**Minutes of the WG Software Development Forum**

**26 June 2018**

**Caerdydd 3, Cathays Park, Cardiff**

**Present:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alan Morris (AM) | Teacher Centre/ Ceredigion LA | Jayne Thomas (JT) | Neath Port Talbot LA/ Capita SIMS User Group |
| Justin Denney (JD) | Teacher Centre/ Ceredigion LA | Jayne Holmes (JHo) | WG |
| Mike Jones (MJ) | Swansea LA/ Capita One User Group | Andy Milne (AMi) | WG |
| Aaron Edge (AE) | ESP Thinking | Steve Hughes (SH)  Item 3 only. | WG |
| Ruth Vincent (RV) | Capita SIMS | Sarah Angel (SA) Item 3 only. | WG |
| John Ashworth (JA) | Capita SIMS | Alison Tang (AT) | WG |
| Paul Walton (PW) | Capita SIMS | Alison Sharp (AS) | WG |
| Mark Weaver (MW) | Cardiff LA/SIMS | Gav Elias (GE) | WG |
| Deborah Green (DG) | Capita One | Alice De’Abreu (AD) | WG |
| Niranjan Yedamakanti (NY) | Capita One | Chloë Harris (CH) | WG |
| James Boyd (JB) | Cardiff LA/SIMS | Gareth Thomas (GTh) SWAC session only | WG |
| Rodel Currie (RC) | Cardiff LA/SIMS | Rachel Shepherd (RS) SWAC session only | WG |

1. **Introductions and apologies**

Apologies were received from Lindsay Lewis (WG), Jim Haywood (Capita SIMS), Glyn Thomas (Cardiff LA/Capita One User Group) and Ceri Davies (Cardiff LA/Capita SIMS User Group)

1. **Minutes, actions and matters arising from the meeting on 22 February 2018**
   1. The minutes of the meeting held on 22 February 2018 were agreed as an accurate record.
   2. JHo went through the open actions and provided the following additional information:

**Action 328 (AMi)** – AMi to speak to relevant WG contact to explain the link between FSM and Universal Credit.

* 1. JHo explained that we have received a detailed paper from the policy lead on this. It will be discussed more going forward particularly with PLASC and any implications that may arise.
  2. AMi continued with a brief update on the proposals, explaining that there will now be a set threshold mirroring England. SH further explained that there will be more who will be eligible for FSM but it wont be straight forward initially.

MJ explained that in Swansea, where Universal Credit is live since December 2017 after a slight delay in implementation, they have seen an increase in FSM eligibility in their PLASC 2018 data.

**Action 330** – Provide schools with guidance on the new Post-16 structure

* 1. JHo confirmed that the new completion notes and FAQs have been uploaded to the website and an email had been sent to all IMS contacts advising that they have been updated and released.

**Action 335 (AS)** – AS to consider the issues discussed before communicating submission requirements to schools and local authorities. AS to confirm agreed action for the NDC collection.

* 1. The submission notes requirements were confirmed when the NDC completion notes went out to LAs. AS changed the requirements for NDC 2019 which can be seen in the draft specification which was circulated on Monday 25th June.

**Action 336** **(WG)** – Update of service children

* 1. JHo explained that this has now gone back to policy colleagues. The regulations need to be changed accordingly. This may be on hold due to urgent legal work related to Brexit.

**Action 337** **(WG)** – Clarification of whether IDPs will be electronic

* 1. JHo explained that there will be no statutory requirement or policy requirement for electronic IDPs. The Act requires an agreed form or forms for the IDP. Any decisions on producing and maintaining electronic versions of IDPs will be a matter for schools/local authorities/regional consortia.

**Action 338** **(WG)** – Can IDPs be appealed and are there regulations on this?

* 1. Detail is already provided in the Act and draft code – the next iteration of the code and a suite of regulations will provide more detail, particularly around the Education Tribunal for Wales (which is replacing SENTW). There is a range of appeal and reconsideration routes available before causes are escalated.
  2. GE explained that there will be an overlap of data with the roll out.

**Action 339** **(WG)** – WG to look at CBDS

* 1. GE explained that this was being looked at presently with the hope of it being released by the end of the week/early next week.
  2. JA commented that Capita will begin their development beginning of July so this is now extremely urgent. JA said that it can be released in draft if necessary.

1. **School Performance Reporting update**
   1. SA joined for discussion regarding School Performance. SA began by explaining that KS4 measures were changing.
   2. In May 2018, the Cabinet Secretary for Education revised the set of KS4 measures, and is moving towards the direction of curriculum reform, including developing evaluation arrangements.
   3. There will be interim measures for reporting in summer 2019. This will be the first in this format. The new format will be presented to schools and local authorities in spring 2019 so that they can become familiar with them.
   4. Predominantly the new measures will be moving away from thresholds to points based measures. It will show attainment across the board and will be broken down into thirds, by gender and by FSM/non-FSM. Schools will also likely be compared to the nearest 3 or 4 schools in similar socio-economic status. Unfortunately SA explained that specifics cannot be given presently on how these measures will be calculated but hopes to provide more detail in the autumn term.
   5. This years release will be as they are. Welsh Baccalaureate measures will be as planned.
   6. The interim 2019 measures will show changes. The Performance Measures bulletin from May 2018 highlighted these and a presentation was given at a recent head teachers conference.

**Action 341 (WG)** - WG to provide a link to Performance Measures bulletin from May 2018

* 1. SA provided the group with a diagram of changes to the Capped Points Score.

**Action 342 (WG)** – Send out the changes to the Capped Points Score document

* 1. SA explained that we expect schools to consider FSM and gender breakdowns in terms of reporting. Schools will look at attainment in thirds, the top third, middle third and bottom third. There will be variations with the school population.
  2. AMi further explained that in 2018 early entry and multiple entries will take the best result as the overall score, however in 2019 the 1st complete award qualification will count. There will be no subsequent award.
  3. PW raised the query on what do you consider as first entry? The first time a pupil sits an exam or the actual award date? This is important in terms of software suppliers coding. SH confirmed this should be the award date.
  4. SA then explained that schools will be asked to consider results in a similar socio-economic setting. This will be refined going forward as SDF colleagues had a number of questions on this. SA explained that they are working with Legal Services to confirm statutory requirements and are pushing to get out confirmation.
  5. In relation to target setting MJ felt that the current target system is not effective at school level. Individual pupil level would be better.
  6. SA explained that statutory legislation means that schools will need to consider their targets.
  7. PW asked if Progress Measures were part of this. SA said that it is part of the same conversation presently. SH commented that they are hoping to procure a National Model where WG won’t set expectations of progress but rather schools and individuals will work together.
  8. MJ referred back to the grouping of socio-economic schools like the ‘family of schools’ there is presently. SA – yes but this not confirmed. It is hoped to look at schools more flexibly rather than a family of 10 schools. AMi said that there will be more freedom for schools to report what they’re doing.
  9. PW explained that suppliers will need detail in January/February to get any changes into their release for the summer.

**Action 342 (AMi)** – AMi to provide some further details in relation to the socio-economic breakdown of schools.

1. **National Data Collection (NDC)** 
   1. Ali Sharp joined the group for discussions on NDC and the draft specification for 2019.
   2. There are 2 main changes:

* outcome codes Gold (G), Silver (S) and Bronze (Z) for statutory end of Foundation Phase assessments for Areas of Learning LCW/ LCE (Language, literacy and communication skills in English/ Welsh) and MDT (Mathematical Development) will be collected for the first time. NAW\_A\_COMP has been updated to reflect this. These codes were already being collected for PSD (Personal and social development, well-being and cultural diversity); and
* School comparative reports below the national level won’t be published. Only Wales data on Stats Wales.
  1. JT asked if school comparative reports will still be made available or if there will be something similar without LA or Wales comparative data? Several members of the group commented that governors like the school comparative reports because they have charts, making it easier to interpret performance than if they were presented with numbers and statistics.

**Action 343 (AS)** - AS to confirm whether comparative reports will be removed.

* 1. Baseline Assessment validation – MJ concerned that some schools using Incerts were sending their data over to MIS in June. Meaning that where schools were using the tool to track pupil progress, their latest rather than their BA result, was going to MIS and being reported in NDC. It was suggested that Incerts do not use a <ResultQualifier> against the result. The ‘BA’ <ResultQualifier> is to be used to mark out a statutory baseline assessment, from other non-statutory assessments on the Foundation Phase Profile (e.g. CA and PO).
  2. MJ suggested an earlier collection of BA to capture the assessment before it changes. Another member said that doing that would miss BAs in schools that have an intake in later terms.

**Action 344 (AS/MJ)** – AS to discuss specific concerns/ examples and possible resolutions with MJ.

**Action 345 (WG)** – WG to consider whether there is a need to add rules to Validation CBDS to check if BA is present and to check the dates.

* 1. MJ says schools are asking what WG are doing with the information it collects. AS confirmed that BA was and will continue to be used going forward and agreed to communicate reasons to LAs/ schools.

**Action 346 (AS)** – AS to update NDC 2019 spec to add clarification surrounding what BA data is being used for.

* 1. AM suggested that some schools are deflating BA results as it show bigger progress/ better performance. AM requested more details on the reason for the differences in progress values between FP outcome codes. He suggested that the increment sizes were different between codes e.g. S–G compared to 2-3 etc. and different between AOLs.

**Action 347 (AS)** – AS to look at progression steps for AoLs and feed back to group.

1. **Welsh National Tests (WNT)** 
   1. AD confirmed that the draft v0.1 WNT 2019 specification should be released following SDF.

**Action 348 (WG)** – WG to release v0.1 of WNT 2019 spec as soon as possible after the meeting.

* 1. AT lead conversation around online Personalised Assessments (PAs) that will be replacing the current WNT paper tests. This will be done in a phased approach, phasing out one paper test per year from 2018/19 onwards, and beginning with the Numeracy Procedural paper test. By 2020/21 all tests should be online.
  2. To access the online Personalised Assessments all users i.e. learners will have to log into Hwb, click on an icon in order to undertake the assessment Work has been on-going with the recent roll-out of the new Hwb Provisioning Tool to all schools. A ‘big thank you’ to those involved with this work. There is a ‘final’ push to ensure all schools have received the new Hwb Provisioning Tool so any help given here would be appreciated.
  3. AT explained that the Personalised Assessment has recently undertaken a trial with a number of schools participating. The purpose of the trial was to determine the calibration has been set accurately and appropriately to the difficulty level of the question. It also enabled use to see the quality of the data that would be pulled through via the Provisioning Tool.
  4. AT also stated that following the previous SDF, the advice was to capture and use the teacher\_category data item in order to identify the roles of staff in school. So the intention is to seek further clarification and assurance from the SDF that it is the right thing to do.
  5. A hand-out with questions was distributed. Please see annex XX for questions and summary of responses
  6. It was identified that a number of schools (as listed in annex XX) had no gender details. AM confirmed those schools listed uses Teacher Centre systems.
  7. Issues identified with Hwb was the timescales was unrealistic when the Hwb provisioning tool was rolled out as some LAs have no Hwb support staff. Potential data mapping issues on Hwb side. Not all the information / username is accurate eg some users have been set up as Administrators when they should be.
  8. For the Hwb Connect tool to work, the Salamander tool needs to be updated to be able to extract any additional data to what is currently extracted.
  9. AT confirmed that the recently rollout Hwb Provisioning Tool did not include teacher\_category as a data to be collected. AM raised a potential risk to introduce a new data item as this time considering the tool has only just been rollout with some teething problem. AT was to speak with Hwb colleague on this.
  10. There was some concern over how the assessment data will be inserted back into a school’s MIS. It was suggested that AlphaPlus, the contractor for the PAs, should be able to export the data as a .csv or .xml file from their system. Supplying these will enable MIS suppliers to build in functionality so that the .csv or .xml could easily be imported into MIS without a school having to manually insert each result for each pupil.
  11. It was also identified if there was a requirement for the results of the on-line assessment to be uploaded back into a schools MIS there may be development work for the MIS suppliers which will require a change request.

1. **Post – 16** 
   1. GE introduced discussions on Post-16. GE explained that draft v0.1 2019 specification had been released. There had been no comments from suppliers and so confirmed that v1.0 would be released onto the SDF area of DEWi following SDF.

**Action 349(GE)** – GE to release v1.0 of the Post-16 spec following the SDF meeting

* 1. The completion notes for the 2018 collection had been released, earlier than normal to allow schools/LAs to become familiar with QWADs.
  2. GE asked SDF colleagues for their thoughts around school closures and how to extract data from schools before they close.
  3. JT explained that this would be the same for the Attendance collection. JT has an example and would let GE know.

**Action 350 (JT)** – JT to correspond with GE on the example referred to.

* 1. JB said that schools should still have access to the old database.
  2. MJ also stated that this would be the same for PLASC and exclusions data. GE clarified that this was only an issue for the Post-16 and Attendance (Primary) collections as they are the ones that are retrospective in nature, collecting data on the previous academic year. GE also stated that as there will be a part of the SWAC collection that is retrospective, this could potentially be something that may affect all schools that are closing in time.
  3. JA asked GE how programmes of study were calculated and if there was a way to illustrate this. GE explained that this would be impossible to list all of the possibilities due to the sheer number of variables but that the Technical Completion Notes did have a new mapping tool that should help. Members of the group asked whether WG colleagues could check whether vocational qualification classifications could be simplified at all as it is the vocational qualification that can make mapping activities to programme references difficult for schools.
  4. AMi suggested that it may be an idea to invite Post-16 colleagues to future SDFs to provide their thoughts.

**Action 351 (SIIB)** – SIIB to invite Post-16 colleagues to the next SDF.

* 1. JA commented that the WG colleagues that attended the Capita SIMS workshop held back in May for SIMS users was really beneficial and that WGs presence was very useful. GE commented that WG also found it useful and beneficial, also noting that all suppliers holding workshops for users are free to invite WG as appropriate.

1. **AOB’s** 
   1. AD began by explaining that there had been some queries from Capita colleagues around the use of code N in PLASC for SEN need. The query related to whether code ‘N’ mean that the pupil doesn’t currently have an SEN need or that a pupil has never had an SEN need.
   2. AD confirmed that code N means a pupil has no current special need on the day of the census.
   3. The next point for AOB was the terms of reference (ToR) for SDF meetings. GE noted that a section on School Performance Reporting has been added to the ToR so that it formally falls within the remit of the SDF and will be added as a regular agenda item.
   4. AT also commented that the ToR should include a section on GDPR, including the use of email addresses for SDF colleagues.

**Action 352 (SIIB)** – Updated terms of reference to be circulated.

* 1. Next SDF would be for the autumn in 16th October. JA mentioned that a further SWAC meeting would be useful before this date.

**Action 353 (GTh)** – GTh to consider whether to arrange a future event specifically to cover SWAC.

* 1. SDF colleagues were provided with a paper on EOTAS pupil registration before SDF. Colleagues were asked to review the paper and provide any feedback they may have to the IMS mailbox.

**Action 354 (SIIB)** – Follow up EOTAS Pupil Registration paper feedback.

* 1. JT explained that some head teachers are not happy if a pupil has moved just before PLASC collection as they will not be captured as a pupil that the school has supported and educated until the point that they left the school.
  2. MJ commented that the pupil should be registered at their main school. EOTAS education is subsidiary, and MJ therefore queried whether this can already be implemented by using code M (main) for the main/last school of the pupil and code S (subsidiary) for the PRU/EOTAS provision. MJ also said that in Swansea LA there are a small number of pupils who aren’t registered anywhere.
  3. MJ asked why code D can’t be used for the Attendance collection and also that schools are using code B instead, which is not dual registered. The group asked whether WG could look at adding some new validation rules to Validation CBDS, primarily so that codes D or B cannot be used if the pupil is not dual registered, and that if more than 40 sessions or more are missed per year by a pupil that it raises a query as to whether the pupil is dual registered.

**Action 355 (SIIB)** - Check validation rules for attendance collection.

* 1. GE then moved on to the ALN transition and implementation and PLASC. GE explained that he had met with policy colleagues to discuss the implementation of the Additional Learning Needs and Education Tribunal (Wales) Act 2018.
  2. There will be a new process that will introduce Individual Development Plans (IDPs) that will replace the current SEN categorisation. There will be 3 categories of IDPs, which are No IDP; School Maintained IDP; and LA Maintained IDP.
  3. As the implementation will be phased in from 2020 to 2023, different LAs will be commencing with the new arrangements at different times. GE suggested that the most feasible way to manage this transition period would be the introduction of 3 more codes as valid entries to cover the 3 IDP categories, giving MIS users the option of using the current categorisation or the new IDP categorisation.
  4. AM asked if there will be IDPs now for all pupils? GE stated that his understanding was that there would not be IDPs for all pupils, hence why one of the new categories will be No IDP. However, all pupils should have one of the three categorisation against them under the new arrangements.
  5. JD asked if pupils have a legal right to appeal their IDPs?

**Action 356 (SIIB)** – SIIB colleagues to check with ALN colleagues and seek clarification on this.

* 1. JA commented that the new codes will need to be added to the CTF 2019 specification. JA suggested that WG colleagues speak to DfE.

**Action 357 (WG)** – WG to speak to DfE about CTF developments and having the new IDP codes added.

* 1. NY commented that codes K and E need to be looked at in PLASC (Reasons for exception).
  2. JHo asked the group if there was any other issues/questions anyone may have.
  3. JT asked about the ULN query that was raised in WUG, and formally raised it within SDF. The query is related to obtaining ULN numbers at an earlier age to be more helpful to schools in their planning. GE stated that he had been looking into this and has had discussions with DfE/LRS colleagues and that they were ongoing.

**Action 358 (SIIB)** – SIIB to continue discussions with DfE/LRS on this issue to establish what is possible, both in a technical and data protection capacity.

* 1. JA asked whether it is possible for LRS to generate CTFs as this would make importing the of ULNs into MIS much easier for schools. If possible, could this CTF be output to DEWi for the schools?

**Action 359 (SIIB)** – SIIB to explore this with LRS in the first instance.

1. **School Workforce Annual Census (SWAC)** 
   1. GTh and RS joined the group for discussions on SWAC.
   2. GTh started the discussions by going through the v0.2 of the specification. JA asked which areas WG are expecting to be collected. These need to feed into the xml data fields.

Suppliers wanted an xml file of school codes and names which will have to provide the contracts and absences data modules themselves (in the case of opted out schools) so the relevant information is extracted from school MIS to ensure a complete return.

It was also raised that a header in the xml file showing which elements/modules were provided by schools and LAs would be useful.

**Action SWAC-002 (GTh)** – GTh to consider whether to add an identifier to data field XML tags so that it can be easily seen whether it is LA or school supplied data.

* 1. GTh explained that the first collection in November 2019 would be the census elements only, with November 2020 being the first full collection to include the census and retrospective elements. GTh asked if suppliers would prefer two different specs, one for the 2019 (census only) collection and one for 2020 (census and retrospective) collection.
  2. JA commented that Capita would prefer to have one specification for 2019 and 2020 so they can do one development rather than 2 as this would be more work. This would allow a single development for suppliers and ensure everything was in place for September 2019 to being capturing the necessary data for both the November 2019 collection and the November 2020 collection.
  3. GTh explained that the SWAC team held a number of workshops with LAs and found that these were very useful and provided the team with good feedback.
  4. JA suggested that WG have a different census date for SWAC to DfE’s workforce collection, even if only by a week or so. A clash in timing would mean more work for the Capita support team if they both open and close at the same time.

**Action SWAC-003 (WG) -** WG to consider dates for 2019 collection.

* 1. There was a discussion of moving SWAC collection in line with PLASC could be beneficial to enable easy cross-referencing of the number of teachers and number of pupils to ensure class size ratios are met where possible – especially when staff data is taken out of PLASC, it might be better to have staff and pupil data in line. Capita again did not want 2 collections at the same time. This would increase the burden on LAs and schools and queried whether PLASC and SWAC could be rolled into one collection.
  2. GTh confirmed that once the SWAC would be embedded in schools and LAs business as usual processes a review should be undertaken to consider whether SWAC should be moved in line with PLASC timetable.
  3. MJ asked for a list of the staff categories that are to be excluded in the collection. This brought on discussions around the inclusion and exclusion on the census. GTh confirmed that a list of in/out of scope staff would be included within both the specification and completion notes documents.
  4. An example was given for Flying start settings. Sometimes in the same building as Primary Schools where employees have a combined contract for the staff working in both areas. GTh confirmed that only school work elements should be included. A query in validation could solve this.
  5. A point was made by AM and JD that XSD schema files are used by Teacher Centre but Capita don’t use these.
  6. The summary reports will need to be different depending on school type (by sector and whether they have opted-out of SLAs).
  7. Supply teacher data – this is often a delay of 4 weeks after their use in a school before the data is available. GTh confirmed that data on supply teachers will be collected on an aggregated basis relating to the previous academic year and therefore the time delay should not be an issue.

* 1. AM and MJ said that the guidance around gender as a category needs to be clearer.

**Action SWAC-004 (WG) -** WG to work with equality division to agree gender categories.

* 1. Developers said if timetabling is wanted for week of census date, changes can happen during that week, and effectively means schools couldn’t submit before end of census week, and validation could take longer/carry on into PLASC census. GTh said changes don’t matter and we’re not trying to capture those, it’s a snapshot sample timetable should be submitted as at point of extraction.
  2. GT queried whether there was a reason why CTF files were not used for workforce data. JA stated that there wasn’t any reason not to use CTF’s for SWAC and the group agreed that they would be useful.

**Action SWAC-005 (Capita) -** JA offered to send a mock up of the staff CTF structure to the SWAC team.

* 1. Contract length to be established. Is this 28 working days or all days?
  2. Not all schools have contract data, and this is used to define who is in/out of census. GTh thinks they should know as they currently provide aggregated data as part of PLASC.
  3. Advisory and challenge teachers may be on contracts with consortia which would not be held by LAs. An example was given where ERW has 50 “super teachers” employed that are deployed across the regions as needed to various schools. These should be collected as part of the school return and identified under an appropriate staff category.
  4. There was a discussion around Names to be collected. Is middle name included in given names? Suppliers suggested middle names should be separated out.
  5. Legal name should be collected rather than known by name, these needs to be made clear for matching contracts.

**Action 364 (WG) -** Remove former family names from spec – considered to be not useful, inconsistent and often not available.

* 1. NI number: can be temporary. People may not want to give them. GTh highlighted that under GDPR there is a legislative basis to collect.
  2. The discussion then moved onto the best way to record and validate supply teachers. GTh explained that schools should know hours of supply used. There will need to be clear guidance on how suppy costs should be recorded.
  3. Suggestion to change and simplify structure of collection of supply – too many different categories /roles currently shown and these might not be recorded/known – large burden for schools to record. Suggestion to record each supply cover incidence as a separate row. MJ offered to work with WG to draft structure of supply data to be collected.

**Action SWAC-006 (WG/MJ)** – To look at building structure of supply data to be collected.

* 1. A further suggestion to change True/False fields to A(1), using 0/1 (making clear which is yes and no for these), Y/N and T/F, no need to have True/False as it is easy for suppliers to use other categories.

**Action SWAC-007 (WG) -** WG to review spec to ensure consistency in recording of true / false fields.

* 1. Also there was a suggestion to change language medium of subjects to 1 letter field i.e. E, W, B

**Action SWAC-008 (WG) -** WG to review lesson medium options.

* 1. It was suggested that only FTE rather than hours worked and FTE hours per week needed, as this is held in the contract. Schools would not hold this so should be in contract module provided by LAs.
  2. Some contracts have daily/hourly rates but not how many hours worked – perhaps these change weekly/ monthly? How do we record?
  3. Suggested to take out completer and completer hours. General agreement that this is mostly made up and does not represent fully. Can be a burden as schools/LAs may or may not include hours spent, updating the details as part of routine.

**Action SWAC-009 (WG) -** WG to look at how completer hours are used once collected and whether data still needs to be collected for all collections.

* 1. For year group, there needs to be a mixed option. Give a clear example in the guidance that will explain how to fill in unusual cases (e.eg multiple year groups).
  2. Coordinators other than SEN to be included? Specialist/Specific coordinator roles – suppliers say can add any from a list.

**Action SWAC-010 (WG) -** WG to work with MJ to replace ‘SEN co-ordinator’ with ‘Additional Roles’ and provide definitive list of roles to be included in census.

**Action SWAC-011 (CAPITA)** – Staff CTF structure to WG

**Action SWAC-012 (WG)** – Outline the timescales as soon as possible.

**Action 372 (WG)** – SDF site of DEWi – add SWAC collection items e.g. Spec, Modular CBDS.

**Action SWAC-013 (WG)** – v0.3 of the Specification to be released to suppliers.

* 1. Suppliers asked for a further meeting on the SWAC collection. It was suggested that this could be a virtual meeting in September.