**Minutes of the Software Development Forum meeting**

**10 February 2015**

**Cathays Park, Cardiff**

**Present:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Andrew Ferguson (AF) | RM |  | Lindsay Lewis (LL) | WG - Chair |
| Andy Jones | AT Summit |  | Claire Horton (CHo) | WG |
| Alex Harris | AT Summit |  | Rhiannon Evans (RE) | WG |
| Jon Ashworth (JA) | Capita |  | Gareth Thomas (GT) | WG |
| Caryl Harding (Cha) | Capita SIMS |  | Steve Hughes (SHu) | WG |
| Jim Haywood (JH) | Capita SIMS |  | Jenna Arnold (JAr) | WG – am |
| Munn-Tzing Bong (M-TB) | Capita One |  | Sian James (SJ) | WG |
| Phil Jones | Capita |  | Craiger Solomons (CS) | WG – am |
| Ceri Davies (CD) | Cardiff/ SIMS user group |  | Rebecca Olney (RO) | WG – am |
| Luke Howells (LH) | Carmarthenshire / RM user group |  | Jayne Dunn (JD) | WG - pm |
| Sara Herbert (SHe) | Vale of Glamorgan / SIMS user group |  | Matthew Skermer (MS) | WG – pm |

# Apologies

## Kenny Barker Advanced Learning

## Nick Buckel Advanced Learning

## Glyn Thomas Cardiff / One user group

## Mike Jones Swansea / One user group

## Natalie Hughes-Owen WG / Post-16

## Graham Davies WG – Assessment

## Andy Milne WG - SIIB

## LL welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked them for attending.

# Minutes, actions and matters arising from the meeting on 11 November, 2015

## It was agreed that the minutes of the meeting on 11 November 2015 were a true record of the meeting subject to correcting Luke Howells’ name.

## LL reviewed the action list. The status for each item had been updated where appropriate. In addition, the following information was provided at the meeting for those items not on the agenda:

Actions 100, 104, 110, 121 and 123 had no update to report and will remain open.

Action 139: SHu confirmed that the 2013 list is to be used for 2015 but with additions and will share this updated list with suppliers this week.

Action 150: Suppliers confirmed they are still looking into this.

# Foundation Phase Profile and Curriculum Review

## LL welcomed CS to provide an update on the Foundation Phase Profile.

## CS took attendees through the paper outlining the Foundation Phase Profile which was sent out prior to the meeting, explaining that the profile would outline observation assessments for which teachers would be given a user guide.

**Action 159: Circulate Foundation Phase Profile User Guide when available.**

## CS explained that from September 2015 there will be two statutory assessments, the first being a Baseline assessment and the second an end of Foundation Phase outcomes assessment at the end of Year 2, with the aim to collect both as part of NDC in May 2016.

## PJ asked if the value ‘4-5’ in the Baseline assessment represented age or school year. CS confirmed this was age.

## CS then ran through Annex A of the paper, which was an example of a skill ladder. PJ highlighted that the ladder does not account for children who are unable to access the ladder. For example, a deaf child may not be able to work towards a listening outcome. CS confirmed that this has been taken into account, and that there will be a 0 value for children who are not on the ladder. CHa identified that 0 means they could achieve something but did not, whereas we may need an option for not being able to access the ladder.

**Action 160: WG to consider children who cannot achieve a skill.**

## CS went on to explain that:

## recording the assessment had not been finalised and that it could be paper or electronic and with or without the school’s MIS.

## whether the ladder is compact or full is indicated on the top right hand corner of the each ladder on the user guide.

## the collection would be via the LA as per the NDC process.

## ladders will work hierarchically but steps can be missed given that development isn’t always hierarchical. WG will only collect the highest outcome.

## AF asked if WG is only recording the highest outcome how this data will be transferred between schools. CS confirmed that WG hadn’t finalised the ladders which are to be used in between the Baseline assessment and the Foundation Phase outcomes assessment, however it would be ideal if schools could pass data on each ladder that has had an assessment as the child progresses.

## AF then asked if suppliers are to provide interim assessments for teachers to use as a reference. JA stated that if children are moving between schools that they might want all the assessments not just the highest outcome. LH then stated that all schools and LAs would want different information. LL explained that when the pilot is complete, WG will have guidance on these issues but that it was unlikely that WG would collect all points on all ladders, only the Areas of Learning, as data on each ladder is not needed by WG.

## CS then explained that during the assessment process there will be two statutory assessments (Baseline and end of Foundation Phase) and two voluntary assessments. The voluntary assessments can use either the Compact or Full Foundation Phase Profile (FPP).

## AF asked if WG is expecting a return for the voluntary assessments and CS confirmed this is not required for 2015. LH then asked if LAs would receive the data and CS confirmed that they would not.

## LL explained that the pilot is exploring whether the Entry to Foundation Phase should be statutory and recorded by WG. CS added that following consultation, it is anticipated that the Entry to Foundation Phase assessment may become statutory, for collection in September 2017. LH stated schools would find it useful if voluntary assessments are included in the school to school transfer.

## JH advised that the DfE are looking into introducing children below N1 and N2 as N0.

**Action 161: WG to request information from DfE about reporting from 0 years of age.**

## A discussion then took place on the Entry to Foundation Phase assessment:

## CS explained that this would take place on a voluntary basis within 6 weeks of the child entering a school or setting.

## JH said that CTF is changing to academic year and asked if WG is expecting this information to transfer via CTF from September 2015. CHo confirmed not and that statutory collection from September 2015 to report in 2016 is for the Baseline assessment.

## LL confirmed the final specification will be available in August 2015 and it is expected that a draft specification will be available by the next SDF meeting on 10 March. JH asked if we could highlight in the draft specification the areas which are more and/or less confirmed.

## CS confirmed that the baseline assessment will be collected as part of NDC and that the numbers of ladders may change.

## PJ asked if the ladders will be weighted and if WG wants 4 or 16 results. CS confirmed they would not be weighted and that WG requires the 4 results which is the combined score of all the ladders. LL suggested that these issues can be dealt with in a separate meeting once there is a clear outcome from the pilot.

## A discussion then took place on the Baseline assessment. CS stated this will also be within 6 weeks of entering reception or Year 1. PJ asked what happens if a child does not start in Year 1, for example if they came from abroad. CS confirmed they would not have a statutory Baseline assessment.

## Delegates were then directed to the software functions within the paper. JH asked if the actual date could be recorded rather than MM/YY. CS confirmed this was fine but PJ raised that the A\_Comp only has the year not the month.

## JH then asked if there is to be an overall indicator similar to the CSI or FPI, and if so, what format it would take it’s an aggregate of the 16 ladders. CS confirmed this it will be a Yes/ No.

**Action 162: WG to arrange a separate meeting after the pilot and before August to discuss reporting.**

## CHa asked how long the pilot is, and CS confirmed it closes at the end of March and that a report is expected 6 weeks after that.

## JAr confirmed that the End of Foundation Phase will match the Baseline assessment and will include Bronze, Silver and Gold with the existing 3 statutory areas of learning. A fourth area of learning of ‘physical development’ is to become statutory.

## LL asked if it is feasible for collection of End of Foundation Phase to take place for 2015/16. JA said this was dependant on the changes within the specification and JH confirmed that Capita would need the specification by September 2015 to release new software in spring 2016. CS confirmed the specification would be completed by August 2015.

## CHa asked what WG is expecting schools to report to parents. CS confirmed this is under discussion. However, current thoughts are that both of the statutory collections should to be reported to parents in May 2016. LH queried the usefulness of reporting a Baseline assessment carried out in September to parents 9 months later. CHa asked if the reports need to be produced in Welsh, and WG confirmed they did.

## AF asked how the assessments will be quality assured. CS stated the Head Teacher will review the assessments to check they are an accurate reflection as is the case for the current NDC.

## **Action 163: WG to complete a draft specification and A\_Comp by the next meeting, 10 March.**

# NDC & National Test Update

## CHo stated that the 2015 import files should be relatively straightforward in that schools will collect them from DEWi and import to their MIS and that they will contain the current year’s calculated scores. CHo asked if LAs want an LA version. LH confirmed they would and that CSV format would work.

**Action 164: CHo to circulate the CSV specification.**

## CHo asked for feedback about the deletion of the 2013/14 data, following the email sent in January. CHo confirmed WG has given the correct data to the LAs to pass on to their schools but that it does not have to be entered into the schools MIS. CHo also confirmed that this year schools are due to receive missing and amended data from 2013, and 2014 and stated that the data needs to go to the school where the pupil sat the test and where the pupil is now, so how will this be achieved? LH confirmed for primary schools a CSV file would be fine but that it’s hard for LAs to track where pupils have gone and that the new school may not be able to import the data.

## AF then asked what they are expected to do about amending data for pupils who have left the setting, do they put revised data in. CHo said they would be telling schools how they performed in 2013/14 when they don’t have the data. JH asked if schools have incorrect pupil data and WG confirmed they do, which is against the DPA and therefore needs to be deleted. AF asked if it is important for the data to be replaced or can it just be deleted? CHo confirmed that the data should be replaced.

**Action 165: WG to keep suppliers informed on actions for import files.**

## LH asked if schools have an obligation to report the amended results to parents. CHo confirmed they don’t. JH suggested schools deleting the information themselves and that any costs incurred should be charged to WG as Capita have not capacity to pay for it. SHe suggested the LA should delete the data not the school to prevent any errors. LH asked if it could be overwritten but CHo confirmed this was too difficult. AF stated they would need to check the format of the files and what happens when importing 2013 data.

## **Action 166: WG to circulate correspondence with instructions for deleting the data.**

# Interventions Monitoring

## LL introduced Jayne Dunn to provide an update on interventions monitoring.

## JD explained that a version of interventions monitoring is already in use in some LAs. WG would like to encourage the use of a single approach and practice across all schools where a standard set of data is recorded in schools’ MIS.

## A consultation group reviewed the draft template last week and this generated a positive response. However, some concerns were raised over the amount of data being collected. Practitioners found it encouraging collecting the data on a strategic level and that this highlighted if teachers require any SEN training.

## CHa asked how LAs would collect the data from schools if there isn’t a data collection for it. JD confirmed that on a strategic level this would be up to the LAs as it’s for schools to collect not LAs. AF asked, if WG is defining what schools need to record, suppliers need to build a mechanism for schools to upload to LAs? LH asked if there will be a standard process. JD confirmed there would be a standard process, however the details are dependent on what is passed in legislation.

## CHa stated that different LAs will ask for different data from schools so it will be easier to have a set process for any upload. JH asked if this will be separate to the current SEN data collected and if this new system blends with the current. JD explained that every child with SEN should have an intervention in place. WG is looking to enable schools to report what is being done for SEN pupils. How this information is then matched to the current system would be up to suppliers but, for example, the data could be used to identify if the intervention is working.

**Action 167: WG to consider the role of the LA, data collection and CTF for monitoring interventions.**

**Action 168: WG to consider defining data for CBDS.**

## CD stated that some children have ALN or an intervention but are not on the SEN register, and AF then asked how record keeping would differentiate if they have an intervention and then move onto the SEN scale. He stated it would be useful to have a standard report of what is being recorded. CD explained that the data is a judgement not a formula so there is no common standard. LH suggested that if WG requires schools to record data, reports could then be produced which hold value for each individual and the school. LL confirmed there is a requirement to show positive effects.

## JD asked what the timescales are for implementation. AF said this is dependant on if it is from schools or WG. If it is made statutory then 1 year from now and 6 months to amend. LH raised that in the legislation WG may want to change it from being recorded to being in MIS as schools might continue to use spreadsheets. JD confirmed they are looking to implement it at the same time as other proposed changed from 2017 but are encouraging schools to start recording it now so that they are familiar with the process before that date. AF stated this may cause deviation which would make it harder to implement into systems.

**Action 169: WG to circulate key dates of the Interventions Monitoring programme.**

# Post-16 2016

## SJ highlighted the changes made to the Post-16 2016 specification as per the issue log.

## As the reporting period begins in September 2015 but the new look-up list is not published until April 2016, JH asked if they should use the old list. If so, how should schools deal with a missing provider?

**Action 170: WG to confirm release dates for look up tables.**

## JH also asked what NCYear should be entered if a pupil has already left? A discussion was held on when the NCYear should be taken, to avoid confusion with in year changes. It was agreed that the last day before the final half term of the year, or the day the pupil left the school if before, should be the reference date for NCYear.

**Action 171: WG to amend on roll date description to include ‘during previous academic year’.**

**Action 172: WG to add detail to the specification for the point in time that NCYear should be taken.**

## SJ then asked whether it is recorded if pupils start early.

**Action 173: LAs to find out if it is recorded if pupils start early.**

## LH asked for guidance to be sent to LAs in order to support schools.

**Action 174: WG to send guidance on the Post 16 collection to LAs.**

## Action 153: to be closed as the policy area confirmed a two year A Level is not available in Wales.

## CHo stated that developers reported an issue with XSLT and suggested changing the survey to P162015 and P162016.

## **Action 175: WG to confirm with suppliers how the XSLT will differentiate between Post-16 2015 and 2016.**

## **Action 176: WG to amend information on duplicate learning activities.**

# PLASC Specification 2016

## LL stated that there were no changes to the PLASC specification.

**Action 177: Suppliers to review and agree the PLASC specification by the next meeting, scheduled for 10 March 2015.**

# Attendance Specification 2016

## LL stated that there were no changes to the Attendance specification.

**Action 178: Suppliers to review and agree the Attendance specification by the next meeting, scheduled for 10 March 2015.**

# EOTAS Specification 2016

## CHo stated that exclusions items had been added into the EOTAS specification in Section 3, page 8; which is an exact replica of the PLASC exclusions.

## PJ stated there may be a problem with the start date of exclusions and asked if morning and afternoon attendance has to be recorded. CHo explained this was important for calculating the attendance data and that there will be a review of accuracy. PJ then asked if the issue of no placement / awaiting provision had been resolved and CHo stated it had.

**Action 179: Suppliers to review and agree the EOTAS specification by next meeting, scheduled for 10 March 2015.**

# AOB

## JH asked if there was an SDF cycle for this year.

**Action 180: WG to circulate 2015/16 SDF cycle.**

## JH highlighted that on 1 August 2015 Capita SIMS will move from CTF 14 to CTF 15. This is due to the decision by DfE to move to an academic year basis for CTF. RM will move to CTF15 later in August. From then on MIS will accept CTF14 and 15 versioning.

**Action 181: WG to consider the timing of CTF versioning and ensure that LRS is using the right version for ULN files.**

# Date of next meeting

10 March 2015 - Cathays Park, Cardiff (Later cancelled)

02 June 2015. Cathays Park, Cardiff