Minutes of Curriculum, Learning & Teaching (CL&T) Committee Meeting

Minutes of Committee Meeting held in Post 16 Study Room, at 17:30 on Monday 4th November 2019.

Governors in attendance					
Paul Colin	PC	Member Appointed	Sophy Norris	SN	Parent Governor
Gina Stroud	GS	Chair	Peter Skelton	PS	Parent Governor
Ceri Johnson	CJ	Parent Governor	Dave Walter	DW	Parent Governor

Additional attendees	Initial	Role/Organisation
Sara Jacobs	SJ	Deputy Principal – CVCC

In Attendance	Initial	Role

Apologies	Initial		Apologies accepted by the Board
Kevin Bawn	KBa	Principal	
Mareena	MAT	Clerk	
Anderson-Thorne			
Susan Diffey	SD	Member Appointed	YES
Dorf Ruscoe	DR	Member Appointed	YES
Crawford Winlove	CW	Member Appointed	YES

AGENDA

ITEM NO.	ITEM	Actions
	Meeting opened by PC.	
19/20.1	Declarations of Business Interests	
	No new interests to declare.	
19/20.2	Attendance/Apologies	
	Kevin Bawn – apologies – unwell. Mareena Anderson-Thorne –	
	apologies – unwell. Minutes to be transcribed from Dictaphone	
	recording at later date.	
19/20.3	Agree and sign Terms of Reference for CL&T Committee	
	PC signed off the committee Terms of Reference. All present assented.	
	No significant changes since last time. GS also signed document in	
	capacity as Chair.	
19/20.4	Curriculum update – Course 42 & Careers Education	
	(Ofsted Personal development)	
	Thanks to NB who has attended Governors' meeting for 2 nd time in	
	18 months to talk about careers at CVCC. Lively, developing area	
	of curriculum so regular updates welcome.	

ITEM NO.	ITEM	Actions
	NB – Careers Although NB spoke to Ofsted during their visit and they gave positive feedback in their de-brief, nothing was mentioned in the report about the CVCC careers provision, which was disappointing. NB provided a handout to summarise her briefing. NB has been in her careers post at CVCC for 4 years. CVCC now a 'hub' school, working with 6 other local schools in a partnership. More support provided via an Enterprise Advisor from DCC. We provide them with data and case studies in return. Progress reviewed every 6 months against Gatsby benchmarks (of which there are 8). A piece of software is used for the review process – this generates a percentage value for how closely we are meeting each Gatsby benchmark. We are above National Average for all benchmarks besides criteria 4. NB explained there is an	
	interpretation issue here. Points made in relation to Gatsby benchmarks: 1. Stable Careers Programme	
	Would help if website had a section for employers, parents and students in relation to careers. NB has issues with how the information that she has provided is displayed on the website. PC highlighted that a complete overhaul of the website is on the CVCC 5-year plan with the possibility of using an external agency rather than doing it in-house, which is extremely time-consuming. SJ added that Sue Voysey is currently doing work on improving the current website.	
	2. Labour market information Careers Pilot website used provides local information. NB cited Construction as an example, on which she recently attended a seminar. There are plenty of jobs in the SW area in the Construction industry – but there is a gap between the jobs students think they can get in this industry, and the actual jobs	
	available. 3. Addresses the needs of each pupil We have a 2-tier approach to this area, and employ Angie Kibble in-house who provides careers interviews for some of our students. More accessible for students when we have Angie here each week. Careers SW also work with us, and have funding to provide this service for students who are looked-after, have EHCPs, or are school refusers, or students in alternative provision. However, although CSW should be picking up these individuals, they currently have no capacity to see anyone new until after Christmas. All of our PLs and SEN students will want their careers appointment before Christmas, so the CSW capacity is not great, our in-house service is better in comparison.	
	4. Linking curriculum learning to careers Last year had Employability Week. However this is not embedded into the curriculum – more needs to be done to embed careers learning into English, Maths and Science. Sometimes this is just a case of clear signposting for things that they already do. Governor commented - having another language is also an employability factor which should be highlighted to students. NB – agree, but the core subjects for benchmarking are English, Maths and Science. (A general discussion followed about the importance of learning a language, and the discrepancy between Government targets for	

ITEM NO.	ITEM	Actions
	language uptake (90% at one stage, then lowered to 70%) and the school's viewpoint that having 50% of students studying a language would be an enormous achievement. There are high levels of resistance amongst both students and their parents to compulsory language learning at CVCC, which it is felt echoes the national picture in the UK. Would be helpful to incorporate into sessions examples that highlight where language learning would give you an advantage in the workplace.)	
	5. Encounters with Employers and Employees On Deep Learning Days we have employers coming in to speak to	
	 6. Experiences of the workplace	
	Page 2 of NB's handout details all of the activities that currently take place with regard to careers.	
	Page 3 of NB's handout – careers provision delivered through Course 42. Careers now features in Y7, which it did not previously.	
	Page 4 of NB's handout – the Careers policy, which is currently up for review. This is currently in draft format (written last summer) and will ultimately need to be signed off by Governors. No major changes, this is a tweaked document.	
	The website pages for Careers need to be developed so that, if organisations such as Exeter College want to come in to give students information, they are clearly signposted what opportunities there are and who to contact. (Currently, they do visit to talk to students about vocational courses, but not about A-level provision.) PC acknowledged that CVCC careers provision has come a long way since NB was appointed, but also that the recent Ofsted inspection gives us more work to do in terms of raising student aspirations. NB commented that many CVCC parents are self-employed, which brings	

ITEM NO.	ITEM	Actions
	its own difficulties. Students do not always see the point of careers advice as they think that they will 'just go and work for themselves'. Also they lack the skills & confidence to pick up the phone and arrange work experience placements as this is way outside of their comfort zone.	
	Discussion followed about the 6 th form and CVCC's conflicts in terms of protecting/ promoting this, whilst ensuring students make choices that are right for them – against an external backdrop of extreme competition from institutions like Exeter College.	
	Course 42 update Specialist delivered Personal, Social & Health Education programme for Y7-10.	
	Lots of changes, publicised widely in media, to relationships and sex education that come into effect from Sept 2020. Well on the way to getting everything sorted with regard to this. 2 handouts provided by NB – green sheet with curriculum detail, white sheet with more generic overview.	
	Increased provision for Y7 – now a lesson per week rather than per fortnight. This results in topics now occurring in the year-groups where they should be. Cover University of Exeter's Living Life to the Full programme (mental health programme) in Y7, started approx. 3 years ago. Careers is now included in the Y7 programme – another positive	
	step. Positive changes to the programme have also come about as a result of RRS.	
	Staffing of Course 42: NB teaches all groups. There are 2 other teachers involved in regular delivery every fortnight. 13 teachers in total involved in delivery. In an ideal scenario, the same teacher would teach all sessions to a group. The current arrangement is that the teaching is divided in a 'carousel' arrangement; with Y8, for example, NB teaches relationships and sex ed, and her counterpart teacher takes the careers sessions.	
	PC explained that the reason that the staffing arrangements for C42 are so squeezed is a direct result of budget cuts.	
	SJ added that when timetabling decisions are made, subject specialist teachers are allocated to their subjects first, and then C42 allocated where there is capacity.	
	NB worked closely with MP this year to sort out the C42 timetabling, and the result of having 13 teachers delivering the course was the very best solution that they could come up with, given the constraints they were working within. The result of having 13 teachers involved makes	
	curriculum delivery difficult. It is also extremely challenging to convene team meetings due to the numbers of staff involved and the differing working patterns.	
	No formal recording for assessment, recording and reporting. NB wants to try to bring in some form of assessment this year. NB will use the PHSE association for support in this. Will develop a system of student self-assessment criteria.	
	NB will also be joining a PSHE local area forum, which has been developed with some funding from DCC. This will enable her to share resources and ideas with staff from local schools.	
	NB has done training workshop on sex ed, crime (run by the police) and another on drugs.	

ITEM NO.	ITEM	Actions
	The national picture in terms of RSE was discussed. (See NB's handout for national statistics.) NB does not think that the picture at CVCC echoes these statistics as topics that have low awareness nationally are on the CVCC curriculum eg: access to local sexual health services. NB considered one of the most important factors was a RSE teacher who is approachable and straightforward; when teachers who aren't comfortable with RSE discussions teach these classes, it is not helpful. The overall structure of C42 was discussed (refer to white handout, p3). Summaries by year-group for the 3 different C42 areas. Some of the curriculum is covered through the tutor programme (eg living in the wider world). Mental health covered in Y7, 8, 9 and 10. The RSE area is where the Government has implemented changes. Many schools are worried about their lack of curriculum coverage in this area; NB stated no such concerns at CVCC as all of these areas are covered. Green handout: 'RSE expectations – secondary' distributed. This sets out the curriculum expectations, nationally, under the headings of: • Families • Respectful relationships, including friendships • Online and media	
	 Being safe Intimate and sexual relationships, including sexual health There is a separate document concerning what students should have learnt at primary school; sometimes this needs to be gone over at CVCC. For example, topics such as puberty – all students have covered this at primary school but to very different levels and in different ways. PC asked where the mental health content came in. NB explained that this is non-compulsory and separate to RSE, but is delivered at CVCC as a broader part of C42. NB has drafted an RSE policy based on a framework from the PSHE association. Consultation with parents, colleagues, Governors and students now required. Need to ensure that what the students want and need is covered and that the parents are happy about content. Things have now changed in terms of what parents can and can't agree to their children participating in. Parents cannot withdraw their child from relationship education, but can withdraw their child from sex education, with reference to current legislation. However, in a lesson these 2 strands are combined. If a CVCC parent decided to withdraw their child from sex education, then the child would have to be taken out of all relationship and sex education sessions, due to the way that these areas combine in the way we teach here. Parents are only able to withdraw children from sex education up to 3 terms prior to their 16th birthday - at which point children can opt into these sessions 	
	themselves. Most sex ed sessions are in Y9/10, meaning the majority of Y10 students could opt into these sessions even if their parents weren't in favour. They would therefore potentially only miss any Y9 input in this scenario. Governors commented that since NB could not recall a child ever being withdrawn from these sessions, this can be looked at again if it ever became an issue. SJA commented that as we are going out to consultation with the new Sex & Relationships Education policy that this is a great opportunity to engage with parents and encourage their support with this programme. Also suggested Y7 'Meet the Tutor' evening might be a good time to invite in an external speaker about keeping your child safe online.	

ITEM NO.	ITEM	Actions
	Governors concurred that highest attendance is guaranteed by programming such sessions to coincide with times where you have a 'captive audience'. Discussion over how we engage with parents over SRE policy	
	consultation. Survey Monkey? Send letter and invite parents to a face-to-face session?	
	Governors felt it is important to offer the opportunity for parents to come and meet in person, especially as this is such a hot topic in the news, currently. This could be offered in addition to a questionnaire approach, for those that cannot attend.	
	NB said she felt that CVCC has a good approach to sex ed, right from Y7, as it is not taught as 'stand-alone' sex ed sessions. Discussion followed surrounding whether there is currently the interest	
	in having an LGBT group in school (NB said there is not currently in the 6 th form). Gender neutrality was queried. We have a gender neutral uniform; do we use gender neutral terminology? How do we deal with students who are transgender/transitioning? We need to make an effort	
	and ensure our students are liberal in their thinking. One area that students struggle with is the concept of bisexuality. PC: Would staff welcome a further session on the use of gender	
	pronouns and the nitty-gritty of terminology when dealing with transgender issues?	
	SJA: Important that, where relevant, this kind of info shared with new staff in the same way that SEND info is shared. Easy to make mistakes. NB: Instances already encountered where, eg, a child wishes to be known in school as male and use a male name, but parents forbid it.	
	These situations extremely difficult to manage. GS: What is the legal situation with regard to the child's rights in terms of their age (eg: when they turn 16, can they choose?).	
	NB: see final page of white handout re: staffing models. 2 possible models, however we currently follow one somewhere in the middle, which is perhaps more in line with a specialist teaching model. Most people who teach C42 are not specialists, have not been trained	
	to teach this course and sometimes do not even wish to teach this course. Conversely, we do have staff in school who would like to teach C42 but do not have timetable capacity to do this.	
	NB: We could have a great teaching model with one additional staff member who, like NB, for the majority of the time teaches C42. The other model is the tutoring model. But do all staff have the expertise to deliver this course to their groups?	
	PC: Very strong preference for a specialist team as his many years of experience suggest that there will always be a group of tutors who do not think they should be spending their time delivering this content and	
	have no wish to do so. Discussion that C42 is not measured and this will always be an obstacle to achieving full buy-in from the school, where the measured subjects tend to be the ones that are prioritised. The subject still needs to be	
	treated seriously – caring about developing the 'whole student' and the RRS ethos of CVCC. SJA: concerned about the impact on NB, leading the subject across	
	school with a very fragmented team and huge workload that lands on NB. Do we need to invest in more specialist staff? Or training tutors? NB: Many schools do have an expectation that tutors WILL deliver C42	
	content – but not at CVCC. C42 and RRS treated as 2 separate things	

ITEM NO.	ITEM	Actions
	here, but they are not. Should be more interconnected and this would benefit the students more. GS: RRS – this is evolving – we have come a long way in a short time. PC: Firmly believe that another specialist teacher needed to complement the current team. Perhaps individual, skilled teachers already at CVCC need their timetable lightened to allow them to step into this role? The previous model where tutors had a full 1 hour lesson per fortnight with their groups for C42 did not work very well, even with carousel sessions, etc, to play to strengths. SJA: One advantage of the tutor-led approach is that it builds capacity to collapse timetables and get guest speakers in where there are common lessons across the school for C42. NB: C42, RRS and the schools' programmes (ie: Green, Red, Yellow) need to be joined together more holistically. GS: is there still conflict felt within the staff with regards to a Head of Year versus a Head of Schools approach? SJA: Largely the vertical system is positive. Cost saving – 3 Heads of School as opposed to 5 Heads of Year. Each HoS does have a larger team to manage. But there is not the overall accountability for a year group's results eg: Y11. NB: Did not feel she has the PSHE oversight that Ofsted were expecting when they came in, as her responsibility is narrower within C42. eg: she did not feel very well equipped to answer questions on the assemblies programme. PC offered a vote of thanks to NB on behalf of Governors for all of the hard work that she continues to do within CVCC.	
19/20.5	Ofsted priorities & Next Steps SJA distributed a Draft Action Plan (green sheet) on Quality of Education. The document is a starting point – milestones etc would need to be programmed in. 1. Aspirational curriculum. Discussion around the EBacc pathway and the fact that according to Ofsted 'not enough' students follow the EBacc. Conversely, some students who do not enjoy languages have been 'forced' to follow this route and are not having a good experience. CVCC is still significantly above the average take-up for languages at almost 40%, but this is not good enough in Ofsted terms. The measure is 75% - we will probably never get there. Should we worry about this measure? Could our vocational offer be improved? Recruitment for languages teachers is extremely difficult. Need to look at our offer and our guidance – are we encouraging or forcing? PC – in terms of the Ofsted target a revolution is needed. SJA – we really need to sell Languages, we need to be inclusive, emphasise that languages subjects are for all, not just for some. Struggling to recruit. Have not had a stable languages staffing structure for a few years now. Discussion that this is a wider issue and that many schools are struggling to attract the calibre of teacher to really enthuse students in a language subject. In the wider area, German appears to be being phased out of schools, with Mandarin now being offered instead.	

ITEM NO.	ITEM	Actions
	2. Curriculum intent. Ofsted had a very mixed experience when they came in. Maths is a good example of a strong curriculum, although it is too soon since implementation for them to be reaping the rewards in terms of results, yet. They have a mastery approach with a spiralled curriculum – topics are strategically revisited throughout the course. There is consistency of approach. In some other subjects, Ofsted received some more 'ad hoc' responses when they asked about why teachers were teaching particular topics in a particular order (eg responses such as 'that is how it is set out in the text book'.) It is the right time now to ask subject leaders to re-engage with their curriculum and ask why they teach what they teach. HoS need to be empowered to do this – all have now created a 'vision' for their curriculum. Next step is to check that they are delivering against their vision. If not, this needs to be a catalyst for change. Key knowledge, skills & conceptual understanding needs to be revisited. How can progression be structured to build towards what is needed as the 'end product' at the end of 5 years? This process needs to start from Y7 and continue throughout the entire course. Need to give some real thought to developing curriculum plans and not rush this phase. Need more than a list of topics – need to look at knowledge/skills to be taught through topics. PC – there is an element of reskilling here. Over the last 20 years or so, teachers have taken sets of criteria and 'shuffled' them. SJA – see this as returning ownership to middle leaders and allowing them to collaborate with colleagues. Staff need to feel secure about what it is that students need to be secure on, at each stage of development, and checking that learning has taken place and students are ready to move on. Some subjects need to be clearer on the key knowledge students need to grasp at that point in order to allow them to be successful later on. Using History as an example, in Y7 students need to have secure knowledge of the Reformation	
	3. Curriculum implementation – success criteria/knowledge organisers. Lead Ofsted inspector really keen on these (although some might feel they can appear a bit gimmicky). Their purpose is to ensure that teachers and HoS know what the key underlying concepts and knowledge are, and students are then tested against these. Distilling down to key principles and checking learning against them.	
	Assessment – leaders identify the component knowledge they want pupils to acquire (knowledge organisers) over the course of KS3 and use assessment to check that pupils are understanding and remembering this. At CVCC need to do some work around formative and summative assessment to check gaps in learning. Build time into curriculum plans to address any misconceptions/ gaps in knowledge. This structure is one of the benefits of a spiralled curriculum.	

ITEM NO.	ITEM	Actions
	Cognitive Load Theory – Ofsted highlighted that we have different practice going on across the school. Some subjects (eg B&V) are really on board with this theory, using knowledge organisers/ retrieval practice, checking students learn and recall key information. Other subject areas do not use so many strategies. Need to also bear SEND in mind here, in terms of classroom practice. We will do more work with Gaby Long in this area in a CPD session coming up in a fortnight's time. GL wants to be able to feed in more to the CPD package for staff, as this will need to be revisited a number of times.	
	These are overview strategies that need to be broken down further into steps, but it does give a sense of where we are going.	
	Question asked about timescales for these strategies. SJA explained that for some of the steps (eg 2.2 to 2.3) there is a difference in implementation date of up to 2 years. This is because some of these changes will require time and reflection from the staff involved to implement meaningful change. The timescales quoted are rather arbitrary at this stage. Ofsted have given us a couple of years to improve before the next inspection takes place. We are in the process of breaking this down into milestones with the curriculum leads - identifying any conflicts between subject vision and reality of the curriculum and addressing these areas. There is a lot of work to do to have a curriculum plan in place that answers all of the right questions.	
	PC – presumably more time needs to be given to this on future training days? SJA – yes, and also regular meetings with HoS needed in order to facilitate leading staff through a process like this. Equally, the process must not become a simple paper exercise. PC – this is an exciting opportunity but staff need sufficient headspace to engage with the process properly. GS – also a fantastic opportunity to connect with parents and create that direct communication channel.	
19/20.6	Deep Learning Days SJA – Deep Learning Days as a concept is brilliant. It's about providing concentrated curriculum time for subjects to explore an aspect of study much more deeply. SJA has spoken to some staff members about DLD. There were a number who would have liked to spend DLD with their tutor groups (esp Y7) and – for example – watched their performances. Some staff frustrated that DLDs fell on days where they then lost PPA time (minority). There can be an inequality of workload. Depending on how days are structured, the majority of the work can fall on one staff member's shoulders (eg Nic Bennett in October planned sessions for both Y10 and Y11). Other department areas eg D&T would not lead on any DLDs. They support, but do not have the planning, preparation, resourcing to worry about. SJA feels that equality of workload is something that needs to be looked at; responsibilities need to be rotated. Feedback: Some students did question the learning – some questioned the environmental impact of the activities themselves.	

ITEM NO.	ITEM	Actions
ITEM NO.	ITEM Languages feedback was extremely positive. Students loved the activities and the cultural experience. Y8 – lots of students enjoyed the rapping but did it deepen learning? Y9 – Geography and B&V based sessions – lots of deep learning seemed to be taking place. Activities fitted with work they had been doing recently on poverty, shanty towns etc and tied in very neatly with their current curriculum. Y10 – this was an all-day careers session. A lot of the work revolved around booklet work. Many students struggled being with the same teacher for 5 hours, covering careers issues. Students enjoyed the mock interviews with employers but other aspects did not receive such positive feedback from students. Y11 – liked their PositivelyMAD session. SJA thinks that session should be repositioned for independent learning, and would be better in Y10. Y11 could instead do more about current issues eg drugs. PositivelyMAD is a session where students are taught strategies to enable them to remember knowledge. So many exams are based around this and it is a useful skill to have. Students felt empowered by learning these strategies. They enjoyed the session but thought that they might prefer it in 'chunks'. There is also the option for students to learn the practical skills and then for the same company to deliver twillight training to parents on how to support their children during exams. This could be tied into the KS4 evening. SJA to investigate and talk to Nic Bennett about the implication of reorganising things in this way, how it would impact upon current C42 delivery. Post-16 loved their session and thought this was the right moment to do the Learn to Live session without disrupting their learning. All of these comments from tutor groups were later echoed by College Council. Need to ensure in the future that those staff delivering the sessions take responsibility – the shanty towns exercise left quite a lot of mess in the classrooms in Humanities. Same for the English sessions with their creative collages.	Actions
	GS – really please from a Governor's point of view to see the feedback; she thinks this is the first time that this has happened. Thank you!	
19/20.7	Monitoring – Standing Item	
	Not covered in this meeting (already done).	

19/20.8	College Improvement Plan - Standing item	
	Not covered in this meeting (already done).	
19/20.9	<u>Use of Funds for Disadvantaged Learners – Standing item</u>	
	SJA distributed Disadvantaged Funding Allocation Breakdown (handout). There was an issue with how the spending was accounted for previously. We weren't able to track how that money was being used for individual students. Therefore couldn't judge whether how we are allocating money is having any impact. If we could track it differently then we would be able to look at individual PLs, for example, those who have been successful in achieving their grades, and then pinpoint how the money was allocated to support them – work out if there is any pattern. This could then inform our future spending. Viv Oldfield (with Paul Sutton overseeing) is now in charge of PLs – she has created a spreadsheet for tracking and accountability for PL spending. She will analyse how the money is allocated across cost centres. Will be able to see if this is going into resources/ enrichment/ tuition/ kit/ subject materials. Easier for us to be held to account for our spending, and will help us make decisions about how to prioritise spending in the future.	
19/20.10	Items at the discretion of the Chair / AOB	
	No further items raised.	

The meeting ended at 7.30pm.
Signed CHAIR:-
Approved as a true and accurate record of the Meeting on 4 th November 2019.

Date of Next Meeting:

Membership: 12 Governors - Quorum 4

Name	Position	Name	Position
Kevin Bawn	Principal	Ceri Johnson	Parent Governor
Dorf Ruscoe	Member Appointed	Susan Diffey	Member Appointed
Gina Stroud	Co-Opted Governor	Peter Skelton	Parent Governor
Sophy Norris	Parent Governor	Crawford Winlove	Member Appointed
Paul Colin	Member Appointed	Dave Walter	Parent Governor
Susan Diffey	Member Appointed	Peter Skelton	Parent Governor