children in 1 class as opposed a class of 30. The school was able to do this due to the catch up funding it had received. The few staffing issues they had in the past had now been resolved.

The school budgeted for more speech and language support this year. This was expected to have an impact in early years literacy and on KS1 outcomes. A lot of work had been done to increase the expectations in the curriculum. The plans that teachers were teaching from this term had higher expectations than plans that they had taught to previously. The Executive Head said that the curriculum would not be streamlined as that was not in the best interest of the children. The impact of this would be felt in the summer term.

Governors were informed that the children had started new workbooks this term with very clear expectations associated with them. There were different workbooks for each subject to allow senior and middle leaders to be able to scrutinize the coverage into the pupils' progress and feed any development points back into the provision the children were experiencing. There was a lot of THEP consultant support for writing and maths and the focus of their work was direct support to teachers around planning, in undertaking a gap analysis exercise and in using the process to adjust the curriculum for this term. There was a recognition that although the school could not teach everything (due to the impact of the pandemic) it was essential that the children were taught the must-have learning to be able to move on to the next year of their learning.

A consultation had started around the staffing structure. If that went ahead successfully, the school would have the necessary resources to accelerate progress as HLTAs and other support staff would be able to help with this.

An analysis was done on the attainment of groups such as boys, Pupil Premium (PP) children, White British children and Bangladeshi children. The key message for the groups were summarised. In most year groups and subjects, there was a gap between the performance of boys and the whole cohort. That was most evident from Year 3 upwards in literacy. On average, the boys were between 1 and 3 terms behind in their literacy. This was a sizeable gap. With the exception of Year 6 reading, PP children had a far lower attainment than the whole cohort in every year group and in every subject. In order to raise attainment and achievement overall, there was a need to look at how to support boys and how to support PP children. This situation had been worsened by the pandemic and its impact on disadvantaged families. The school had done a lot to support these families.

The data for White British children was not statistically significant to deliver any clear conclusions. The data for Bangladeshi children showed that attainment in KS1 and Year 6 literacy was below the cohort. In Years 3, 4 and 5, the children started to out-perform the whole cohort in core subjects. In summary, it was expected that the actions taken for the whole cohort would impact on the boys and PP children. However, the new staffing structure was needed, to have the level of impact expected and to be able to better target the available resources. In the meantime, pupil progress meetings were taking place every term during which teachers scrutinised individual pupil data. Parent consultations had been held to update parents on their children's learning and the staff remained very ambitious about the children's outcomes. The Executive Head asked Governors to scrutinize the data and ask any questions.

Q&A: Is there a national average for the data?

There is no national average as there had not been any national assessment. Any national average would be 2 years out of date. In addition, this is our internal tracking data. We want to get as many children to the age expected levels as possible. Sometimes a high level of mobility can affect the data and the pandemic was not ideal. Collectively the children may not have made enough progress in a disruptive period for the teachers to feel they have the evidence base to say they are working in line with age related expectations.

Q&A: Is the Year 1 gap similar to other schools, based on the overall trends?

I believe so. The research done by the Education Endowment Foundation has highlighted that the younger the children are, the more they have suffered. The Year 1 children have missed half of their time in Reception and missed a considerable amount of time in Year 1 as well. They have missed out on all of the valuable time they should have had in Reception and Year 1 which would have prepared them for the national curriculum. A lot of work needs to be done to make up for that time that they have lost.

	<p>It was noted that independent working up to Year 3 was dependent on input from parents. The Executive Head said that by being out of school, the children had missed out on a rich language environment where they were saturated in spoken English. In addition, during lockdown, the children missed out on physical development and the development of social skills and resilience. A loss of these skills had had an impact on the children’s outcomes in reading, writing and maths.</p> <p>Q&A: With regard to writing attainment, you mentioned that the data was low because teachers were unsure as to whether the evidence had been influenced by parents, but why is attaining in writing so much lower? Is it due to the children not reading enough of books?</p> <p>It is due to a lot of things. The reading is important and you can see that a child who writes well had done a lot of reading. This feeds into the impact of lockdown. The children have said that they have not been doing a lot of reading at home. When the children are in school, we ensure that they have a rich reading diet. The correlation with reading is important. If we can get the reading up, the writing will follow. However, there are other issues in our communities which impact on writing and one of them is around resilience because writing is hard and children need a lot of support with this. It also has to do with the models of language that the children are exposed to. Children who do not have a rich language experience at home or are not exposed to good models of English can find writing daunting and a lot of children will write what they say.</p> <p>Eddi Miller added that with regard to Year 1, looking at the data, it was evident that the children were young both in terms of their age and because they had missed out on half of their educational life. This would have an impact when they got to Year 2. The Executive Head said that every year group’s literacy stemmed from a core text. This was very difficult to do during lockdown. When the children were in school, the first part of any literacy unit was speaking and listening and only after this had been done would they look into how this would feed into the children’s writing. This was difficult to do remotely.</p> <p>Governors thanked the Executive Head for her update.</p>
6.	Attendance Update
	This item was deferred until the full governing body meeting.
7.	Behaviour Update
	This item was also deferred until the full governing body meeting.
6.	School Development Plan (SDP)
	This item had already been taken under agenda item 3 above.
8.	Language Used By The Children

	This was an item that had been raised by Kiran Rahman at the last meeting. As Kiran was not present at this meeting, it was agreed that the item would be deferred until the next meeting of the committee.
9.	Policies For Review
	<p>The following policies were presented for review and approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intimate Care Policy – Agreed • Asthma and Allergy Policy – Agreed • Support Children With Medical Conditions Policy – The Chair advised Governors to be clear on their roles with regard to this policy. – Agreed • SEND Policy & Report – Agreed. Susannah Abdelouahed, SEND Link Governor, said that she had met with the SENCo. She had gone through the previous policy and given her feedback to Jubeda. The policy had been amended in line with the feedback. • PSHE and RSHE Policy – Agreed <p>RESOLVED: To approve the above policies and to recommend them to the governing body for ratification.</p>
10.	Any Urgent Business
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To decide whether PSHCE should be a fixed agenda/bi-meeting agenda item <p>It was agreed that the above item would be discussed after the consultation and the policy had been ratified.</p> <p>Presentations – It was agreed that a presentation on reading would be delivered by Phase Leaders in the autumn term. The Headteacher undertook to upload the presentation on writing on GovernorHub.</p> <p>Action: Rebecca Abrahams</p> <p>Susannah Abdelouahed suggested that peer on peer pressure/knife culture and gang culture should be placed on the agenda of a future curriculum committee meeting. It was noted that this formed part of safeguarding and the PSHE curriculum. Following a discussion, it was agreed that PSHE curriculum should be placed on the agenda next year. The Executive Head suggested that an additional meeting should be scheduled at the beginning of next academic year, which would be dedicated to safeguarding and where the Borough’s safeguarding lead could be invited in to do a presentation. A decision on this could not be reached at this meeting as Father Tom Pyke, Safeguarding Link Governor, was not present. It was agreed that this should be considered by the full Governors body for September.</p> <p>Action: All</p>
	Part 2 – Confidential Item (If Any)
	None

The Chair closed the meeting at 7:15 p.m.

Chair’s signature: _____ **Date:** _____