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| **Information about the review**  This review was instigated at the request of the Principal in September 2018. It has included a variety of activities such as student voice and questionnaires, parent consultation, student performance data review, collaboration with senior leaders at other OAT Academies, curriculum and subject audits against the national curriculum aims, consultation with subject teacher and leads, meetings with senior leaders, research of similar school’s curriculum and research on curriculums that impact on the achievement of underperforming groups of students. Subject reviews conducted by other senior leaders supported this process.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Headline Summary**  **Strengths**   * The **National Curriculum statutory requirements are being met in years 7 and 8** with the exception of those students that do not opt for music and a small minority who do not study a modern foreign language. * **Statutory content is being covered** in all subjects bar ICT in Key stage 4. * Overall **attendance for 2017/18 is above the national average** (GSA 94.88%, Nat 94.6%) with persistent absence being lower than the national average (GSA 11.5%, Nat 13.9%) showing students enjoy their education. * The majority of **students have positive views about the curriculum** and their subjects, and feel the curriculum meets their needs over the course of year 7 to year 11 (89%). * **Progress in English and Humanities was in line with national** 2018 * Overall **progress for LAT students (0.1) was above the national average** and similarly so for this group across English (0.2), EBACC (0.1) and the open basket (0.3). * **EBACC entry was above national in 2018** (GSA 43%, Nat 38%, LA 20.8%) despite some students being withdrawn at the end of year 10. EBACC attainment at grade 4 and above was above national (GSA 26%, Nat 24%, and LA 6.4%) * The **Gatsby benchmarks for high quality careers education are all rated as 100%** when tracked by the Compass assessment tool. * **Academic pathways at post 16 are good with progress above national for 2018** (0.08) with the average grade for students best 3 A levels being in line with the national average(C+)   **Recommendations**   * **Despite a three year KS4 with nearly double the guided learning hours**, attendance above national and an increase in the number of slots filled in both EBACC and Open baskets, **progress has remained below national for the last two years**. The curriculum has not supported the Academy’s most vulnerable groups such as disadvantaged, WBR, SEND and boys. More must be done to address the “double disadvantage” experienced by these students. Leaders need to ensure that there is equal **access** to higher sets **and to the full curriculum entitlement, and gaps in knowledge, vocabulary and cultural capital are closed before entering KS4.** * There is National Curriculum coverage of subject aims, however the need to include all of these inside **a two year key stage 3 has led to less depth of study**. A new curriculum should allow for greater emersion in subject content to give wider context that can be built on by all key stage 4 subjects. * An ambitious curriculum should ensure there is equity of provision, however presently not all students access modern foreign languages or music in years 7 and 8. **With key stage 4 starting in year 9 access to foundation subjects is narrowed and statutory requirements of providing Religious Education is not complied with.** Religious Education needs to be added to the key stage 4 curriculum. The curriculum needs to be broader for longer to ensure students have access to all National Curriculum subjects until the end of year 9. * To facilitate deeper learning experiences and **to secure high quality PSHE and Religious Education for all the curriculum should run over 30 periods rather than 29.** * Research on the vocabulary gap shows that the word poor should associate more with word rich students. **Presently the most word poor are taught in a nurture group** and have restricted access to the full curriculum. A new curriculum should look to support these students whilst ensuring there is full access to the curriculum and appropriate subject sets whilst **widening their interaction with the word rich.** * **Applied general qualifications were below average progress** (-0.3) with students who average prior attainment grades D and below, or Grade C doing significantly less well than national. There is a clear need for higher entry requirements for the revised specifications or **Level 2 pathways in post 16 to provide a bridge to level 3 qualifications.** * The pupil teacher ratio **(PTR) at George Salter Academy is 14.6 compared to the national average for schools of 16.0.** To increase PTR the Academy we should seek minimise any increase in staffing levels this year despite the temporary bulge intake of an extra 70 students in year 7 Sept 2019. Class sizes should be increased to cut the cost of staffing and increase PTR. * Quality development and various subject reviews have **found inconstancies in provision both between different subjects and within them. This matches the variance in student performance seen at the end of Key stage 4 and 5.** The new curriculum needs to invest in time to create **high quality schemes of work that reduce inconsistencies in teaching** and learning so that for every student and every group there is high quality first teaching. With this an **emphasis on teacher subject knowledge development** and greater **support for non-specialist teachers** is required. These schemes of work need to have consistently high expectations of lay out and content as well as displaying a clear understanding of lesson objectives and learning outcomes. **Developing oracy skills and the love of reading should be key drivers within these planning documents and clear sequencing of knowledge** needs to be evident to avoid the increased pace in year 11 perceived by students. * It is vital the curriculum educate the whole child, with **mental health and well-being, safeguarding, PSHE, SRE and CEIAG being fully integrated into new schemes of work.** * With revised schemes of work should come **greater focus on assessment pedagogy** so that students are better informed on their progress and teachers are better able to adapt and plan lessons that best support learning. Consistent use of Go4schools should augment high quality planning and formative assessment to give a clearer picture of underperformance. * The **assessment model should implement principles shared by RADY** in that in earlier KS3 assessments barriers such as the vocabulary gap on entry removed. We should plan increase progressively the demands of these assessments as gaps are addressed. * With options being delayed by a year for the current year 8 there is scope to introduce a **new KS4 model**, therefore the curriculum review should continue to evaluate the best possible pathways for students that emerge from the new knowledge rich curriculum. An evaluation should also take place of specialism options in key stage 3 to analyse if it supports student progress.  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Curriculum review timeline**  Middle leaders review of the curriculum and subject/year group curriculum Sept 18  GSA performance data review Sept 18  Meeting with Faye Cutler OSCA re curriculum and open basket qualifications Sept 18  Meeting with SLT Chadwick re curriculum and SEND Sept 18  SLT consultation on the Curriculum Oct 18  Whole cohort student voice on the curriculum Year 8 Oct 18  OAT SLT questionnaire on curriculum Oct 18  Local Governing Body consultation Nov 18  Whole cohort student voice on the curriculum Year 12 Nov 18  Curriculum audit against National Curriculum statutory requirements Nov 18  Subject leaders KS3 National Curriculum audit Dec 18  Focus group Student voice Year 9 and 11 HATs Dec 18  SLT consultation of Programme of study and Schemes of work Jan 19  Middle leaders consultation on the intent of the curriculum Jan 19  Boys work scrutiny, homework planner and student voice Jan 19  Parent Forum consultation and discussion on the curriculum Jan 19  Focus group student voice SEND/Nurture group Jan 19  Consultation on curriculum development with Amelia Walker (OAT)  Middle leaders consultation on SOW framework Feb 19  Opening of parent consultation on the curriculum Feb 19  Subject reviews Product design, Science, MFL, Enterprise, CLASP RBM Sept 18 – April 19  Curriculum efficiency CLFP review Feb 19  All staff training day on Curriculum cohesion – audit of connections between subjects Feb 19  Careers, mental health, Enterprise, PSHE curriculum audit March 19  Assessment review ASI March 19 onwards  Similar schools comparison March 19  Post 16 review Curriculum RRE March 19  Review of subject entry patterns May 19  Evaluation of teaching and learning JHO ongoing  **Main Report**  **Context**  George Salter Academy is an inclusive multi-cultural secondary school which is over-subscribed and serves an area of high deprivation. Nearly half of the all students are eligible for the pupil premium.  As an Academy we presently organise the curriculum over three key stages with KS3 being scheduled for year 7 and 8 (age 11 to 13). The Academy is compliant with the statutory structure of the curriculum in year 7 as all of the subjects are compulsory with the exception of Modern Foreign Languages. MFL is presently not offered to a small group of students who enter the Academy with poor literacy and numeracy skills. Historically the Academy has targeted intervention to develop these skills due to the barrier they present when accessing the curriculum. In addition to the statutory foundation subjects the Academy offers Dance and Drama as additional separate subjects.  In year 8 statutory requirements are met with the exception of Music as this becomes an optional subject as part of specialisms with students preferring to study other forms of the performing arts.  **As students presently take their KS4 options at the end of year 8 the provision of foundation subjects does not meet statutory requirements.** Students may opt out of some foundation subjects to specialise in others. For instance students must select from History or Geography and only a minority presently select both.  KS4 runs over 3 years and students have been banded into three bands based on ability at the point of entry into KS4. The highest ability band presently study an EBACC pathway and complete a GCSE in a modern foreign language. This has resulted in a higher percentage of students being entered for EBACC when compared with the national average (GSA 2018 43% Nat 38.4% LA 20.8%). This would be higher except for a pattern of withdrawing students from languages in year 11. **Subject entry is in line with national for each of the EBACC pillars except for in humanities where 5% more students are entered.**  All other students are offered the opportunity to select the traditional EBACC pathway but very few have chosen to so do over the last two years. Separate sciences are currently only offered to students in the higher band based on performance in KS3 assessments.  **Currently compulsory Religious Education in years 9, 10 and 11 is limited to drop down days** as part of a PSHE and British values programme and a small group of students who opt to take this subject at GCSE. There is no statutory guidance for the content and delivery of Religious Education in KS3 as this is devolved to Local authority agreement.  Student performance  The IDSR for 2018 shows that the Academy has been below the national average for **progress 8 for the last two years (-0.19 for 2017 and 2018).** Progress 8 for LAT students (+0.1) is above national for 2018 as is the case for their progress in each of the P8 baskets bar mathematics (Eng+0.2, EBACC +0.1, Open +0.3). Those students with middle prior attainment made less progress (-0.17) and those with higher prior attainment (-0.36) made significantly less progress when compared with national.  There was also a significant gap between the progress made by boys (-0.59) when compared with girls (+0.21).  **Progress in English and Humanities for all students is at national** but for LAT (Eng +0.2, Hums +0.6) and MAT students (Eng +0.1), Hums +0.1) it is above national. Progress for MAT (+0.2) students in Languages is also above national.  **Students attaining EBACC at grade 4 or above was above national** (GSA 26% Nat 24% LA 10.6%) and this is forecast to rise to 28% in 2019. Students attaining EBACC at grade 5 or above was slightly below national (GSA 15% Nat 16.7 LA 6.4%) with forecasts expecting this to rise to national in 2019.  **Progress 8 is below national for MAT (-0.2) and HAT (-0.4) students.** Progress in Mathematics (-0.4) is below national as is progress within the EBACC (-0.2) and Open baskets (-0.2). Progress is below national in Science (-0.2) and Languages (-0.1). Progress 8 was significantly below the national for disadvantaged students for at least two years for the overall disadvantaged (2017 P8 -0.37, 2018 P8 -0.46). FFT KS4 dashboard shows significantly below national progress for Boys (-0.59), Disadvantaged (-0.42), SEN support (-1.43) and White British Students (-0.81).  The **curriculum has increased the number of students filling slots in the EBACC (2017 2.54 slots to current Year 10 3.00) and open (2017 2.93 slots to current Year 10 2.99)** baskets over the last three years.  For post 16 progress was slightly above national for **academic subjects in 2018 (0.08),** however below national for **Applied General qualifications (-0.3)** due in main to the performance of students with prior attainment at average grade at GCSE of C and D and below.  **Curriculum efficiency**  The DFEs school workforce statistics for 2017 show that pupil teacher ratio in secondary schools at 16.0. In secondary schools there has been a continued increase through from 2012 (when it was 14.9). The current pupil teacher ratio for **George Salter Academy is 14.6** (1327 students and 90.6 full time or equivalent teachers).  The national average class size for secondary schools is 21.2. The average teaching group size at George Salter Academy for the academic year 2017/18 were: year 7 21.5, Year 8 22.9, Year 9 22.0, Year 10 21.9, Year 11 19.8, Year 12 14.3, Year 13 16.7, **total average class size is 19.9**. Whilst the pattern of smaller class sizes in KS4 and 5 is common, class size is already near the national average in KS3 where it would be expected to be higher.  **Curriculum comparisons**  Using FFT Data Lab “Schools like yours” a selection of **80 schools were found with similar APS on entry and of a similar size.** The schools were non selective and all were mixed gender. There were 25 schools which had a positive progress 8 score. 11 of these schools operated a 3 year KS3. George Salter Academy was ranked 39th of 80 based on progress 8.  Of the 80 similar schools **47 schools had a similar percentage of students who were eligible for Free school meals.** Of these schools 10 schools had positive progress 8 scores with four of these schools operating a 3 year KS3. There were five schools with a similar intake (APS and FSM %) with a progress 8 score of higher than +0.20 and one of these operated a 3 year KS3. George Salter Academy was ranked 20th of 47 based on Progress 8.  From looking at the case studies of high performing schools there seems **no clear link to length of key stage and performance.** However the use of a **knowledge rich curriculum that has connectivity and breadth at key stage 3 is a clear pattern particularly in schools which serve communities with similar levels of deprivation.** A clear ambition for social mobility is evident within the curriculum intent and a use of knowledge and depth of understanding are seen as effective tools in raising attainment. The language with curriculum intent commonly refers to the “provision of “a broad and rich curriculum, and **not an impoverished one.”**  Many schools offered GCSE RE to all students as part of the breadth of study and to meet National Curriculum requirements, but this also impacted positively in the open basket. Interestingly GCSE Media, Vocational I.Media and more academic subjects such as Statistics, Sociology and Psychology featured as options at Key stage 4.  **Subject entry patterns**  There has been **an increase in the EBACC subject share by 5%** with schools entering more students for more EBACC subjects. However the number of entries within **non EBACC has decreased by 13%** when comparing 2017 to 2018 as schools continue to narrow the curriculum offer at KS4.  The most popular non-EBACC entries for this academic year were in Religious Education (250k), Physical Education (80k), Business (90k) Art and Design (184k), Design and Technology (90k), and Food (45k). However the majority of these have all seen a fall in the number of entries for this year with only Business and Art and Design showing slight increases. Other less popular subjects that have seen slight increases are Statistics, Economics and Citizenship. Design and Technology showed the largest decrease in entries for this coming exam season with 27000 fewer entries. **At George Salter Academy uptake of Religious Education is low as it currently runs as an optional subject whereas these entry patterns suggest approximately a third of schools enter the full or the majority of their cohort.**  **Subject provision**  There is **much in school variation at George Salter**, both in pupil groups but also between subjects. The FFT data dashboard recognises RE, Music GCSE, Art and Design, Dance Non-GCSE and Photography as performing well. The lowest performing subjects are Engineering, D&T Product Design, Child Care Non-GCSE and Health and Social Care Non-GCSE. Whilst overall leadership and management has been recognised as weak in these departments it is **the specific lack of curriculum planning of content delivery, moderation, and assessment timelines that have appeared contributing factors.**  Across core subjects there is also variation the performance of where there is whole cohort entry patterns. English has remained broadly in line with national (2017 -0.04, 2018-0.02) for the last two years. Conversely Maths has been below national for the last two years (2017 -0.41, 2018 -0.43). Progress in the EBACC basket has fallen from national in 2017 to below national 2018 (-0.17) despite strong VA in History (+0.22). VA was significantly lower in the other humanity subject Geography (-0.25) and also in Combined Science (-0.17) despite high ability students being moved across to this subject from separate sciences. French also contributed towards this baskets below national performance with a VA of -0.47.  Whilst the different make up of how the cohort was divided across History and Geography may have contributed towards the difference in progress, there can be no mistaking the **correlation between poorly planned schemes of work, timelines and assessment structures with student progress in Science, Care and technology subjects.**  **Assessment**  There have been concerns raised over the how student progress is tracked in vocational subjects both at KS4 and in the recent review of KS5. In some subjects current working at data is not calculated due to a reluctance to enter predicted grades for units that have not been completed. However this leads back to students and teachers understanding where they are in relation to the big picture.  The **pedagogy of effective and useful assessment with the use of explicit criteria for success and reference to assessment objectives now needs to be consistently applied** as part of any development of subject planning and schemes of work. An example of this not being applied was found in ICT where despite reassurances a recent assessment showed that students were far from where they should be in the relation to the end of the course and additional curriculum time required to rectify the situation.  Presentations by RADY showed how assessments could widen in scope as students’ progress, with **assessments in year 7 being structured so not to reinforce the gap between disadvantaged and other students.** This could be done by removing barriers such as an understanding of vocabulary by having a glossary of terms and adding removing this support once students understanding of this had developed.  **Views of stakeholders**  Student views were gathered via two whole cohort questionnaires The first of these was with Year 8 once they had moved into a slightly narrowed curriculum through their specialism options. The second of these focused on year 12 reflecting on their curriculum over the year 7 to 11 as well as their views on post 16 options. Student voice was used with smaller more targeted groups such as year 11 HATS and SEND/Nurture groups. Student voice was also sought independently during several subject reviews.  **The positive feel the students have for the curriculum and their lessons is both gratifying and challenging.** All evidence suggest that their experience could be so much better if there was consistently high quality teaching in all subjects and our students frequently settle for less. Perhaps students believe the inconsistency is due to the personality of the teacher rather than differences in preparation and planning.  The **role of the Nurture group seems to have evolved into a safe study place rather than the original focus of making students ready for secondary education.** Outcomes for SEND would suggest a greater need for the integration of students with educational needs and greater access to the wider experience presented by other students. There needs to be equal access to the curriculum for all abilities rather than restricting the most interesting work to the most able students.  Most subject leaders wanted students to take more options and therefore keep all KS4 subjects alive in the curriculum. Two EBACC subjects wanted to remove the pathways that restricted choice. The first of these wanted their subject to be no longer offered to all of the highest band and to only be offered as a free option choice. They believed that this would gain greater “buy in” from the students. Another liked the current model where all students opt for History or Geography but wanted wider options explored for less able students.  Many **teachers agreed that the curriculum should retain breadth for longer and some suggested that students should all select one of an Art, a technology or a performing art subject at KS4.** Others stated the importance of retaining Religious Education throughout years 7 to 11 due to the diverse intake of the academy and the development of cultural capital applicable to their subject or the development of debating skills that are a strength of this subject. A few progress leaders commented that KS4 bands could be restrictive when needing to move students for pastoral reasons.  Many KS5 subject teachers wanted there to be a **Level 2 pathway as they felt the step up to level 3 subjects was too much for some students**. Some felt that students that were retaking either English or maths needed a bridging course to prepare them fully and then study level 3 qualifications over the following two years.  Parents were invited to give their views on the curriculum via an email address, as well verbally at each parents evening. A parent’s forum event was used to share the proposed curriculum models and all **favoured the move towards a three year KS3** curriculum when presented with the advantages of this models compared to the advantages of remaining with a three year KS4. Parents were consulted on changes to the school day to facilitate any change in the curriculum model. The proposed model was shared on the website and letters sent home to parents making them aware of the consultation, with all of the feedback favouring an extension to the timetable on Wednesday by one period.  Models were shared with governors at the local governing body meeting and they supported the move to thirty period week and an extended KS3 curriculum model.  Literature review  The “Education in England: Annual report 2018” highlighted that there has been a significant **slowdown in the rate of gap closure** over the last few years “threatening the ambition of greater social mobility”. For the most significantly disadvantaged pupils there has been no closure at all in performance in English Language and Maths since 2011.  The causal effect of the lack of progress in closing the gap is put down to **“double disadvantage”** in Professor Becky Francis research for the Education Endowment foundation as students are disadvantaged on arrival into the education system and then are the **“recipients of school practises found to hinder their progress”.** These practises are identified as **misrepresentation in lower sets** by disadvantaged students and the assigning of less well qualified teachers to these groups. The research show there is a relationship between students liking for school and their set, over and above the students prior attainment.  In her research paper, “Key drivers of the disadvantage gap”, Whitney Creena-Jennings shares this view that disadvantaged students can experience disproportionate setting possibly as assessment used measures the difference in parental support and interest, rather than intellect or potential. Creena-Jennings agrees with Francis that due to being assigned to lower sets they are more likely experience “lower quality teaching” and increased frequency of being taught by unqualified teachers. The paper shares research that shows the **most important factor for pupil attainment is the effectiveness of the teacher and that the progress comparison between having a good teacher and a bad teacher is the equivalent to whole year of learning for disadvantaged pupils.** This belief is shared by many when looking at the performance of other under performing groups such as the inequality in the performance of boys or SEND. There is no intervention that can replace high quality first teaching.  In his book “The Matthew Effect”, Daniel Rigney goes further and attributes the double disadvantage to students from **disadvantaged backgrounds to them not “possessing the foundational knowledge they need in order to access and understand the school curriculum”.** This is demonstrated by the impact of having good reading skills with more skilled readers going from “learning to read to reading to learn” whilst “poor readers become increasingly frustrated with the act of reading and try to avoid reading wherever possible”.  Hirsch in his book “The Schools We Need” shares this view and says “The children who possess intellectual capital when they first arrive at school have the mental scaffolding and Velcro to catch hold of what is going on, and they can turn the new knowledge into still more Velcro to gain still more knowledge”.  Matt Bromley in his article “Closing The Vocabulary Gap” recognises the **importance of cultural capital, knowledge and word power as important facilitators on addressing the disadvantaged gap** in attainment. In his article he advises a greater mix of abilities with the most disadvantaged and **“word poor” spending more time with the “word rich”.** He agrees with the theory of “double disadvantage” referencing “many” schools placing disadvantaged students in lower sets and a “dumb down” curriculum to make it more accessible with lower expectations, and more scaffolding to which the word poor become increasingly reliant upon. He suggests a better approach is for disadvantaged students to have equity of access to a knowledge rich curriculum with cultural experiences that take place on top of the normal curriculum rather than at its expense.  This research confirms the need for equity of access to the whole curriculum for all. We need to avoid capping potential based on the degree of disadvantaged experienced prior to arriving at the Academy and then doubly disadvantaging our students by ensuring every lesson has challenging content and the building of cultural capital. We should carefully look at the **subject knowledge of all our teachers** and in particular those that teach lower ability or where there is high levels of disadvantage. The uplifting KS2 APS of disadvantaged students and the fair distribution across the higher sets is also something we should develop further. Quality assurance of subject staffing should be carried out to ensure all sets have access to consistently good teaching. The **focus on high quality schemes of work will support this drive to improve provision for all.**  The removal of a nurture group and more open setting for low ability students, granting them **access to students who are more word rich and where the teachers expectations are higher** is a key strategy in raising achievement and closing the vocabulary gap.  Finally the research points to the importance of tackling the knowledge gap and continuing the work started with the present year 7 in the creation of a knowledge rich curriculum where low stakes frequent testing is an ever present. |  | | | |

**Actions post review**

|  |
| --- |
| Sufficient planning time to be given to the new curriculum’s schemes of work - **June 19** |
| Provisional option blocks for post 16 in place earlier with students allocated to ensure maximum students options are adhered to. – **June 19** |
| Review intent – is it strong enough (ambition) -  **June 19** GSA intent compared to OAT |
| SLT link leadership of timescales for completion of the schemes of work to ensure they are ready for September 19 –**June 19** |
| Greater links between Art and technology as part of a faculty – addition of graphics at Ks3 as lead up to an alternative pathway in technology at KS4 – **June 19** |
| Audit of PSHE SOW to ensure coverage (and role of year 9 RE in delivery) - **WER June 19** |
| Audit of careers opportunities in KS3 – guest speakers, presenters etc. **by end of term** |
| CPD priorities of assessment pedagogy, oracy, reading – matrix and CPD calendar – **JHO/HJS this term** |
| Agreement on format of lesson objective, learning outcomes, success criteria – **JHO this term** |
| Decision made on Level 2 subjects to be offered at KS5 – **June 2019** then KS4 exam results day ready for new term for definite courses |
| Exemplar models for academic, practical and vocational subjects use of Go4schools in recording CWA and forecast – **Sept 19** |
| Meet with new HOD re Adaption of courses offered within technology – **June 19** |
| Strong staffing of groups with higher numbers of LAT/SEND - **July 19** |
| CPD for teachers of group with LAT/SEND **Sept 19** |
| Enrichment audit of all year groups – where are the gaps? What is every student’s entitlement in each year group? What does this look like? **Sept 19** |
| Role of Finance within the curriculum – **June 19** |
| An investigation into using RADY principles in setting year 8 into 9 for the final year of KS3 – **June 2019** |
| QD of schemes of work to ensure high quality content and sequencing and progression – **ongoing SLT links and samples DFT/RBM** |
| Checks against agreed cohesion in the curriculum to ensure these have been established, identify strong links – **ongoing** |
| Setting of the new Year 9 into 10 bands – **June 19** |
| Guidance on assessment given to subject leaders relative to KS3 **by end of term** |
| Evaluation of the assessment calendar in readiness for the start of the new KS4 **Feb 2020** |
| **Agree role of specialism** for the new year 8 – wider study on impact on progress, attendance, behaviour, options by **Oct 2020** |
| **Agree curriculum model for the new KS4**, bands, setting, breadth, compulsory subjects, optional subjects, new courses to be offered, access to MFL and separate sciences, **by Oct 2019** |
| Review of KS3 tech rotation – **Easter 2020** |
| Review implementation of cross curricular themes in lessons - **Jan 2020** capture evidence of implementation |
| Student voice KS3 – again **Easter 2020** |
| HODS Review SOW and respond to QD – time set aside for this in departments next academic year topic **by topic and termly - HJS** |