

**CARDEN PRIMARY SCHOOL  
GOVERNING BODY MEETING  
MINUTES**

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Development and Resources</b>
<b>Date/Time:</b>	4.00 pm 4 <sup>th</sup> May 2017
<b>Location:</b>	Carden Primary School
<b>For:</b>	Development and Resources Committee
<b>Distribution:</b>	Website The Governing Body Nicky Buttress Lisa Perrins
<b>Quorum:</b>	3
<b>Present:</b>	Governors (voting) Helen Longton-Howorth (HLH) Headteacher Jeff Nixon (JN) Chair of Governors Pete Sandeman (PSD) Chair of Development and Resources Committee Paul Smith (PS) Other (non-voting) Nicki Buttress (NB) School Business Manager Janet Johnson (JJ) Clerk to Governors Lisa Perrins (LP) SENCO
<b>Apologies:</b>	n/a

	<b>DISCUSSION AND DECISION</b>	<b>ACTIONS</b>
1	<b>Introduction</b> PSD opened this meeting of the full committee.	
2	<b>Declarations of Interest</b> No new interests were declared when invited and all governors were entitled to take full part in discussions and decisions.	
3	<b>Minutes from last Meeting and Matters Arising</b> The minutes of the meeting were agreed to be an accurate record and signed by the Chair accordingly The Consistent Financial Reporting report had yet to be provided. Production of the cost centre analysis had now resumed when reporting projected outturn figures to governors. All other matters had been completed or no longer required.	NB PSD/JN
4	<b>Ensuring financing is effective in improving learning and achieving value for money</b> Governors had already received and considered the final outturn 2016/17 with notes on anomalies and the budget projection for 2017/18. NB and HLH gave further information 4.1 Outturn 2016/17. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The final outcome (Deficit £17,656) differed from that planned because of Nursery clawback.</li> </ul>	

**CARDEN PRIMARY SCHOOL  
GOVERNING BODY MEETING  
MINUTES**

	<p>❖ <b>The outturn was agreed by governors.</b></p> <p>4.2 Budget 2017/18</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The staffing restructure was proceeding to schedule with advice from the local authority human resources department.</li> <li>• HLH had met with the new service on site and had requested a contribution from them of 25% of utility bills (proportion of building occupied). It was noted they used the facilities all through the year, including school holidays.</li> <li>• The budget was based on the staffing restructure proceeding but did not incorporate any final payments that may be needed. The surplus at the end of the year was projected to be £41k from which redundancy payments would be taken. Staffing costs still accounted for 109% of the budget.</li> <li>• The planning application for advertisements had been rejected and an appeal lodged. Existing advertisements were allowed to remain until July.</li> <li>• Admissions for September 2017 were currently at 58, all first or second choices.</li> </ul> <p><b>How much has been raised in fundraising?</b> £7.5/8k in all.  <b>Are there any other revenue streams?</b> Nothing significant.  A governor gave some advertising suggestions and another advised the top-slicing of any pension might be paid in instalments.  There were no other questions and the budget was accepted.  NB left 16.27</p> <p>4.3 No amendments had been received for the Scheme of Delegation and this would be reviewed autumn 17.</p> <p>4.4 Evaluation of Sports premium effectiveness  This was deferred until the next meeting when more information would be available. HLH confirmed the review had commenced and there were no concerns.</p> <p>4.5 Has the school fund been audited? This would be for the autumn 17 meeting along with the charging policy review.</p>	
5	<p><b>Were Pupil Premium funds 2015/16 spent effectively?</b>  Governors recalled Ofsted had been complimentary about the pupil premium work and the reports. They had already considered the pupil premium report and evaluation along with LP’s response to a number of queries raised by governors. LP now gave further information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LP and HLH had met to draw up the rationale and LP evaluated progress termly through discussions and hard data at least annually and this was then added to the report.</li> <li>• She was confident as a school with how we are spending pupil premium</li> </ul> <p><b>We know Ofsted praised the school’s approach and achievement. Are there any changes following Ofsted or your usual monitoring?</b> We flagged last year that there had been nothing in place for the higher achieving pupil premium pupils so this year we introduced the ‘story bones’ work, a termly weekly intervention. The focus was to start with the more able then when they finished it moved on to the</p>	

**CARDEN PRIMARY SCHOOL  
GOVERNING BODY MEETING  
MINUTES**

	<p>others. We will do this again next year. We also used some of the money for some of the speech and language pupils. HLH added that the learning mentors were really well used. Most of their case load comprised pupil premium pupils as they gave that child what they need which also had a beneficial impact on the learning environment for other children.</p> <p>A question raised by a governor 'for pupils that continue to receive the benefit of these provisions, have we seen a continued improved progress between their achievements in key stage 1 and those now seen in key stage 2?' had prompted thought and it was decided this would be monitored longer term and the data was easily available.</p> <p>Governors passed on their thanks to LP who left 16.43. The reports were accepted.</p>	
6	<p><b>Are School improvement (D&amp;R sections) going to plan?</b></p> <p>No written reports had been received. Governors were aware much leadership and management time was focussed on the budget and related restructure work. HLH informed the actions for the next stage of the plan were in place, such as planning for staff meetings, lesson observations and appraisals.</p> <p>Do you get enough governor attendance at the development of the plan meetings? No.</p> <p>Governors support headteacher in the consultation. Welcome ideas and realise they want it going forward to be good.</p>	
7	<p><b>Effectiveness of Committee</b></p> <p>Governors reviewed the terms of reference and the previous year's effectiveness document. In discussion it was agreed that the committee worked well and was effective. HLH informed she found it useful.</p> <p>JJ had been in discussion with JN with a view to reorganising some of the work of the governing body to reflect its current circumstances and these were now briefly outlined. Going forward it was agreed this committee should continue with its present membership and remit. JJ would submit a discussion document for the full governing body meeting on 26<sup>th</sup> June.</p>	
8	<p><b>SFVS</b></p> <p>It was agreed the action plan would be monitored by JN and reviewed by committee in March 2018.</p>	
9	<p><b>Policies</b></p> <p>9.1 Data policies for D&amp;R and HSW committees. The link governor reported there was nothing of concern to report to governors. Their vision was being met and processes were in order for both the D&amp;R and HSW policies. It was agreed any data protection linked policies remaining on the HSW committee list should be transferred to D&amp;R.</p> <p>9.2 Appraisal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Headteacher performance management (HTPM). The HTPM group now reported this was proceeding according to plan. The last meeting had been the previous month and performance was on track.</li> <li>• Rest of staff. This up-date was not received.</li> </ul> <p>9.3 Nursery admissions policy – the policy was not yet available. It would be rewritten with a new Early Years lead.</p>	<p>JJ/FGB (R)</p> <p>PSD</p>

**CARDEN PRIMARY SCHOOL  
GOVERNING BODY MEETING  
MINUTES**

10	<p><b>Reducing Teacher Workload</b> Governors had already noted the recommendations following the review of teacher workload nationally and HLH now informed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marking was discussed frequently and we don't believe teachers overmark. No complaints had been received.</li> <li>• The school did not expect teachers to have lesson plans.</li> </ul> <p><b>Do teachers have to do them every lesson?</b> They draw up long and medium-term plans together and use them. They don't have lengthy meetings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We use high quality resources and schemes of work which were reviewed a couple of years ago at the last curriculum review.</li> <li>• For data, we expect teachers to use the Venn diagram method but only as a working document.</li> <li>• For workload we do have to be mindful that in the future we may need to be more creative with some administrative tasks currently done by teaching assistants. We are looking at using school direct students.</li> <li>• We are maintaining cover teaching.</li> <li>• Teachers would but have not said they are overloaded.</li> <li>• The school's overall approach was to keep work on a necessary basis.</li> </ul> <p>Governors were satisfied the responses met with their knowledge of the school and no further action was required now.</p>	
11	<p><b>Next meeting: Pay committee 12<sup>th</sup> July</b> It was agreed the next meeting of the committee would be 5<sup>th</sup> October 2017 (Thursday)</p>	

.....signature noted in minutes.....signed .....dated

# CARDEN PRIMARY SCHOOL GOVERNING BODY MEETING MINUTES

Questions are primarily aimed at the 2016/2017 report.

With regard to the Annual cost column, does this represent actual spend incurred or planned spend for the duration of the provision?

This is the planned spend.

Are all provisions currently meeting expectations with regard to cost and effectiveness? If not, which areas have not met initial expectations and has regular assessment allowed for an improved outcome?

Provision is reviewed and evaluated termly by myself and ongoing discussions with SLT/ teachers/ outside agencies/ Intervention TA. Helen and I discuss the rationale and provision for the next year at an annual meeting. Provision is adapted and changed if it does not meet expectations or is not cost effective. Teachers / children are asked for feedback as well as the use of hard data. Key organisations LSS, Dialogue and play therapist as well as school staff are aware of the accountability attached to the money and the expectation of feedback.

A couple of changes from last year are Success @ Arithmetic – dealt with small numbers of pupils and there was limited evidence of impact for the amount of TA time / costs. Also last year a recognition that the needs of the SLC pupils were not been fully met by the whole school PP approach. The SLC pupils needed to be able to access whole school resources and have more personalised approach. The decision was made that an amount of funding was given to SLC and this funding was to be evaluated by the SLC lead.

Where pupil attainment ratings have been noted as 'Not Met' i.e. on page 10 of your report dated 2016/17, has achievement been broadly in line with our expectations?

Not Met – this links to the phonics check in Year 1. Children will re-take the phonics check in Year 2 and this data will be inputted as an example of impact in the summer term. Children are identified for FFT intervention if they have not met phonics check in Year 1 as it may indicate Literacy difficulties. PP children are targeted first. All children who did not meet phonics check in Year 1 apart from 1 child have received or are receiving FFT intervention. Last year of the 6 Y2 pupils targeted 3 Y2 achieved Phonics check and of the 3 Y2 who did not achieve the phonics check 2 increased their scores by 16/17 marks compared to Year1. 2 Y2 pupils referred to specialist Literacy teacher and are now on intensive caseload. (2015-2016 report)

For pupils that have achieved their benchmark rating, have they met or exceeded our own expectations?

Depends on individual pupil and individual pupil data is looked at within PP meetings and tracked at the end of year for Key year groups. For all children we are working at all children making expected progress.

In 2015 – 2016 in school progress from starting points is overall positive for Pupil Premium pupils and is comparable to progress for Non-Pupil Premium pupils.

For pupils that continue to receive the benefit of these provisions, have we seen a continued improved progress between their achievements in KS1 and those now seen in KS2?

This is an area that needs further development. There is anecdotal information which indicates positive progress but further tracking of for example FFT pupils, star class pupils are needed. There

## **CARDEN PRIMARY SCHOOL GOVERNING BODY MEETING MINUTES**

are a few pupils who are identified for a high level of input and may receive a number of key PP interventions however these are usually pupils who have other additional needs and therefore the provision is correctly targeted.

**When children have been transitioned out of a provision, such as the 'Star Class', what support is made available to ensure that pupils retain the benefit and continue to improve?**

The children received Learning Mentor provision for at least the first term following star class. Some of the children have also received interventions for Learning as they are now able to access this intervention. One child is also going to access counselling.

**Although we received good feedback from OFSTED on the general provision provided, have we made any amendments to our approach as a direct result of their report? If so, what changes have been implemented?**

Prior to OFSTED the school had identified the need for a focus on the more able PP pupils. A provision for this was included as part of the provision for Storybones provision which was initially targeted at the more able. PP writers. The provision has extended since to include other PP children with the focus on improving writing.

The provision for SLC children was also updated this year following evaluation from last year and now is being used as described above.

Now we have moved into the summer term, are you of the view that this year's provisions have been correctly focused and are there plans for a change in approach within the next academic year? If changes are to be implemented, will this be as a result of limited ongoing success from the current provision or a change in focus within the school plan? What, if any are the anticipated changes?

The focus for provision this year has been even more directly linked to PP children including learning mentor caseload but we also continue to include the lowest attaining pupils in Year 2 / Year 1 as part of the learning provision. Our aim with PP funding is to close the attainment gap and this includes PP and Non-PP children therefore on all caseloads – LM, LLS, intervention TA there will be PP and Non-PP children. We also recognise as a school that Early intervention is key for both emotional / mental health issues as well as for learning this is why Star class, play therapy, FFT is targeted at KS1 pupils and especially Year 1.

Changes to provision may take place this year for all the reasons listed above. At the moment it is likely that provision such as counsellor, LSS teacher will remain the same. It will also be important to continue to plan for more able pupils as part of PP funding. There may be some changes to other areas in response to School Plan and budget implications.