

Minutes of the OLICAT Directors & LAC Chairs  
 Performance Meeting  
 26<sup>th</sup> September 2023



Attendees: Christopher Donnellan, Bill Nelson, Lucia Debertol, Catherine Leong, Tony Bishop, Sam Jukes, Andrew Waterhouse, Cathy Piotrowski, Ilona Bond, Brian Sweeny, Nicola O’Neil, Donna Galagher, Chris Atkin, Nathan Wells, Lorraine Cullen, Bernie Grimley.

Agenda item	
<p>1. Introduction and aims            CD welcomed all directors and LAC chairs to the meeting.</p> <p>SJ introduced the aims of the meeting: to provide directors and chairs a clear and consistent summary of performance, context and some guidance on the interpretations of figures.</p>	
<p>2. Primary Data            SJ introduced an overview of KS2, with the caveat that data remains provisional and does not include remarks, appeals or disapplications. Key points noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Context is King and Queen. When making comparisons we need to be very conscious of differences in cohorts for comparisons.</li> <li>• KS2 is end of year 6. More detail included than prior years – split by demographics to address a wider number of audiences.</li> <li>• P3 covers number of students in each school. This reinforces how unique each of our schools are with a wide range of pupil group sizes across schools. Brackets is the difference to prior year.</li> <li>• Different class sizes mean a single pupil has a different % impact on outcomes. OLW 1 pupil = 1.6%, STG would need 2 pupils for same effect.</li> <li>• P4 has progress scores. What we mean by progress is difference between what our pupils got vs what similar pupils got. KS1 matched vs average achieved at end KS2 and what is the difference. It’s the difference to an average so 50% will have +ve and 50% -ve. So, it is entirely feasible we could all fall into bottom half. What need to look for is deviation to norm. Latest data suggests 68% of schools’ data would sit between +/-1.</li> <li>• P5 is key attainment measures. RWM at expected standard is how many got a scale score of 100 in Reading and Maths and are at expected for Writing. One school in the Trust achieved higher than national. The rest are below, however a number improved on prior year, and 4 within 10% points of average.</li> <li>• Additional supplementary table provided showing permutations at expected (all 3 removed) to identify the missed subject. RW most pop combination – resource has been pushed into reading at trust level. Writing seems to have piggybacked. Maths weakest performing in general, but not in all schools.</li> <li>• Flag where proportion of children did not achieve expected in any – area to look at.</li> </ul>	

- P6 shows expected standards For reading a couple are over and whilst a lot are below it is close. Gap between lowest and highest is closest here. Writing is a very similar pattern. Numbers are such that difference is often one child. Maths appears to be the limiting factor in achieving all 3.
- When reviewing one does appear consistently over, and a couple under. Cannot assume one is 'better' – context important. Very different intakes. But this should prompt questions why and initiate discussions.
- Greater depth is lower but is relatively in line with prior years. No national data yet for comparison.
- Breakdown of prior attainment groups. I.e. how did they do at KS1 (y2). KS1 is teacher assessed data. Research indicates prior performance is one of the biggest indicators of future performance – HPA should be GD at KS2.

BN queried when we talk about writing, what are we talking about – creative or physical process. LC confirmed GPS is skills of writing, writing is composition both non-fiction and fiction.

BN noted we should be cautious about prior achievement as a predictor as someone with the right input and focus all can make progress. LC noted one change is to be quite prescriptive about target setting and looking at how many targeted to shift across bands. The aim is getting teachers to translate data and know their children. Raising expectation is our biggest challenge.

LC reported we have a consultant going in for maths in most the challenging schools. Curriculum gaps following covid remain a challenge.

IB queried why not use 2019 data as a comparator? SJ outlined there are pros and cons for both datasets. For the 2022 results the process by which results were arrived at are same as this year. The 2019 cohort did not have the covid disadvantages, whereas 2022 cohort did, as did 2023 cohort and are more comparable than 2019. This differs for KS4/5. IB noted it might be useful to have both. LC noted we can report on that with heads for targets.

IB observed there are elements of celebration and questions. Are impacts on writing and reading as good as wanted generally across cohort? LC confirmed not and we are disappointed they aren't higher, but teachers are doing the right thing. We need to change how we teach, and we need to be tighter and respond to individuals. Our schools are stronger places but we need to translate that to outcomes. We need to transfer them to secondary at a higher level.

IB observed we can share good practice across similar cohorts. LC agreed but we can't keep giving same arguments and need to make a difference. Keep in mind we have asked heads to introduce a broader and wider curriculum and now need to thread core through that.

DG noted as COG and thinking of wider governing body having data in such a way we can use and inform where we need to get to and what we should we be looking at on a termly basis. LC confirmed that is what you will see in target setting this time around and is generatable for the HTs report.

<p>LD observed we can see some positive elements but has covid resulted in a lowered bar? SJ clarified the 2022 data was produced under normal testing practices with no covid</p> <p>LD observed on page 3 almost half schools show double digit decreases in y6 cohorts. Where have they gone? LC observed sometimes it is demographics, and one school has been unsettled. However we do need to answer that and understand how we draw people in. We did lose families due to Brexit. On the ground pupils in schools are happy and families are happy.</p> <p>CP observed taking on board DGs comment for interpretation and challenge. Looking at children who didn't make expected can we give a breakdown of how many PP, SEND, etc. LC explained we can request the head generates that info from from insight.</p> <p>CP queried should we look at RE results also? SJ, yes and longer term it is our intent to bring in data for all curriculum areas. Barrier is currently technical.</p>	<p>To look at intake patterns across the board and support marketing.</p>
<p>3. Secondary Data</p> <p>SJ gave an overview of KS4 and key points. 2 schools allow more of drill down. A health warning applies. The KS4 checking exercise is still not done. There is no DFE verified data and no progress data. Attainment data on its own does not include context. Key points noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P2 shows number of students in each group and difference to last year. 17 fewer at STM for 2022.</li> <li>• EHCP – only 1 at STM, profound need with significant barriers to learning. Comparisons of SEND cohorts are so widely different as to make impossible. Suggest asking schools for case studies and review qualitatively.</li> <li>• Question raised by JB regarding prior attainment data. At TBCS 1 in 5 have no prior attainment data, and this can be for a range of reasons: entering the country after y6, formerly in private system etc. CA noted Nhants has an added challenge of a high level of mobility with challenging students being passed across schools. SJ noted where there is no prior attainment the school has to create its own baseline.</li> <li>• Range of scores in 2023 wider at STM and has narrowed at TBCS.</li> <li>• Pre pandemic grading in 2020 and 2021 used teacher input for grading. Top 3 grades went up. Last year was a transition year between 2019 and 2021. This year the process is back to 2019.</li> <li>• We've used 2022 over 2019 as 2019 is a cohort unaffected by the pandemic and 2023 has been affected. Everything will be down but we have a base rate and can quantify in relation.</li> </ul> <p>CD queried data if the same question can be asked over 4 years and each year gain a different grade for a correct answer, how do know if we're teaching better or to a higher standard? SJ confirmed the short version is not exactly but we can get an indication of movement or a deviation from pattern of what is happening. Data used is not to make absolute judgements, but to flag things to investigate and use in conjunction with other info sources.</p> <p>IB observed there needs to be a level of understanding of data that it is data plus other information and data only can lead to wrong judgements.</p>	

CP noted grade boundaries across cohorts can give quite substantial shifts, and being articulate with data combined with other sources of information is needed to interrogate effectively.

BS queried in light of this data what is the trust going to do differently? What messages are we taking from the data. What is coming down the line.

LC confirmed as a central team, everything we're looking at draws back to impact on outcomes. All the reporting is about outcomes and impacts. We have asked HTs to give more feedback on how teaching is impacting. Increased formative assessment and training in each school. Changing how heads report – outcomes are on 3 agendas. We are refocusing back onto data and coaching to improve outcomes.

BG confirmed the focus last year and this is on T&L. Both schools have identified focuses. STM for more modelling of learning in classroom. TBCS is looking at learning behaviours and how to support. We're looking at identifying what an ambitious learner looks like and how we create that.

SJ introduced the KS5 report. KS5 metrics by government are poor and the brevity of the report reflects this. Data relies on uncalculatable metrics they cant currently report on. Conversations on post 16 provision may be best to ask schools for internal metrics.

CD queried how do we know they've been pushed to the best of their ability and how do we know there has been challenge. SJ clarified the data available is probably not going to show that as grade impacts over the past few years have been impacted and entry to universities delayed.

BG reported one of Nathan's priorities is looking at sixth form provision for these reasons. We have lots of low number course which impacts on reliability of figures, viability, long term provision and attraction of students to the school.

NW observed that interrogating the information and identifying what are whole school issues, or demographic specific, or subject specific is critical in turning data into improvement.

CP also flagged concerns over recruitment and challenges to give best offering we can at 6<sup>th</sup> form.

LD observed in enabling students to access universities they want at university there has been a drastic lowering of the bar at admissions. They might get there but not with skills and competencies they need.

4. Trust school improvement priorities

Educationalists will be working with schools across the Trust to establish priorities informed by the data and other information sources. Teaching and learning in the classroom is a Trust priority for this year.

LC stated work will include the development of consistency of teaching maths, ongoing support with writing, refreshing reading to allow teaching to be validated by leaders. Main focus is the use of assessment to allow teachers to respond within the

context of the lesson and the use of summative data to be used diagnostically so children can use knowledge to move through curriculum.

NW outlined that data is being used to inform meetings with heads and sixth form leads to develop the strategic focus for the next 2 years. KS4/5 data will inform early intervention planning within KS3. Specific subjects identified will have action plans created. Looking at removing barriers around SEND and allowing access to all curriculum areas. Supporting a project at TBCS looking at attitudes to learning and behaviour. Working with 6<sup>th</sup> forms on course offerings and collaboration.

CD inquired if we can we offer courses across two schools to share resources and increase numbers. BG noted we are doing this with computer science at KS4 this year and there is a future in this.

NW noted certain qualifications are being phased out by the government and we need to have conversations about staffing and future need.

TB thanked everyone for their work and input. The report gives us an element to assess what we are doing, and this forms part of a wider evaluation of the first year of a 3 year plan.