

PATCHAM INFANT SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Committee | ETHOS LEARNING and ACHIEVEMENT AGENDA |
| Date/Time: | 30 th November 2016 4.30 pm |
| Location: | Meeting Room/Staff Room |
| For: | Governors |
| Distribution: | Learning Committee, Full Governing Body, Website following approval |
| Present: | Governors (voting) Andrew Ahmad Walsh (AAH) Helen Emerson (HE) Ron Guilford (RG) Chair of Governors Helen Hawkins (HH) Irene Leeves (IL) Chair of Committee Robert Lenton (RL) Margaret Maslink (MM) Chris Taylor (CT) Headteacher Other (non-voting) Janet Johnson (JJ) Clerk to Governors |

MINUTES

| | DISCUSSION and DECISION | ACTION |
|---|---|---------------|
| | <p>Acronyms : APS – Average Point Score ARE – Age Related Expectations EYFS – Early Years Foundation Stage LA – Local Authority NA – National Average PIS – Patcham Infant School PP – Pupil Premium or Disadvantaged RSE – Relationships and Sex Education PSHE – Personal Social Health and Emotional SEN (D) – Special Educational Needs (and Disabilities)</p> | |
| 1 | <p>WELCOME and apologies for absence IL opened the meeting. No apologies had been received.</p> | |
| 2 | <p>DECLARATION of interest in items on agenda No new declarations were made when invited. All governors could contribute and remain throughout.</p> | |
| 3 | <p>APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR In discussion IL was elected as Chair of Committee</p> | |
| 4 | <p>MINUTES of last meeting These were agreed to be an accurate record and signed by IL accordingly.</p> | |
| 5 | <p>MATTERS ARISING if not covered elsewhere</p> | |

| | | |
|---|--|----------|
| | <p>5.1 The Department for Education funds available for building resilience had appeared to have gone to academies and the high school partnership bid for was not successful.</p> <p>5.2 The senior leadership team met as part of the monitoring process to review the consistency of marking in writing. Maths would be reviewed the next week. CT informed he considered the system used by the school was manageable and consistency was improving.</p> <p>Will you be doing a book scrutiny looking at marking in particular in future?</p> <p>Yes, termly, in different ways.</p> <p>HH arrives.16.35</p> | |
| 6 | <p>TERMS OF REFERENCE</p> <p>The draft terms of reference were agreed. Individual roles for policy monitoring were agreed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEND - AAH as part of inclusion role. He would report back in spring this year and in the autumn meeting thereafter following the national data release. Pupil Premium reporting would be in spring. • Teaching and Learning – IL • RSE and PSHE – HE. <p>JJ recommended review of Social Moral Spiritual and Cultural be considered – it could be included within another remit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home school agreement – CT • EYFS – RL • Vision and Ethos – MM • Curriculum – It was agreed CT should advise governors if there were any changes • Equality objectives – CT • Exclusions – CT by report direct to full governing body. <p>JJ gave advice on the behaviour principles statement. Governors were in favour of the main principle being to create a culture for learning and that any behaviour policy be short and concise. CT would provide an up-date at the next meeting when it would be on the agenda.</p> | CT JJ |
| 7 | <p>VISION, GOALS AND PURPOSE STATEMENT</p> <p>BUILDING LEARNING POWER</p> <p>7.1 HH, CT and Nina Taylor joined the school as part of inset day with a diverse range of stakeholders looking at the school vision, goals and values. All contributions were valued. The results have been shared with governors, the headteacher of the Junior School, the school partnership advisor and the year one Explore and Discover afternoon. Some feedback had been received which was now discussed. It was felt laughter and friendship was now more of a tag line than a vision. The vision was agreed as:</p> <p>We dream, we aspire, we thrive. Powerful learning for life. The purpose goals and values were also agreed.</p> <p>Governors were pleased with the outcome of the work on the vision and congratulated CT. HH and Helen Erikson would pick out what the various parts of the vision would mean to the children and MM would monitor the evaluation of its success.</p> <p>7.2 Mary Chambers carried out a building learning power learning walk and had been overwhelmed by its success with the children here and the design of the curriculum. She thought we should showcase this for other teachers. We will do some research for her and we have got some cheap resources. We have also been asked to do a blog on their website so will be working with her till June.</p> | |

| | <p>Will you get some funds for this as you are in effect acting as consultants? We are working on that. A governor said it was a really powerful tool for impact on the children.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|-------------|-----------|-----------|---------|-------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------------|---------|--------|---------|--------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|------------------|--------|--------|--------|--|
| 8 | <p>PRIORITIES for 2016-17 In discussion at item 9 areas for focus would include: phonics, the disadvantaged and the higher attainers. Governors would keep a close check on progress data as it emerged.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | <p>2016 RESULTS – including KS1, Phonics, EYFS and RAISEonline 9.1 Governors had already received and considered the: 2016 RAISEonline summary report 2016; the school headlines headteacher report; data summary collection reports for Key Stage one results (2016), Reception attainment (2014-2016) and phonic screening (2012-2016); along with comparative data, average point score since 2012 in the various subjects for gender, ethnicity, SEND, English not as a first language and (discussed at item 10) disadvantaged learners (PP). Governors were aware of the changes to assessment the last year and the unreliability of attempting comparisons between years and between schools due to differences in teacher assessment.</p> <p>9.2 Results Summary Phonics – 86% (84.6% PP)(81%NA) in Year 1, 97% (88.8%PP)(91%NA) Year 2 (cumulative). Reception – Good level of development stable at 71% and above local authority (LA) 66% and national average (NA) 69%. Age related expectations (ARE) were lower than previous years. 65% of the cohort were boys. Key Stage 1 -</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>School (NA)</th> <th>Reading %</th> <th>Writing %</th> <th>Maths %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Expected or above</td> <td>70 (74)</td> <td>63 (65)</td> <td>71 (73)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Greater depth</td> <td>20 (24)</td> <td>2 (13)</td> <td>12 (18)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Expected or above PP(9 pupils)</td> <td>33 (78)</td> <td>33 (70)</td> <td>44 (77)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Greater depth PP</td> <td>0 (27)</td> <td>0 (16)</td> <td>0 (20)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Further information was given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PIS had been cautious about the new system and in hindsight, harsh in its marking. After further analysis CT considered an additional 10% of the cohort could have been awarded expected standard for all three subjects which would have raised outcomes to 64%. • Interventions following the departure of an underperforming teacher during the year needed more time take full effect. This had affected the PP phonics progress. • This year the school had worked extremely hard on writing as it was an area for development and there was a lot of evidence. • The disadvantaged had also been an area for development and there has been a staff meeting, teachers and teaching assistants know who they are. A 'grab pack' of tools for 5 minute interventions had been devised and was being used. • Higher attaining children – on paper it looks like not doing as well at working at greater depth. <p>How do the results compare in the city? The highest category for this school this year was now among the lower achievers, we are way down in with those</p> | School (NA) | Reading % | Writing % | Maths % | Expected or above | 70 (74) | 63 (65) | 71 (73) | Greater depth | 20 (24) | 2 (13) | 12 (18) | Expected or above PP(9 pupils) | 33 (78) | 33 (70) | 44 (77) | Greater depth PP | 0 (27) | 0 (16) | 0 (20) | |
| School (NA) | Reading % | Writing % | Maths % | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Expected or above | 70 (74) | 63 (65) | 71 (73) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Greater depth | 20 (24) | 2 (13) | 12 (18) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Expected or above PP(9 pupils) | 33 (78) | 33 (70) | 44 (77) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Greater depth PP | 0 (27) | 0 (16) | 0 (20) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| | <p>schools in challenging circumstances.</p> <p>How do we know this is accurate? It is not. I have spent months trying to unpick the data. The data on one year alone is not reliable particularly if you look at our trends. Against NA we have been very good in the past. Phonics has increased from 46% to 86% so we know we have good provision; however Raise is showing we have weaknesses across phonics. Also the data from EYFS for that cohort was from when assessments were not as robust as now. This may partially explain it and there was a new system. The year 2 teachers said they felt the cohort had gone up more ready for year 3 work than before. We have asked the Junior school to confirm whether they were Junior ready. If you look through the historical data and the groups they have done well over time, however, this year, not so. The disadvantaged again have historically not been disadvantaged here but on Raise not looking particularly good.</p> <p>CT had attended an Ofsted meeting last week and was advised to retain evidence of the historical data.</p> <p>Have you any evidence so far that things you have introduced are having an impact? Yes from the book scrutiny. Real data will need to wait to the end of this term. At the first data point at October half term not enough had been covered so they need a bit longer. The cohort that year 2 have inherited are very strong but the picture may look different the next year as 66% are boys and 42 are summer born. We are monitoring them</p> <p>Reading. I noticed reading was down to 74% ARE from 83% last year for reception, less so than the writing. If we look at the year 1s that were emerging, they were very young boys and their skills were not there. HH is looking at phonic intervention with a group of 30 summer born boys. You will recall the Reception environment was changed around for them.</p> <p>Governors commended the results in reception as they were above NA. They lamented the change in government stance in now judging the school on the previously denied correlation between EYFS outcomes and the rest of the curriculum.</p> <p>Looking at phonics outcomes the progress on the phonics results is incredible over time. Are there other areas that are not getting the attention they need? When the school partnership advisor saw the data she too wondered whether we had taken our finger off the pulse and spent too much time looking at learning behaviours. I do not think that. What we are doing this year is refining our planning to link to the assessment criteria much better. The 2 year phonic drive did not impact last year's results so there has been no change there. The only thing that has changed is the new framework so we need to give it more time. We know where the focus needs to be.</p> <p>What are your plans for tracking on route? The first lot of tracking has happened. We will monitor at Christmas and will expect to see children are working where they need to be and we also need to look at the combined score.</p> <p>With the phonics improvement it doesn't make sense that other areas would drop. It should enhance the outcome. HH what has happened is that year 2 is ready straight away for the spelling. The school would be more confident in its assessments this year. See item 8.</p> | |
| 10 | <p>OUTCOMES for PUPIL PREMIUM PUPILS 2016</p> <p>Historically this group performed well on APS. Their year 1 teaching needed improvement. Of that, some of those children were borderline, 2 were on child protection plans and of the 4 spaces with the school counsellor all were in this group. One child had high needs. We have case studies for them and the</p> | |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| | <p>progress made was great. Governors considered that if this was the start of a trend it would be of concern. It was cohort specific based around assessment criteria. In previous years they performed in line with NA. Would you change anything? No. A governor thought it would be useful to see what strategies were in place and whether they are having the impact and whether the pot of money is being used and CT confirmed Michelle Doyle reported on this termly. A governor could confirm there was an expectation that the teachers were on the case and checked in daily with the PP. Do you approach families to help? We do positively discriminate some families and get them on board. Governors thanked staff for their work in this area which would remain under scrutiny. Governors would consider gradings for the School Self Evaluation form.</p> | |
| 11 | <p>SCHOOL COUNCIL A governor had provided a further report on the school council meeting which was accepted with thanks. Is there anything else to add? Governors were pleased to learn from CT that the school councillors had helped with food tasting from Eden food service, filling out questionnaires and had a voice. A governor made a suggestion for books and a small budget to be under the control of the school council was agreed.</p> | |
| 12 | <p>GOVERNOR VISITS SINCE LAST MEETING Early Years Foundation Stage The full report following the visit by two governors had already been considered. Further information was given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EYFS had a vibrant pulse with purposeful, concentrating play. • Provision for children to play in a meaningful collaborative way was clear. • It was clear resources had been made to be accessible. • Reception children were really engaged even without an adult there, as was the expectation. • It met with governors' vision. <p>Discussion turned how to engage with parents at that age. CT would consider some funding for some home games packs. The report was accepted and RL would return in the summer term to review the policy.</p> | |
| 13 | <p>FUTURE GOVERNOR VISIT – focus AAH would be undertaking a learning walk on inclusion and report back.</p> | |
| 14 | <p>TRAINING There would be at least two from the GB attending the RAISEonline for infant school course. RL leaves 18.00 Suggestions and views for the FGB training session on 8th February were requested to be directed to IL. 20th February was the City school partnership training. The list of LA governor training was considered. The hearing training was considered to be more useful to PIS than the exclusion training for which JJ could provide guidance.</p> | |
| 15 | <p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING 8.3.17</p> | |

Signed IL 8.3.17 and noted in minutes of that meeting