

Curriculum Committee, notes on meeting held Thursday 26th June 2025, commencing 4.00 pm

Present: Shruti Mistry, David Fox, Abi Walton, Murray Perkins, Mike Simons (Chair)

Apologies for absence:

None

Notes of previous meeting (5/12/2024):

These were agreed to be a true record, subject to a correction about an error in dates, and there were no matters arising.

Pupil Assessment Data:

Shruti Mistry presented the assessment data for the summer term:

The percentage attaining the expected level in each year group is shown in the table, together with results for Spring Term 2025 for the same year groups. Also shown are results for the same cohorts a year previously, in Summer 2024.

Numbers of children assessed as Below and Significantly Below the expected standard were also given, not shown in these notes.

	<u>% expected</u> <u>Summer 25</u> <u>Spring25</u>	<u>or</u>	<u>above</u>	Summer Term 2024 (the same cohort)		
Year Group	Reading	Writing	Maths	R, Wr, M		
1	70 70	64 55	68 68	71,55,71		
2	65 65	72 70	78 52	77,73,77		
3	76 71	58 49	76 73	58,49,51		
4	77 70	60 53	71 73	77,77,73		
5	79 71	73 74	85 81	78,70,80		
6						
Average	73	65	76	Overall av. 69		
Av Sumr 24	72	65	70			

In 10 cases out of the 15, the assessments were higher than for the spring term, in 3 cases the same, and the 2 remaining cases were only marginally less than the spring term results. Compared with Summer 2024 assessments for the same cohorts, assessments were improved or broadly equal, with particularly marked improvement in the current year 3.

Shruti presented other aspects of performance / attainment:

In **NFER test results** for this term, the percentage of children who took the tests and gained a score of 100% or above ranged from 69 to 88%, with most in the high 70's. Note that children who would have had difficulty with the tests did not take part, which skewed the percentages upward compared with the school's pupil assessments. It was suggested that in future it would be helpful if the percentages of pupils gaining 100% or above were given as a percentage (a) of those taking the test, and (b) as a percentage of the whole year group.

% attendance was between 94 and 96% for all of year groups 1 – 5 (Y6 was not reported as they took SATS this term).

Information for each year group was presented on

- Differences between girls' and boys' attainment
- Information on Pupil Premium and EAL children's progress
- SEN children's numbers, categories and progress
- % of learning targets achieved in each year group.

Discussion of the Assessment Process:

It was pointed out that the assessment results are reported as percentages in three categories: those achieving the expected standard, those below the expected, and those significantly below. The question was raised why is the % significantly above expected not reported. It was suggested that recognising high levels of achievement could help in raising standards overall.

David Fox suggested that there was a case for adjusting upward the "expected" level to be achieved in the autumn term assessments. There are two reasons for this: records show that there is a distinct trend, apparent in many but not all cases, for the % achieving expected in a given year group to be lower in the spring term than in the autumn term, suggesting a decline in attainment, which is probably not valid. Also, if the % achieving expected in the autumn term were a bit lower, that might act as an incentive towards higher standards. The feeling of the meeting was that this is worth exploring further.

Policy on AI (Artificial Intelligence) Usage at Harlyn:

This policy was approved by the committee. In broad terms, it sets out the potential dangers of AI, it states that pupils will not be permitted to use AI tools within the school setting, with the exception of AI augmented search engines, while teachers will be permitted to use AI tools to enhance teaching and lesson planning, for which a set of guidelines is given.

English Policy:

A draft English policy was considered. A question was raised over the coverage of writing as a subject. As clear proposals on that point were not forthcoming at the meeting, it was agreed that this point should be considered in the days after the meeting and agreed by email exchanges.