



**Eastburn Junior & Infant School Governing Body
Meeting held on 21 January 2019
Minutes**

The meeting opened at 5.50pm

Present: Ian Bester, Ann Craggs (Vice Chair), Samantha Fernie, Richard Grayson, John Hughes, Rebecca Reynolds, Sarah Teal, Joanna Waterhouse (Head), David Wilson (Associate Member and DHT)

In Attendance: Helen Osman (Clerk – BC/SGS¹)

In the absence of Katy Walsh, Ann Craggs (Vice Chair) took the chair.

48/18 Apologies for absence and their acceptance

Apologies had been received, and were accepted, from Katy Walsh.

49/18 Notification of other urgent business and requests to vary the agenda order

The Clerk had been notified of two items of other business. The Governing Body (GB) agreed to take them as follows:

- Behaviour policy and flowchart for exclusions – at Item 65/18
- Review of the days of the week on which meetings are held – at Item 66/18

50/18 Declarations of interest for items on this agenda

No interests were declared in items on this agenda.

51/18 Minutes of meeting held on 26 November 2018 and matters arising

Governors noted the following amendment to the minutes:

Item 29/18 (matter arising 20/18(f)), line 3 – Delete “indicted” and replace with “inducted”.

Action

¹ BC/SGS – Bradford Council’s School Governor Service

Signed _____

Date: _____

- Subject to this amendment, ***the minutes were agreed as a true record of the meeting***, signed by the Vice Chair and passed to the Headteacher.

Matters arising were in hand, had been completed or would be discussed under other items on the agenda for this meeting.

52/18 Discuss Headteacher's report

Agenda paper

Key Information – The Head said that there had been minor adjustments to SEND ranges and a small increase in the number of pupils eligible for Pupil Premium funding (“PP pupils”).

Governors asked about the causes of the increase in overall Persistent Absence² (PA) from 8.2% in the autumn 1 half term to 10.7% in the autumn 2 half term. The Head said that the attendance of one or two pupils had risen above the 90% threshold in the autumn 1 half term but had since slipped back. She reminded governors that PA pupils included a disproportionate number of PP pupils with difficult home circumstances: the school was monitoring them closely. Governors noted that cumulative PA to date stood at 7.8%.

Asked whether it was generally the same pupils who were PA group from term to term, the Head said that it was: among the general pupil population attendance was good. She explained that it took some time for a pupil whose attendance had dropped to, say 86% or 87% to work their way back up to 90%. Some of these pupils had taken unauthorised leave for holidays and had then been absent with chicken pox. Some had experienced difficult family circumstances such as a period of hospitalisation. Where pupils had a history of high absence, the pattern tended to be odd days throughout the years. The Pastoral Manager maintained close contact with all the families concerned, and was due to send out another round of letters to parents and invitations to come into school to discuss attendance, as she had done in October 2018. Leaflets had been handed out to parents and pupils: parents had welcomed the production of leaflets for pupils, which supported parents' efforts to get their children to school. The school encouraged parents to contact the school as necessary so that staff could talk to pupils and persuade them to come into school.

Safeguarding – **Asked** why the numbers in the CPOMS³ report did not add up, the Head explained that the number of pupils involved in an incident could vary. **Asked** whether the ten behaviour incidents that had involved boys had related to the two exclusions, she confirmed that they had. The incidents had involved a small number of individual pupils: for example, one child had been involved in three serious incidents and had been externally excluded.

Achievement and Standards and **Post Ofsted Action Plan Update** – Governors agreed to discuss these under the relevant items on the agenda for this meeting.

Curriculum and **Extra-curricular activities** – Governors noted the opportunities that the school was providing for pupils to widen their experience, both through the curriculum and through extra-curricular activities, and to develop links with the local community – the Head said that the school was particularly proud of these developing links. Governors noted the increasing importance that Ofsted was attaching to the wider curriculum and were pleased to hear that the work to prepare Year 6 for the SATs was not being allowed to prevent their participation in these wider opportunities.

² Persistent Absence: attendance by a pupil of less than 90% (ie 19 days or more missed in one year)

³ CPOMS - a software application for monitoring child protection, safeguarding and welfare issues and generating related alerts and reports

Signed _____

Date: _____

Staffing – The Head said that much work in the autumn term had focused on the implementation of Read Write Inc⁴, and the first round of observations had also focused on this.

Replying to questions, the Head confirmed that parents continued to attend Reading sessions. There were six to eight parents who attended regularly, and a steady flow of others. Attendance at Phonics sessions was good and there was pleasing evidence that parents shared the experience with others in the playground. The Deputy Headteacher (DHT) added that an evening session had not been well attended – it seemed that parents preferred to have the sessions in the mornings with the class.

Governors commended staff on their willingness to deliver these sessions for parents when Read Write Inc was still so new to them – it reflected well on the whole-school Building Learning Power approach to learning for all. Those with a background in education were especially appreciative, commenting on the critical importance of parents' understanding and involvement to the success of Read Write Inc. Replying to questions, the Head said that the school would probably run further sessions: governors welcomed this, as it was often beneficial to top up parents' understanding and allow them to see the progression of the programme. The Head said that parents had commented positively on the progress that their children had made since September 2018, as had the Read Write Inc trainer. As well as further Reading and Phonics sessions for parents, the school was also considering running afternoon sessions at the end of each topic for parents to see the work that their children had done.

53/18 **Receive report from Resources Committee meeting of 14 January 2019**

Ann Craggs, in her capacity as Chair of the Resources Committee, reported that the Committee had reviewed the Quarter 3 budget position. It had been a pleasure to learn that Funzone had a forecast surplus of £17k, which could be offset against the main budget forecast deficit of £9k, leaving a small forecast carryforward of £8k. Given the pressures on the budget, this was a major achievement, though the Committee had noted that it was not sustainable in future.

The Committee had noted that actions had now been completed to address the recommendations of the financial audit. It had expressed its gratitude to John Hughes for participating in the preparation of the Schools Financial Value Standard (SFVS): a final version would be reviewed at the next meeting and brought to the GB meeting on 11 March for approval before submission to the Local Authority (LA).

The Committee had reviewed the school's contracts, Service Level Agreements and rolling ICT programme in preparation for setting the 2019-20 opening budget. It had approved the GDPR⁵ Action Plan and policies on charging and remissions, lettings and capability. It had asked for further work to be done on the finance policy, with a view to approving it at the next meeting.

54/18 **Discuss reports of Janet Keefe (BC/PAO⁶) visits and consider any action required**

Agenda paper

⁴ Read Write Inc – a series of four literacy programmes, developed by Ruth Miskin, for children of various ages from 3-11 covering Phonics, Literacy & Language and Spelling.

⁵ GDPR – General Data Protection Regulation: implemented on 25 May 2018, replacing the Data Protection Act 1998

⁶ BC/PAO – Primary Achievement Officer, Bradford Council

Signed _____

Date: _____

- (a) Early Years on 04 December 2018 – The Head said that she had been pleased by the very positive report of the visit conducted by BC/PAO on 04 December 2019. The report had indicated that good progress had been made in Early Years, particularly on the use of assessment data to inform planning.

The Head said that she and BC/PAO had undertaken a short observation of a Maths lesson and had identified one or two issues around the pace of learning, which had been due to the teacher teaching the whole class at once. Since then, she and the DHT had addressed this for both Maths and Phonics lessons by breaking the class into smaller groups, which allowed for more effective use of resources for Maths Mastery. Work in small groups had been well focused and of high quality, and had provided opportunities for sustained pieces of work and use of outdoor areas. Small group work was challenging to manage with only two members of staff, but was beneficial in terms of pupil progress.

The focus for the current term would be on the Maths programme. The DHT and Maths Leader had visited another school and had returned with good ideas to implement that were consistent with the schools Maths Mastery approach. The DHT said that these ideas had been around focusing on a specific number each week and helping pupils to develop a deep and secure understanding of what that number meant. This approach would provide a sound basis for future learning. The Head said that this supported the work that she and the DHT had been doing with Early Years staff on the importance of establishing patterns and contexts during early years as a foundation for future learning. The Early Years Leader was keenly enthused by this work.

The Head said that leadership was aware that more work was required to develop continuous provision in Early Years. Mindful of the need to avoid overloading staff, they would address this in a carefully managed way.

Replying to questions, the Head confirmed that governors could expect to see the impact of these improvements in evidence of strong pupil progress by the time of the next meeting.

Asked whether BC/PAO would conduct a return visit to Early Years, the Head confirmed that she would. Indeed, she had dropped in on Early Years when she had visited on 15 January 2019, and her findings would be included in the report that would be brought to the next meeting. In the meantime, the Head dropped into Early Years regularly.

Asked whether she was confident that the Early Years baseline was sound, the Head said some 25% of pupils joined the school at a level below expectation and from a large number of settings of varying quality. Pupils varied widely in their academic and social abilities. Work on transition was thus a major issue in the autumn term, as staff sought to harmonise the class and establish expectations. Moderation with other schools had been undertaken in the week prior to this meeting, and the difference in the abilities of pupils in schools with their own Nursery provision had been marked.

To achieve the most accurate baseline possible, the school sent all pre-school feeder settings a form to record data on a consistent basis. Not all settings returned the form, and some of the assessments were not particularly accurate. During the first four weeks of the autumn term, staff carried out their own assessments and triangulated them with the forms returned by the feeder settings to establish the Early Years baseline data.

The Head said that previous inspection teams had assumed that the level of attainment on entry to the school was much higher than the actual figure of around

Signed _____

Date: _____

75% of pupils working at ARE⁷. The difference in attainment between some of the 25% working below ARE and the higher achievers among the 75% working at or above ARE could often be significant. It was important that governors, as well as leadership, made this clear in discussions with Ofsted and others.

The Head added that, while most pupils joined Early Years with attainment in line with ARE for social development, only around one third of them were in line with ARE for Reading, Writing or Shape and Space. Governors noted that this underlined the need to reach out to parents as early as possible with information about Read Write Inc – this could prove powerful.

The Head said that around 50% of pupils joined Early Years from Eastburn pre-school. The limited hours offered by this setting meant that many parents did not use it. She believed that there was scope to consider offering pre-school provision: the idea would need to be explored and costed thoroughly, but could be beneficial in ensuring that more pupils were well prepared for entry to Early Years, and could also help to attract more parents to the school.

The Head said that the Reception teacher had worked with parents and local pre-school settings to facilitate transition. She noted the benefits that would accrue from having stable staffing in terms of developing relationships with settings. Governors agreed: it was important to develop common expectations and ensure that settings were aware that the school used Read Write Inc. The Head said that the school had invited the pre-school to bring children to visit the library during the summer term and take home a book to read. **Asked** whether the Reception teacher was permanent, the Head said that she was, and that she was highly committed to Building Learning Power.

The Head said that the atmosphere in continuous provision was calm and purposeful, suggesting that pupils were being provided with the appropriate level of challenge. Activities were aligned with the next step in learning, although there was more work to do to tailor them to the specific needs of individual pupils. Assessment was now a real strength, being based on robust evidence and observations.

- (b) Learning Walk and book scrutiny on 15 January 2019 – The Head advised that she had just received the report of this visit for comment. The GB agreed that this sub-item should be deferred to the next meeting, when the final report would be available for circulation with the agenda.

55/18 Review pupil progress and attainment and consider any action required

Agenda papers

(a) Inspection Data Summary Report⁸ (IDSR) and analysis (2018 data)

The DHT said that summary of the main messages in the Inspection Data Summary Report (IDSR) had proved very useful in school. It summarised the schools actions, their impact, what remained to be done and how it would be taken forward. He drew governors' attention in particular to two of the strengths identified in the summary:

- *In Reading, Writing and Maths, Key Stage 2 children made greater progress than children with similar Key Stage 1 outcomes nationally; and*

⁷ ARE - Age Related Expectation

⁸ Inspection Data Summary Report. Data on the school's performance in the previous academic year, published annually by Ofsted. The headlines on page 1 of the report indicate the likely lines of inquiry in any Ofsted inspection.

Signed _____

Date: _____

- *Pupil outcomes at Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 in Writing and Maths have improved and are now broadly in line with national.*

Governors congratulated the school on this major achievement and noted the need to make these two points clear in discussions with Ofsted and others.

The DHT reminded governors that the way that progress was measured nationally was complex and defined in a way that meant that half of all schools would have a negative progress score. Governors acknowledged this, but commented that the increasing emphasis that Ofsted appeared to be placing on progress was to be welcomed.

Turning to the issues to be addressed, the DHT said that, in light of the extensive work that the school had done on Writing and Maths, Reading had not improved in line with those in other subjects: the school was addressing this though the action identified in the agenda paper.

Work had been done to identify the reasons underlying the lower level of progress made by lower and higher ability children in Writing than made by their peers nationally. The actions that the school was taking were set out in the agenda paper, and the school expected that the proportion of Year 6 pupils reaching Greater Depth in Writing in 2019 would exceed the national average. Governors commented that they welcomed the focus on applying writing skills across the curriculum – they considered that the school was now ready to move to this stage.

Noting that the number of fixed term exclusions had been at or above national average for three years, the DHT pointed out that this could be regarded as positive (ie the school was tackling poor behaviour appropriately rather than allowing it to continue) or negatively (ie behaviour in the school was worse than in other schools). The Head said that the number of pupils concerned was low – one or two each year. This had been included as an issue because it would be reasonable to expect Ofsted to ask about it; governors and leaders therefore needed to be confident that they understood the underlying facts and could answer questions. She pointed out that pupils had not benefited from Nurture Group provision until relatively recently. This provision was highly effective: she estimated that, for every fixed term exclusion, Nurture Group support enabled twice as many pupils to return to class ready to learn. The school did exclude pupils when necessary, often to safeguard other pupils and ensure that the child in question received the support they needed, but it only did so after exhausting all other options.

Replying to questions, the DHT said that fixed term exclusions nationally stood at 0.27 for schools in areas with a similar level of deprivation, whereas the figure for Eastburn was 1.3. Governors noted that the difference was significant, but that the reasons were understood and the school was taking action as set out in the agenda paper.

The Head said that Eastburn had been in the highest quintile for the proportion of SEND pupils in 2017-18. SEND provision in school was strong, and agencies had historically signposted SEND pupils to the school. A high proportion of the SEND pupils had very complex needs. The behaviour policy introduced three to four years ago had helped with this: it had included a clear system of rewards and sanctions and continual evaluation of pupil needs.

Noting the very positive outcomes shown in the IDSR and its summary, **governors asked** whether the school needed to continue doing more of the same or whether it needed to take additional actions. The Head said that the improvement to date in ensuring that attainment was broadly in line with national averages and progress was good represented a major achievement. The school now needed to focus on further improving attainment and progress. This would be a matter of continuing to embed existing strengths, rather than seeking to introduce a Big New Idea. The DHT agreed: some of the initiatives and

Signed _____

Date: _____

programmes that had been introduced in the last two years (eg Maths Mastery) were long term programmes that needed to be continued to realise their full impact. The Head said that, while the consistency, quality and standard of handwriting in Year 2 was remarkable, a number of Year 6 pupils were at risk of not reaching the required standard: although they had made strong progress, they had not benefited from Read Write Inc throughout their school careers. **Asked** whether this meant that the prospects were good for exceeding national averages in future years, the Head said that it did: the key was to consolidate and embed the programmes and initiatives that had been put in place and continue to move forward.

(b) Autumn 2018 term progress, attainment and analysis

The DHT said that the data presented in the agenda papers had been extracted from the more detailed presentation of data circulated with the agenda for the last meeting to make it easier to identify the key messages. Governors strongly welcomed the revised presentation, which was significantly easier to understand, particularly for those who did not have a background in education.

Replying to questions from a newer governor, the DHT said that Key Stage 1 comprised Years 1 and 2, while Key Stage 2 comprised Years 3 and 4 (Lower Key Stage 2) and 5 and 6 (Upper Key Stage 2). Governors noted that the year on year data related to different cohorts of pupils.

Noting the high progress score for Year 5 Reading, **a governor asked** whether the school predicted that the outcomes for this cohort would exceed those of the current Year 6. The DHT said that leadership planned to work with the teacher in question, an NQT⁹, to moderate her assessments. The Head added that the Year 6 cohort was highly polarised, with a significant number of pupils who were either high or low achievers. The Year 5 cohort had a more traditional distribution of abilities. The school was moderating assessments closely, but the two cohorts were undoubtedly different.

56/18 Presentation from David Wilson, DHT, on how data is gathered, validated and used

The DHT said that SPTO¹⁰, the provider of the school's tracking system, was due to cease trading at the end of 2019. For this reason, there was little value on giving the proposed presentation on the system. The school was engaged in identifying the most appropriate alternative.

Governors asked whether the cessation of SPTO was likely to lead to loss of the insights available with the current data and set out in the papers for the previous agenda item. The DHT said that it was difficult to be sure until a new tracking system had been selected.

Asked whether SPTO had recommended a replacement, the Head said that the school was aware of a wide range of systems. At the time that the Executive Headteacher arrangement had been put in place, the school had considered moving away from SPTO, which had a number of limitations, including being unable to record Early Years data. Other systems were better aligned with the 2014 national curriculum, which was intended to lead to teachers spending less time on crunching data and more reflecting on next

⁹ NQT - Newly Qualified Teacher. Qualified and undergoing 1 year training post. Governors have a responsibility to ensure that NQTs are given the support and training to which they are entitled, including induction time away from the classroom as well as the usual Planning, Preparation and Assessment time to which all teaching staff are entitled.

¹⁰ SPTO – School Pupil Tracker Online

Signed _____

Date: _____

steps. Leadership had, however, concluded that the time was not right to go through the upheaval and major training activity required to implement a new tracking system effectively: there were at that time too many other changes being implemented, and there was a clear need for consistent data.

While replacing the system would involve a lot of work that had not been planned for in the current year, there would be advantage in adopting a system that better met the needs of staff, leadership and governors. The first step in identifying a replacement would be to discuss with other schools in the 2VLC the systems that they used. Between them, they used most of the main providers, and there would be clear advantage in adopting a system used by one or more of these partner schools. Governors agreed: this would aid moderation between schools. Leadership would research the available systems and bring a recommendation to the next meeting of the GB. SPTO had indicated that the school could continue its subscription until December 2019, which would allow for historic records to be kept into the autumn term and available if the school was inspected.

Head

Asked about timing, the Head said that staff would be trained on the new system during the summer term, with a view to implementation from September 2019. The training task would be significant if the school was to be sure that the system was implemented effectively, accurately and consistently from the outset.

The Clerk advised that the GB needed to be satisfied that the new system would meet its needs for accurate and consistent data presented in a way that was comprehensible to those without a background in education and that did not involve leaders spending a lot of time extracting data and turning it into a comprehensible format. Governors recognised that the recommendation of senior leadership would be critical, since leadership had to be confident that the new system was easy for staff to use effectively and capable of providing the analysis that staff and leaders needed to inform teaching and learning and ensure continuing school improvement. They agreed that it would be useful to have feedback from other governing bodies that used the recommended system on their experience of the data it provided. The school would arrange this.

Head

Asked about the likely cost of the replacement system, the Head said that she thought it might prove cheaper than the current SPTO subscription.

57/18 Agree progress and attainment targets for all year groups and vulnerable groups for 2018-19

Agenda papers for Item 55/18(b)

The DHT referred governors to the targets shown in the agenda papers for Item 55/18(b). The Head said that the target for most classes was for around 80% of pupils to be working at or above ARE at the end of the Key Stage. This was ambitious. **Asked** how the GB would hold the school to account for progress and attainment in-year if the targets were expressed in terms of the end of the Key Stage, the Head said that the progress and attainment data would show how each class was moving towards the end of Key Stage targets – this was how the achievement of teachers' targets were assessed in their annual appraisals.

The DHT highlighted the fact that progress in every class and subject appeared to be significantly in excess of the targets in the autumn term. He explained that this was a vagary of the tracking system: there were fewer "boxes" to be "ticked" in the first term to demonstrate expected progress. As more "boxes" were added in later terms, the progress figures could be expected to reduce.

Governors were pleased to learn that the Year 4 teacher had worked with the pupils who had joined her class in September 2018 from Year 3 and was now content with their

Signed _____

Date: _____

assessments. The Head said that Years 3 and 4 remained the most complex cohorts in school. They had high proportions of SEND pupils with particularly complex learning needs. Like governors, leadership was keeping a close watch on Year 4. Assessment was a particular strength of the Year 4 teacher and the school was confident that the Year 4 data was accurate.

The Head said that Year 3 attainment was low: at the end of Key Stage 1 this cohort had some of the lowest attainment ever seen at the school. This was reflected in the attainment targets for this cohort (75% of pupils working at or above ARE at the end of Key Stage 2, compared with the 80% in other year groups). The progress targets for this cohort were, however, the same as for other year groups. The DHT said that Year 3 attainment had improved greatly in the autumn term, and the cohort had made over 80% progress.

The Head said that pupil progress was the clearest indicator of the quality of teaching, and was less cohort-specific than attainment. It would be worth governors bearing this in mind in discussion with Ofsted and others.

Asked how confident leadership was in the baseline data for each class, the DHT said that this data was, essentially, the attainment figures for the cohort at the end of the previous year. **Governors asked** about the noticeable drop between these figures and the October 2018 data – did attainment decline that much over the summer break? The DHT said that this was the usual pattern. The Head said that, in the previous year, Key Stage 2 staff had moved up to the next year group with their classes and the October dip in data had not been seen. The school was exploring the logistical scope to repeat this in future years, so that teachers stayed with their classes for at least two years.

The Head said that the school had not set targets for pupils eligible for Pupil Premium funding, because it was the gap between the progress and attainment of these pupils and those of all pupils nationally that mattered. **Asked** whether targets had been set for narrowing the gap, she said that they had not, although an ambitious target had been set for SEND pupils (60% to make Expected progress), who made up a significant proportion of PP pupils. **Asked** why a target had not been set around narrowing the gap for PP pupils, the Head said that this could be done but that the nature of the PP cohort made it difficult to set a meaningful target. The nineteen PP pupils in school could be divided into two groups:

- boys with complex SEND needs – the school was spending around £35k per year to support these pupils so that they could remain in mainstream education, and they were covered by the SEND target of 60% making Expected progress; and
- high attainers who faced no academic challenges; would make greater than Expected progress without additional support; and for whom there was no gap with national averages.

The school monitored all nineteen of these pupils closely but, under the circumstances, did not consider it useful to attempt to set PP targets in addition to the SEND target. Governors accepted this reasoning and noted the need for the GB to monitor the progress and attainment of these pupils, and the support they were receiving, at each meeting. The Head said that she would draw this out more clearly in the regular Pupil Premium reports.

Head

58/18 Review monitoring and evaluation of teaching, learning and assessment and consider any action required

Agenda paper

Signed _____

Date: _____

Governors were pleased to note the progress made in the quality of teaching and learning, as indicated by the high number of blue (“Practice to be Shared”) and green (“Secure”) boxes with upward arrows.

Asked how the school was addressing the red (“Causing Concern”) box with the downward arrow, the DHT said that targets for improvement had been agreed with the teacher; arrangements had been made for her to observe a colleague whose practice was blue in this aspect of teaching. A repeat observation for this teacher, focused on this area of weakness, had been scheduled for later in the current half term. The teacher had been keen to improve, had responded very positively to the opportunity to observe a colleague and had requested the repeat observation so that she could demonstrate improvement.

Referring to the teacher who had three areas of red, the Head said that the working pattern of this teacher had not allowed for the opportunity to observe a colleague; nor did it allow for participation in wider school training – the school was looking at how to address this. The Head had worked with her on assessment for learning and the need for it to impact on planning. The teacher had been very receptive and a repeat observation would be carried out later in the half term. Governors noted that this teacher was a costly resource and a very experienced teacher whose practice ought to show as blue: they hoped to see the red boxes change to at least yellow by the time of the next meeting.

The Head said that governors were right to focus on these red boxes, which represented current cause for concern and should expect to see them move to yellow by the next meeting.

Governors noted that the blue and yellow boxes were largely at the upper end of the school. Some of the yellow boxes had been yellow for some time. The Head reminded governors that yellow did not mean that teachers were failing to meet their appraisal targets: it meant only that there was room for improvement to reach the high standards expected at Eastburn. Teachers who had shown as mainly yellow for some time were new teachers and RQTs. With the exception of the teacher discussed above, all teachers shown as mostly yellow had one or more green boxes with upward arrows, indicating improvement in that aspect of teaching from yellow to green since the last GB meeting.

Noting that governors and leadership believed assessment in school to be rigorous and accurate, **governors asked** how this tied in with the five yellow boxes shown against “*Rigorous and accurate assessment of pupils identifies gaps in learning and plans for future needs*”. **They also asked** how long a member of staff could show as yellow for an aspect of teaching before the school would put a support plan in place. The Head said that the two of the five teachers were NQTs and NQT action plans: these were similar to the support plans that were put in place for teachers for whom there were concerns about capability, but were a routine element of the NQT programme. One other teacher was on an informal support plan.

The Head said that the high proportion of yellow shown for a teacher in Upper Key Stage 2 triangulated with the questions governors had asked earlier in the meeting about the apparent 100% Expected progress indicated for Year 5.

Asked whether the staff who showed high proportions of yellow displayed the right behaviours and attitudes for improvement, the DHT said that their initial reactions had been very positive and proactive. Governors might wish to ask this question again in the future to see whether the initial positive reaction was sustained. He added that staff across the board were working hard and doing their best, and leadership were providing the appropriate support. If the mid-year reviews indicated that the issues identified by governors persisted, it would be necessary to take more formal steps.

Signed _____

Date: _____

The Head reminded governors that, by the time of the next meeting (11 March 2019), staff mid-year reviews of performance would have been held, or at least be underway. She suggested that governors might wish to ask about the proportion of staff who were on track to meet their targets for the year.

Asked how it was possible for two teachers in a job share to have different colour boxes for aspects of teaching such as (for example) lesson sequencing, the Head said that it was necessary to distinguish between sequencing within a lesson and sequencing for teaching as a whole. In this case, the different colours related to sequencing within the lessons being observed.

Governors were conscious that they had asked some testing questions under this item, and noted that they would not previously have had the knowledge, confidence or information necessary to do so – this was an important step forward for the GB. While they had, for obvious reasons, focused on the yellow and red boxes, they commented on the very welcome increase in green and particularly blue boxes, and the high number of upward arrows. It was important not to overlook this important evidence of improvement in teaching and learning.

59/18 Report on impact of Pupil Premium and plans for coming term

Agenda paper

The Head had explained earlier in the meeting (Item 57/18) the diversity of the nineteen PP pupils. She added that a disproportionate number of these pupils (ten of the nineteen) were concentrated in Years 3 and 4. Page 2 of the agenda paper listed the main barriers to attainment for PP pupils. Referring to these barriers, she made the following additional points:

Barrier A – the 20% of PP pupils who were also identified as SEND were at Ranges 3 and 4, with Range 4 being the highest level of need that was considered to be manageable within a mainstream school.

Barrier B – 20% of PP pupils were also identified as “Child in Need” – ie they were sufficiently vulnerable that external agencies were involved with them and/or their families. A further 60% were identified as “Vulnerable” – ie they were not necessary eligible for support from external agencies but the school had concerns, for example around attendance, issues in the home etc.

Barrier C – 33% of PP pupils were also Persistently Absent: there was a clear correlation between Persistent Absence and Pupil Premium status.

Barrier D – while some of the school’s PP pupils had limited experiences and did not engage in diverse cultural activities outside school, this was by no means the case for all. As noted at Item 57/18, a significant proportion of PP pupils were academically and socially no more disadvantaged than the general pupil population.

The Head said that PP funding was focused on those pupils in greatest need. Governors noted that total PP funding in the current year was £23k; **replying to questions**, the Head said that this did not begin to cover the cost of the support that the school provided for its disadvantaged and vulnerable pupils. The work of the Pastoral Manager and the Nurture Group, from which PP pupils benefited disproportionately, were dependent on PP funding. They represented good value for money and enabled some pupils to remain in mainstream education who might otherwise have required referral to specialist provision, so extending their life chances. There was a significant number of pupils in the upper school who had successfully moved from Nurture Group to the mainstream.

Signed _____

Date: _____

Asked whether staff were aware of which children in their classes were PP pupils, the Head said that they were – this became particularly evident in Pupil Progress Meetings, if the progress and attainment of PP pupils fell behind. **Replying to questions**, the Head said that she would need prior notice of questions about the breakdown of pupils by Free School Meals, Pupil Premium and EVER 6

The Clerk advised that feedback from Governors at schools that had recently been inspected indicated that Ofsted expected governors to be able to account for the impact of all funding streams, such as Pupil Premium and Sports Premium.

60/18 Review progress against 2018-19 Post-Ofsted Action Plan (POAP)

Agenda papers

- (a) **Priority 2:** “*Improve the quality of provision in early years by: raising teachers’ expectations; planning suitable activities which challenge children’s thinking; providing purposeful tasks to develop the skills children need to learn; using the outside provision to develop all areas of children’s learning.*”

Asked how close the school was to completing the POAP, the Head said that progress was well on track. All actions that should have been initiated in the autumn term had been, though the DHT noted that the implementation of Read Write Inc had been more time-consuming than anticipated. The identification and introduction of a new tracking system to replace SPTO would also take time that had not been planned for.

Replying to questions, the Head confirmed that the POAP would transform into a School Improvement Plan when the school moved out of Requires Improvement, hopefully at the next inspection. **Asked** about the likely timing of the next inspection, she said that the “window” would open in March 2019 and the inspection could happen any time in the following twelve months.

Asked about the annual bullying survey, the Head said that this had not yet started but that the School Council, who ran the survey, had it in hand.

- (b) **Governing Body section** – The Vice Chair said that, as agreed, she and the Chair had met to devise the RAG rating and text for the impact column of this section of the POAP. Governors discussed the draft and reached the following conclusions:
- **Section 7(i)** – A GB training plan was in place and was being monitored through a standing item on GB agendas. **Yellow agreed** (in hand, but not complete)
 - **Section 7.1** – Succession planning was on the agenda for this meeting. **Yellow agreed** (in hand, but not complete)
 - **Section 7(ii)** – Robust procedures, including the GB workplan and the Clerk’s knowledge of the cycle of statutory requirements, ensured that the GB fulfilled its statutory obligations. **Change to Green** (the procedures were such that, at any given time, the GB was up to date with its responsibilities).
 - **Section 7(iii)** – Governors noted that it was tricky to identify the contribution to school improvement made by the GB as distinct from all the other actions taken by the school. The GB now provided an effective challenge function alongside its support. It was increasingly capable of analysing and querying educational data and it had taken steps to co-opt governors with the experience to strengthen its financial governance so that it had been able to take difficult but necessary decisions in relation to the tight budget position. Governors visited school regularly and attended monitoring activities so that they had a clear understanding of the work of the school. **Change to Green**

Signed _____

Date: _____

- Section 7(iv) – As discussed at 7(iii). **Change to Green**
- Section 7(v) – This action was due to be initiated in April 2019. **Agreed no RAG rating**

The Chair and Vice Chair would update the GB section of the POAP to reflect these conclusions.

Chair,
Vice Chair

61/18 Receive report on any safeguarding issues arising since the Resources Committee met on 14 January 2019 and consider any action required

The Head said that there had been no major safeguarding incidents since the previous meeting. There had, however, been some serious behaviour incidents. Having ascertained that these incidents related to a matter that the Head had discussed with her prior to the meeting, the Clerk advised that it would not be appropriate for the Head to say more about them at this meeting but recommended that the Head brief the Named Governor for Safeguarding (NG/SG). The Head assured governors that the incidents, though serious, had not involved endangerment of pupils or staff.

Head,
NG/SG

62/18 Note report on Headteacher's Performance Management review

The Vice Chair reported that the Performance Management Committee had met in the presence of an external adviser to agree the Headteacher's objectives for the year ahead. As this was the Head's first year in post, there had been no prior year objectives to review and no pay recommendation. A mid-year review of the Headteacher's performance would be held, probably during March 2019.

63/18 Report on Governors' visits to school, training and development

Agenda paper

Governors thanked Ian Bester for the helpful report of his visit, which he said that he had found useful. His main observation had been about the use of Risk Assessments. Sarah Fernie said that she had visited in December 2018.

Governors had undertaken, or planned to undertake, training as follows:

Rebecca Reynolds, Ian Bester, John Hughes	Governor Induction
John Hughes	Ofsted inspections (March)
Ann Craggs	The wider curriculum (planned)
Sarah Teal	Named Governor for Safeguarding (planned)

The Vice Chair recommended the Effective Financial Governance course: it was useful and interesting and would be of benefit to all governors, though (as previously agreed), it was essential for members of the Resources Committee. John Hughes said that the Effective Financial Governance course was next due to be held on 30 January 2019, if governors were available

64/18 Report on Chair's actions and correspondence and consider ratification as necessary

None reported.

Signed _____

Date: _____

65/18 **Review policies and other key documents:***Agenda papers*(a) Governor Induction policy

- **The Governing Body unanimously approved** the Governor Induction policy.

Governors thought that it would be useful to have a Named Governor for Governor training and development. The role would be to take on the kind of tasks that had been performed by the Chair in the current year, such as drawing up the governor training plan; and to be aware of, and draw colleagues' attention to, training and development opportunities. **The GB asked** the Clerk to add this to the list of Named Governor roles for consideration when appointments were made at the last meeting of the year.

Clerk

- (b) Assessment policy – The Head said that the policy reflected practice in school at the present time. It would, however, need to be substantially re-written once a new tracking system replaced SPTO

- **The Governing Body unanimously approved** the Assessment policy.

- (c) Privacy Notice for governors and volunteers – Governors asked that the reference to “Head of School” in the final paragraph on page 4 be replaced by “Headteacher”.

- Subject to this amendment, **the Governing Body unanimously approved** the Privacy Notice.

- (d) (New sub-item) Behaviour policy (including flowchart for exclusions) – *circulated prior to meeting*

The Head said that the only amendment to this policy was the addition of three lines saying that the school would adhere to Local Authority and DfE¹¹ guidance with respect to permanent exclusion of pupils. She had circulated the flowchart to help governors to follow the process that would be involved if a permanent exclusion became necessary.

The Head reminded governors that the behaviour policy had always set out the range of possible sanctions leading up to a fixed term (usually one or two day) external exclusion. The criteria for an external exclusion were:

- Risk of danger to the pupil or to others
- Risk of damage to property
- Persistent low-level disruption

The Head could authorise fixed term exclusions of up to five days. Fixed term exclusions of six to fifteen days required consultation with governors. **Asked** whether this consultation was before or after the fact, the Head undertook to check.

Head

Permanent exclusion would be considered when a pupil had been externally excluded for fifteen or more days within any term. This level of exclusions indicated that a child was struggling to cope in a mainstream setting. Such a child would be given increased Social, Emotional and Behavioural support, including through work with external agencies, before the school took the step of considering permanent exclusion.

¹¹ DfE – Department for Education

Signed _____

Date: _____

- Subject to clarification of the point about consultation with governors, **the Governing Body unanimously approved** the Behaviour policy and exclusions flowchart.

66/18 Governing Body matters

- a) Monitor governor training plan and actions required before the next meeting – Governors noted that they were undertaking the planned training.
- b) Recruitment of governors – The Vice Chair said that action continued to identify a potential Co-opted Governor but without success. Governors agreed that she and the Head should arrange to e-mail to them a copy of the letter that she continued to send to potential sources so that they could circulate them it at their places of work. All
- c) Succession planning – The Vice Chair reminded governors hat both she and the Chair had indicated their intentions to step down at the start of the next academic year. Governors needed to consider whether they would be willing to step into these roles and, if so, start to undertake relevant training and development activity for those roles. All
- d) (New sub-item) Review days of the week for meetings – The Clerk said that the Resources Committee had noted that the practice of holding all meetings on Monday evenings, and often in two consecutive weeks, was not ideal for all governors. Governors considered alternatives but **concluded** that there was no alternative that would work for everyone. The GB therefore agreed to continue with the current schedule of meetings, though **they asked** the Clerk to try to avoid meetings in consecutive weeks as far as possible when planning the meeting schedule for 2019-20.

Noting that her domestic circumstances would make it difficult for Rebecca Reynolds to attend meetings of the Resources Committee for the remainder of 2018-19, **the Governing Body agreed** to give her a leave of absence from the Committee until September 2019. The Clerk would continue to send agendas, papers and minutes of Resources Committee meetings to her.

67/18 Any other urgent business referred from Item 49/18 above

- (a) The Head circulated the new Instrument of Government (IoG). The Clerk said that this related to the decision taken by the GB in November 2017 to reconstitute with effect from 01 January 2018. The IoG was the document that gave the Governing Body and its actions legal standing.

The Head said that the letter covering the IoG indicated that Co-opted Governors must start a new term of office from the date of reconstitution. The Clerk said that this conflicted with the advice that she had been given: she would clarify the position. [Clerk's note: see Clerk's e-mail to Governors of 24 January 2019, attached as Annex A]
- (b) The Head reminded governors that the subscription to the National Governors Association (NGA) gold package included online training. She would re-circulate the log-in details and asked that governors try out some of the training before the next meeting and determine whether it provided value for money. If not, it would make sense to subscribe to a lower level package in future.
- (c) Referring to the outstanding supply insurance claim of which governors were aware, the Head said that, using a draft provided by John Hughes, the Chair had written to

Head,
All

Signed _____

Date: _____

the company about the intercepted payment. She read out the response, which was a holding reply pending the return of the account manager from extended Christmas leave and promised a substantive response by 25 January 2019. The holding reply was not encouraging: she would keep governors informed.

68/18 Date of next meeting

The next meeting would be held at **5.45pm** on Monday **11 March 2019**.

The meeting closed at 8.27pm

Signed _____

Date: _____