

**CARDEN PRIMARY SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY MINUTES**

Committee	Development and Resources
Date/Time:	11 th February 4.00 pm
Location:	Carden Primary School
For:	Development and Resources Committee
Distribution:	Website The Governing Body Attendees
Quorum:	3
Attendees	Governors: Jeff Nixon (JN) Chair of Committee Helen Longton-Howarth (HLH) Headteacher Margaret Garrard (MG) Paul Smith (PS) Karen Wicker (KW) Pete Sandeman (PSD) Daniel Holmes (DH) Other: Lisa Perrins (LP) Nicki Buttress (NB) Bursar Janet Johnson (JJ) Clerk

MINUTES

	DISCUSSION and DECISIONS	ACTIONS
1	Welcome JN opened the meeting. No apologies had been received.	
2	Declaration of Interest in items on the agenda No new declarations were made when invited.	
3	Minutes from last Meeting Subject to changing PS to PSD on page 4 the minutes from 16.11.15 were agreed as accurate and signed accordingly.	#
4	Matters Arising if not covered elsewhere Matters were all completed or covered elsewhere on the agenda.	
5	Continued Profession Development (CPD): Governors had already considered the report from MG and PSD. Since the report had been circulated the school had promptly drawn up a CPD policy and this was welcomed as a positive move. Other governors confirmed they had evidenced the impact of CPD and praised in particular the benefits of improving middle management. They had noted that whilst Edison had been covering a lot of CPD within the school, ownership now lay within the school. What are the opportunities for assistance in the future? There are some but	

**CARDEN PRIMARY SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY MINUTES**

	<p>at a cost and there may not be funds available.</p> <p>In discussion governors noted the links with the appraisal policy and agreed the CPD experience at the school was good. Edison was considered to have been very effective. The report's findings and recommendations were accepted.</p> <p>Governors commented it was disappointing to see the lack of CPD priority given by government in both the supporting of their new initiatives and developing top leadership.</p> <p>PSD and MG were thanked for their useful report. The focus for next year will be how CPD is taken forward once Edison moved on, including the need for external input.</p> <p>Is it ensuring equitable progression? This was not covered at this point.</p>	
6	<p>Ensuring financing is effective in improving learning and achieving value for money</p> <p>6.1 Evaluation of pupil premium. Governors had previously received and scrutinised the pupil premium report and submitted many queries relating to each of the key stages. The questions and responses are annexed to these minutes. Governors confirmed that responses were in accordance with their own observations. Further information was given:</p> <p>6.1.1 General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non class based full time Teaching Assistant (TA). The TA was a very useful member of staff, adapting the programme to suit individual children and dealing with parents who have also been invited in to observe the intervention. LP uses the phonics check and year 2 data to assess need and last year all the pupils the TA had dealt with passed the phonics test at year 2. • Any children that aren't on track are named as targeted children • Pupil premium are always discussed first. • Gaps were narrower lower down the school and results from earlier interventions were still working through the school especially as a lot of the focus has been lower down the school. <p>6.1.2 Governors were pleased to note progress from all was expected and were satisfied. They were aware from the Education Endowment fund findings that as well as marking, universal improvement strategies had the most impact in narrowing the gap and supported the school in pursuing these measures.</p> <p>6.1.3 Now the maths specialist is going what will fund be spent on? Discussion turned to evaluating whether interventions were value for money. There were several options of which drilling down was one. The</p>	MG PSD

CARDEN PRIMARY SCHOOL GOVERNING BODY MINUTES

<p>evaluation took place termly to ensure the most effective measures for the current situation were in place. One example of an intervention ceasing was Every Child a Reader as it had been found to not be a good use of spending.</p> <p>6.1.4 Inclusion mentors and play therapies. Play therapies were free. Inclusion mentors incurred the greatest expense and thus given greater focus at progress meetings. The evaluation was still developing particularly with linking learning mentors to learning as well as with behaviour. In recognition of difficulties identified in the nursery an additional learning mentor had been employed. This strategy had been endorsed by the DfE in its 'supporting the attainment of disadvantaged pupils: ... good practice' guide. Governors knew there was little support for schools for pupils at that age. The school uses historic data that shows changes in behaviour e.g. in red slips and we can see if there is an impact. If there is a high level of red slips a learning mentor will be allocated. An improvement has been seen over a year and much improvement compared with historic data. The play therapies were going to be evaluated after half term.</p> <p>6.1.5 Further Early years queries What was the impact on the reception class? A group came in with 51% Good Level of Development. They were showing accelerated progress as they were already on 64% in year 1 and the current year 2 was already on track. How do we identify successful transition from nursery to transition? A parent questionnaire. 88 parents said children were confident, 12 said children were ok and 100% were happy with their first term. Feedback from the teaching assistants and teachers had been that the transition was smooth. Why is there a disparity in the numbers of pupil premium children in the nursery compared with the rest of the school? NB had already looked into this and checked with Finance department - the criteria is slightly different.</p> <p>6.1.6 The school partnership adviser had visited the school and reviewed the use of pupil premium. HLH would circulate the report.</p> <p>6.1.7 Counsellor. Pupils were identified for this service by staff in discussion and mainly if a concern was having an impact on learning or a specific crisis in the family. The length of the counselling would be discussed by LP, the deputy head teacher and the counselling team. Pupil premium children tended to be given greater priority.</p> <p>6.1.8 Speech and Language. The impact evaluation session had now been completed.</p> <p>6.1.9 How is provision linked to the school plan? Our whole school plan is focussed on children meeting Age Related Expectations. It is all about breaking down barriers for children. PS would be monitoring the Key stage</p>	<p>HLH</p> <p>PS</p> <p>LP</p>
--	--------------------------------

CARDEN PRIMARY SCHOOL GOVERNING BODY MINUTES

2 progress in maths and supported the use of case studies.
Talk boost progress would be checked in the summer term.
LP was thanked for her work and responses.
DH arrives 16.28

6.2 Is funding being spent as planned?

Governors had already received the current outturn forecast with detailed explanations of any anomalies.

The surplus was currently forecast to be in the region of £21k with a final figure of £15-16k more likely. Governors were satisfied funding had been spent as planned and had no further questions. Discussion turned to the draft budget.

6.3 On what basis are the draft budgets 16/17 and 17/19 being prepared and what are the preliminary findings? The Local Authority had notified the school of its budget share in recent days and governors now considered the latest draft of the budget 16/17. The budget 17/19 had yet to be drafted.

6.3.1 The budget had been drawn up on the following basis:

- Using all local knowledge for staffing.
- Reduction in agency staff following successful introduction of 'in house' supply.
- Maintaining existing staffing levels
- Maintaining existing numbers on roll
- Including only compulsory training
- A lower expenditure on ICT replacement than requested
- Maintaining curriculum spending with each phase responsible for their own
- Worst case scenario re ground works
- Rates as last year
- Lower water costs as refurbishment of original loos expected.
- Lettings would be discussed at 6.5

6.3.2 **Do you group buy with other schools?** We have tried doing that but it did not work out. We have space and we bulk buy.

What ICT needs replacing? The whiteboards were all bought at the same time and are nearing the end of their life.

Where do parentmail entries go? In office other

How much was Sickly? NB will check and advise.

Is the High need income confirmed? Yes, it is mainly speech and language.

How do you propose addressing the anticipated deficit (year 1 £80k less any carried forward surplus)? By natural wastage of staff and increase in income from an increase in roll. The LA had given a strong indication numbers on roll would be higher next year, thereby increasing income. In 5 years' time the school was expecting to be full. At present there were still 90 places short.

NB

NB JN

**CARDEN PRIMARY SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY MINUTES**

From 11.2.16	OWNER	ACTIONS	DUE BY
5	MG PSD	Take CPD forward including addressing evidencing ensuring equitable progression	Ongoing
6.1.6	HLH	Circulate LM report re pupil premium	10.3.16
6.1.9	PS	Continue with monitoring KS2 progress Maths	27.4.16
6.1.9	LP	Provide info re Talk boost progress/evaluation for next meeting	27.4.16
6.3.2	NB	Remind gobs of cost of Sickly	10.3.16
6.3.3	NB JN	Draft and circulate 17/19 projections and liaise LA and committee	10.3.16
6.4	KW JN NB	Finalise SFVS 15/16 and action plan 16/17. Ensure Business continuity Plan in place.	10.3.16
6.5	HLH KW	Liaise re new lettings policy, rates and letters	10.3.16
7	PSD JN PS	Agree monitoring arrangements re pay – liaise JN HLH re information required (brought forward from Nov)	End March

Signed..... J Nixon 05.05.16

CARDEN PRIMARY SCHOOL GOVERNING BODY MINUTES

Appendix PUPIL PREMIUM

Specialist maths teacher:

We are now just over 4 months into the new academic year. Has there been any interim evaluation or indeed end of intervention outcomes?

Yes – see updated evidence December 2015. All pupils have made progress. Teacher feedback has been positive and links were made between the intervention and the classroom.

Specialist Literacy teacher:

is there any tracking / evaluating during the programme? (currently only end of programme evaluation is mentioned in the plan)

Termly evaluations of work completed. Weekly contact with SENCO / Class teacher and TAs. Work provided for pupils weekly. Ongoing concerns can be raised during the year. End of programme evaluation is for intensive pupils and standardised testing is used annually.

Pupil progress termly meetings.

How will teacher and TA confidence through training be evaluated?

Lesson observations are used to identify if resources are evident in classrooms. Recent Year 1 observation – communication in print grids of topic vocabulary, word mats etc were all being used. Clicker 6 is being used and identified on planning / individual learning plans. Teachers are using talking tins to support pupils. Teachers are willing to contact Rose and ask for advice on a regular basis.

Non class based full time TA:

FFT wave 3 intervention -Who will be evaluating that progress made by pupils through the various programmes then transfers to the classroom?

See end of intervention data grids and also end of year data is recorded. Class teachers are involved in identifying pupils for intervention. Ann is very aware of transferring skills and has discussions with the teacher and ensures similar resources are in place in the classroom to encourage independent working.

Year 1 teachers are attending Talk Boost training to ensure the links are made between classroom and intervention.

Wave 2 School start, Talk Boost and Narrative:

KS1 Evaluating impact section: Overall attainment and progress in r, w and m and boys attainment in r,w,m.... 'will improve'. What are the expectations for improvement?

Linked to the targets set for year groups and classes. These targets are discussed as part of pupil progress meetings and appraisal meetings. Aim is for children to reach age related expectations at the end of the year.

Inclusion mentors, counsellor and play therapist:

How will 'positive impact on learning, progress and attainment' be measured and against what?

Engagement in learning aspect of counsellor questionnaire – teacher, pupil and parent/carer views at start and finish of sessions.

Pupils are discussed at SAF meetings and academic data is reviewed termly and annually to see if pupils are making progress / achieving at age related expectations. This is an area we are continuing to develop. Data is compared to expectations for all

CARDEN PRIMARY SCHOOL GOVERNING BODY MINUTES

pupils e.g. 4 APS points KS2 / 6APS points KS1. This year % progress across the year will be looked at and age expected data.

Learning mentors are going to become more involved with termly learning conferences which we are planning for targeted pupil premium pupils in the summer term.

EYFS Pupil Premium 2015 – 16

Are there specific identifying factors for ' a successful transition from Nursery into reception'?

Parent feedback from EYFS questionnaire – see updated EYFS rationale. Teacher / TA feedback comparing start of year arrangements.

End of year data as regarding progress from Nursery to Reception.

- Re: specialist maths teacher. In the evaluating section, do we have an idea as to how much progress is expected? Is the level of progress expected to match the evidenced Number Age gain of 16 months in 4 months? Since we now have 2 terms behind us, how do we know we are on track?

Yes the aim would be the average expected progress across the pupil group taking account individual differences. As this is a very intensive and highly specialised and expensive intervention we would be expecting high levels of progress. See data collection sheet.

- Re: specialist literacy teacher. In the evaluating impact section, do we have more detail on what these bespoke programmes look like? And in terms of Teaching and TAs feeling more confident to ID needs - how do we measure this?

IEPs are produced for pupils who are on the intensive caseload. Targeted pupils are given activities linked to their specific needs and a communication book is in place between TAs and Rose Carter to share information. Rose adds new activities weekly or as necessary which are then carried out by TAs. Rose also links in with teachers as necessary and with SENCO weekly.

Teachers / TAS are happy to ask for advice and to use resources. See KS1 information.

- Re: Wave 2 interventions . In the evaluating impact section, it is stated that overall attainment in reading, writing and maths "will improve", but do we have expectations as to how much?

- Re: Inclusion mentors. This seems to be the biggest YOY increase in terms of spend (obviously because increasing number of staff from 3 to 5, representing an increase of 27.5k in spend). How do we know that this is the best area for increase in spend? How many pupils will there be per mentor on average? Will this mean more mentor to pupil support time or are there just more pupils to support?

4 Learning Mentors are employed – 3 full time and 1 2days a week.

The main reason for the increase was due to the recognition that the school needed to plan for early intervention based on the high levels of needs identified in Nursery and Reception. The development of a specialised Nurture group using the Boxall profile / training has been part of this provision. There was limited support being offered to the school for this age high need pupils. (Find a creative solution)

There is historic evidence to show that early intervention is necessary and helps to ensure that the majority of pupils entering the end of Y2 and KS2 are emotionally able to engage in their learning (Tamsin case study / Lewis C case study). It is a key feature of our school and as identified in the recent DFE report on disadvantaged pupils Nov 2015. Successful schools have really effective behaviour strategies and strong social and emotional support strategies including working with families.

CARDEN PRIMARY SCHOOL GOVERNING BODY MINUTES

Learning mentor system is being developed to link in more closely with learning in the classroom. Learning conferences – using data from achievement teams etc.

- Re: counsellor. How do we ID who needs/qualifies for counselling?

Discussion between SENCO / DHT and counsellor.

Children may be identified as part of CP intervention, as a result of ongoing concerns re: emotional presentation in school that is impacting on learning or as a result of a specific crisis in the family – bereavement. Ongoing discussions take place throughout the year as to length of counselling and also counsellor meets with parents / class teacher.

Pupils with PP / Disadvantaged are given priority and children preparing to transition.

- Very interested to see how the play therapist (seemingly a new venture YOY) works out and what impact this might have

Feedback from parent/carer, pupil and teacher is positive so far. Some interventions are due to end at Feb half term. Strength and Difficulty questionnaires have been completed at start and will be done at end of sessions.

- Re: speech and language centre. Do we not have impact evaluation metrics for this section or is this elsewhere?

Now added!

- Re: enrichment activities. Again in the evaluation section, do we have expected levels of progress/impact? and how often monitored to ensure on track?

Links in with whole class targets and targets for children not on track as part of Appraisal meetings. Discussed at pupil progress meetings.

With regard to the provisions for both the 'Councillor' and 'Specialist Literacy Teacher', 'evidence of success' seems to have come by way of their own reports. How did we at Carden validated these stated results or where they accepted on face value?

See other question responses. Ongoing discussions weekly / half termly. Clear criteria for referral. Annual meetings with service provider.

Other provisions clearly show improvement, but the report does not indicate how we should recognise success. i.e. What were our expectations and how can they be compared against the actual results.

Need to see progress as part of the interventions and that this progress is indicated in end of year progress / age expected data.

There is a provision for 'Pupil Premium Support Management'. Can some of this benefit output, be transferred to each of the provision 'Evidence of Impact' sections. I would like to understand for each provision, whether or not expected results or benefits were met or exceeded. If they were not met, at what period in the academic year was this recognised, what action was taken to resolve and whether or not the provision was abandoned.

No longer payment for Pupil premium support management – now just part of job description. Provision is reviewed termly and changes are made as necessary. Continually being reviewed and as part of pupil progress meetings. Meetings between SLT.

For areas that cover attendance/exclusions and red slips, can we have a clear statement on whether the improvement was achieved as a direct consequence of the provision, a

CARDEN PRIMARY SCHOOL GOVERNING BODY MINUTES

movement of pupils from one key stage group to another or whether it was a result of individual pupils leaving Carden Primary?

Historic data indicates the changes. Individual pupil data is also held so that changes for individual pupils are tracked. This is used to identify learning mentor provision.

Probably a bit late for last years report, but an indication as to how each provision was linked to the School Plan and how we can better articulate provision/benefit against KS1, KS2 or 'Whole School'.

Provision is focussed on ensuring all pupils reach age expected results. The provision links to the School Plan because of this focus on breaking down barriers for children and ensuring they reach their potential.

Academic Year - 2015/2016

Not sure if it is too late to change the format of the report or something to consider for future use. I find a 'Storyboard' style flows well, and is a useful tool in helping to articulate a journey.

Here, I would like to see this flow, such as 'How does this feature in our school single plan', 'What do we need to achieve, to recognise success?', 'What does success look like?', 'What provision (and cost) is available to us, in order that we may achieve our goal?', 'What actions or regularly signposted activities need to be completed, to ensure we remain on target?', 'What was the final result?', 'What was the actual cost of provision', and finally 'Was the provision deemed a success?'

Please send an example for us to look at in discussion with SLT.