

THE GOVERNING BODY OF HINCHLIFFE MILL JUNIOR AND INFANT SCHOOL

Minutes of the meeting of the Governing Body held at 6.30 pm at the School on Tuesday 17 July 2018.

Present: Charles Crossland (CC), Stephen Clarke (SC), Yvonne Donkersley (YD), Nicola Holgate (NH), Angela Hornby (AH), Lauren Metcalfe (LM), Rebecca Townsend (RT), Allister Turner (AT)

In Attendance: Sandra Schoolar (SS) – Clerk, Victoria McCormick (VM) – Observer, Deborah Hirst (DH) – Co-opted Governor

Apologies: Vivienne Short (VS)

The meeting commenced at 6.30pm and closed at 8.50pm.

CC welcomed Deborah Hirst who is to join the GB. It was unanimously **agreed** to appoint her as co-opted governor from September. Ms Hirst gave a brief resumé of her experience. She had attended the Head Teacher's appraisal and is to focus on governor training.

Agenda Item	Discussion and Decisions	Action – who / by
2327.	Apologies for Absence, Consent, Declarations of Interest The governing body accepted the apologies of VS.	
2328.	Notification of items to be brought up under Any Other Business (i) Governor recruitment. (ii) Governor action plan. (iii) Governors' profile on website. (iv) MUGA.	
2329.	Minutes of the Previous Meeting held 15 May 2018 There were the following amendments: Matter 2312 – under Matter 2298 – The second sentence to read ...in safeguarding in respect to SEND. Matter 2313 – The sentence 'More work is to be carried out for maths.' and the corresponding action 'VC' be deleted. Amend the sentence 'YD is to visit Early Years and look at safeguarding' to 'YD is to visit Early Years and is meeting RT to look at safeguarding.' Matter 2323 – SC visited in March to meet with NH, not RT. The corresponding action to be SC/NH, not SC/RT. CC deferred signing the minutes.	
2330.	Matters Arising/Actions (i) <u>Matter 2309</u> SS had sent the reply from the governor service to CC.	

	<p>(ii) <u>Matter 2312</u></p> <p><u>Item 2291</u> – CC has left leaflets at the local dentist in respect of governor recruitment and regularly checks the website ‘Inspiring Governance’ in this regard.</p> <p><u>Item 2294</u> – RT has circulated.</p> <p><u>Item 2301</u> – SC is still pending due to IT/logging on problems. DH will undertake in due course.</p> <p>(iii) <u>Matter 2315</u></p> <p>The budget was approved and shared.</p> <p>(iv) <u>Matter 2317</u></p> <p>To be distributed in hard copy and electronically.</p> <p>(v) <u>Matter 2318</u></p> <p>Lead subject staff members have shared information with their governor.</p> <p>The proforma templates for governor visits have been completed and sent to the relevant people.</p> <p>(vi) <u>Matter 2323</u></p> <p>CC has circulated the proforma. SC has made a visit to look at humanities and had discussions with NH.</p> <p>(vii) <u>Matter 2324</u></p> <p><u>Item 2324 (i)</u> – under agenda item 2343(iv). CC is to photograph the attendance register at each meeting and will put on the website alongside the minutes.</p> <p><u>Item 2324 (iii)</u> – GB self-review agreed to be in early November 2018.</p> <p><u>Item 2324 (v)</u> – The Head Teacher’s appraisal was successful; support was from DH and AH. CC to update the Finance Committee.</p>	<p>DH</p> <p>RT</p> <p>CC</p> <p>CC</p>
2331.	<p>Reports from Committees</p> <p>(i) The Finance Committee met on 4th July. AT reported. The committee looked at policies including Kirklees’ draft GDPR (RT to query). The medical policy was approved.</p> <p>The budget for this year will break even. There was no financial change at the time of the meeting.</p> <p>The MUGA to be brought up under 2343(iv).</p> <p>(ii) The Curriculum Committee met on 12 July. YD reported. Mrs Holmes addressed the committee on the topic curriculum. She analyses progress from data input by staff. Staff consider the childrens’ views and look into gender progression.</p> <p>The triad leadership meetings have been difficult to arrange this year.</p>	<p>RT</p>

	<p>All staff are responsible for standards. School is to focus on maths for the next academic year.</p> <p>30 new laptops have been bought.</p> <p>Branding – all children have been given the opportunity to take part in the design.</p> <p>Q: Is this a new logo?</p> <p>A: Not a logo but an emblem/motto to highlight the school values which will be displayed around school and on communications.</p> <p>Feedback sheets have been sent to Y6 parents with the school reports. Parents were asked for 3 stars and a wish to comment on their child's experience at the school. Initial results are encouraging.</p> <p>Attendance has been 97% this academic year. Two fines have been claimed for unauthorised absences.</p>	
2332.	<p>Head Teacher's Report and Governors' questions</p> <p>RT circulated the 2018 Pupils' outcome sheets and the summary of results. Governors' questions raised:</p> <p>Q: KS2 – from the data there was no combined GDS score – was this expected?</p> <p>A: None were predicted due to the standards in writing. 2017 showed 57.8% combined at expected; there has been a huge focus on aiming for 85% in all areas due to coasting measures along with combined expected+. The achievement of 83% combined this year has been a fantastic result. The tracking of expected+ and GDS for all groups should support more GDS and GDS combined scores coming through. Although GDS pupils have been targeted in subject specific areas (R,W,M) more focus at pupil progression meetings and when setting targets will be on GDS combined.</p> <p>Q: Is there a gender bias in subjects – girls seeming to do well at writing (x3 GDS) and boys at maths (x6)?</p> <p>A: From the analysis of the results this is a question we will be focusing on to reduce the gender stereotype and divide. The KS2 data certainly has shown this and as practitioners we must consider the provision is not specific to girls or boys. The whole approach of reasoning language across school supports pupils to draw on evidence, opinion and prior learning. This links to the SDP 2018/19.</p> <p>Q: Gender bias – is this in Greater Depth only?</p> <p>A: Yes, this is mostly evident in GDS.</p> <p>CC commented that the topic subjects can aid greater depth due to pupils' interest in the topic.</p>	

NH can only look at GDS in writing within her teacher assessments, not in maths due to restrictions in what is making the teacher assessments.

Q: KS1 GDS in maths and writing are below national – was this predicted and are there any reasons behind this?

A: In line with last year – one pupil can alter the percentage weight due to cohort size. This year group scored 66% GLD (good level of development) in EYFS. Therefore, 73% combined expected+ was a good increase. The reasoning in maths and the consistency writing attained GDS in reading to achieve GDS in other subjects would improve GDS combined.

Q: In KS2, Y3 and Y5 TA show standards within 80% bracket. Can you explain why two year groups seem to have a higher proportion?

A: Historically the upper year group has always achieved and attained higher than the lower. This was the case in Y3/Y4 and Y5/Y6 classes. In the upper year group, there is no specific reason why but is something that the governors and I will track next academic year.

Q: In KS2 the Y4 writing is above 2017 results but only 64%, How do we target this group?

A: Girls results were 3/6 (50%) and boys 2/8 (25%). These 5 pupils will have booster sessions in the autumn term. Mrs Jepson's early morning focus groups appear to have been very successful – we will consider running them from the autumn term.

Q: PP non-SEN – Y5 pupil met expected but within Y1, Y2 and Y3 some pupils did not meet expected. Is it realistic to expect that the PP funding will allow pupils to meet expected level?

A: We should always endeavour that they do. From discussions with staff, 3 pupils across the cohorts who didn't, would be recognised as pupils who could benefit from moving to SEND. If we had moved them already then it would be 100% in all PP non-SEN. However, a child would never be moved to SEND to improve outcome results.

SC suggested that PP funding be tracked to outcomes. In the future this could show both improvement and how the funding is used.

Q: How much does school receive per PP child?

A: Around £1,320 per child.

Q: Y1 phonics data is lower than the national and Kirklees. Noticeably boys – 6/11 achieving. Is there a reason that 50% of PP didn't pass?

A: We have focus on the provision and making the approach more active and games-based. VM noted that

2 pupils particularly struggled with the made-up words, therefore, ensuring coverage of this. 50% of PP includes 1 SEN pupil with an EHCP and another pupil who would benefit from additional SEN intervention. Both pupils were emerging in reading and writing when they left EYFS and neither scored GLD. Mrs Cooper has worked with the children for a long time and in structured groups which have been successful. This will be on the SDP 2018/19.

Q: In Foundation stage, 60% reached GLD – below Kirklees and national. Given 1 child is 10% which is the difference, was this expected? It seems to have been girls that were lower as a proportion getting expected+?

A: Yes, this was accurately anticipated from pupils completing a baseline assessment in the first 2 weeks, including 3 summer born pupils who were emerging in reading, writing and maths and 1 pupil with an EHCP. This is an uneven cohort and the results were as expected. We know our pupils and their back stories which affect their progress.

Q: Were any of the summer born EYFS children boys?

A: One – he did better than expected

Observations and evidence-based progress follow the children through from EYFS to Y1 and throughout their life at school.

Q: Y1 teacher assessments are below expectation. Combined in all areas, 44% combined GDS 13%. Is it possible that this is due to the changes?

A: These are accurate results for the pupils with moderation taking place internally throughout the year and at the end of the year with VM and Mrs Shackleton. We recognise that internal moderation is vital as looking at EYFS data over times, the profile is spiky. Writing and maths focus is based on evidence of all aspects. I am sure the turbulent year hasn't helped the drop in results.

Q: Y2/Y3 results are good. Have there been any challenges with the class changes and 2 Key stages together?

A: VM expressed that she is used to 2 differing phases. It has supported pupils working at GDS in Y2 and, interestingly, as stated earlier a shift in increased progress has been seen whereas historically, Y3 progress was always lower when mixed with Y4. The initial challenge was putting the long term planning in place. Mixed year groups are always a mix of different abilities and progress.

It is appropriate to add here that many Y6 parents' comments have referred to the positive impact Y6 being on their own has had!

NH commented that it is very beneficial to have Y6 on their own – you can dip into their weaknesses and strengths and know the areas to work on to help them gain better results. The children have become more confident in their own peer groups and willing to try things and speak up more.

RT is to meet with the new Y6 teacher during the summer break to discuss each Y6 child and their weaknesses/strengths. An experienced TA (Mrs Jepson) will be working in Y6. Mrs Hosker, who knows the children very well, will also work with them during Mrs Marsden's PPA time.

Q: Given that we are a small school are there any circumstances where Y5 and Y6 are likely to be a mixed group in the future?

A: Looking at the make-up of school for the academic year 2018/19 we recognise that currently these are smaller cohorts in Y5 and Y4 at present. As yet we don't know the numbers for Reception 2019 but this year we are above PAN. We always need to be prepared and willing to make changes to provide the best provision and learning possible.

Q: Could the back stories of the children be a factor in keeping small groups?

A: This is taken into account.

Q: Could an August born child go straight into Y1?

A: VM replied – a child's happiness and well-being are important factors which need to be taken into account, so it is unlikely that a child would miss a year. If a child doesn't attend Reception year they miss out on establishing school routines and friendships from the first year as well as the initial learning that takes place.

In cases where a pupil has significant needs then the offsetting a pupil starting school may be appropriate but this has to be agreed by the LA.

Q: Writing has improved – did you have a focus on writing this last year?

A: Yes.

CC commented that the school has made good progress under RT's leadership and said well done to all the staff.

RT distributed a summary of mean progress scores for Y1 to Y6, explaining the findings to the GB.

RT thanked the GB for their questions.

2333.	<p>Finance Report</p> <p>The budget was balanced for the year when school was still waiting to recruit new staff members.</p> <p>At this point, staff governors were asked to leave.</p> <p>The recruitment of new staff will affect the budget. There are benefits of having an experienced teacher against an NQT especially in Y6. LM had spoken with HR. It was decided with the governors on the recruitment panel to give some consideration in this area.</p> <p>Q: What was agreed?</p> <p>A: The budget was balanced but now there is a need to take money from the spare funds to cover the salary.</p> <p>At this point RT was asked to leave while CC reported on the Head Teacher's appraisal.</p> <p>Staff were asked to return to the meeting.</p>	
2334.	<p>Review School Development Plan 2017-2018</p> <p>The SDP 2017-2018 was sent out to relevant staff to review.</p> <p>Approved.</p>	
2335.	<p>Approve School Development Plan 2018-19 priorities</p> <p>Q: Has the KLP had input in the SDP?</p> <p>A: The KLP has not been involved in the SDP.</p> <p>Governors can access their specific subject leader to discuss any queries via email or face to face meetings. RT is to assign overarching elements so that governors and staff can meet together.</p> <p>Q: How can reasoning be improved?</p> <p>A: We need to develop a reasoning culture over all subjects. We have bought laptops so that we can bring ICT into the classroom.</p> <p>Q: How do we take it forward?</p> <p>A: The main overarching targets on the front cover and link governors with the relevant leaders.</p> <p>Q: Is there an opportunity for governors to meet and discuss tracking and success criteria in September before the FGB?</p> <p>A: This will be arranged in September.</p>	RT
2336.	<p>Pupil Attendance</p> <p>This is 97%.</p>	
2337.	<p>Role of Chair</p> <p>CC is prepared to be Chair for 1 more year.</p> <p>YD commented that she would consider the role and will shadow CC from November to July. However, there will</p>	

	need to be a Vice Chair prepared to take over when she is away. She will take over the role for 2 years or so.	
2338.	Equal Opportunity Incidents (Standing Agenda item) There have been no incidents.	
2339.	Pupil Progress (Standing Agenda item) Discussed under matter 2332.	
2340.	Safeguarding There have been no incidents. YD is to report after the governor visit.	YD
2341.	General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) School will adopt Kirklees' draft GDPR policy with some small amendments.	
2342.	<p>Governor Training and Governor Visits (Sharing learning outcomes and key points)</p> <p><u>Governor Training</u></p> <p>VS attended the June Governor Briefing, CC will share the information with the FGB via email. The briefing takes place monthly, all governors can attend. SS to contact the governor service for details of the meetings and training available.</p> <p><u>Governor Visits</u></p> <p>YD visited RT in respect of safeguarding. She reported that a child on child protection has been moved to child in need – no support is provided in respect of emotional health concerns; YD is to undertake online prevent training; YD would like to observe the lockdown procedure. GDPR was discussed – visitors wearing smart watches will be asked to remove them due to the fact that they have cameras on and can be internet enabled. The children are not allowed to access the internet without adult supervision. A meeting is to take place in the autumn term to discuss the keeping children safe guidance.</p> <p>YD also visited EYFS and was impressed by the new provision allowing free-flow for the children to the inside and outside. VM is to send a copy of the risk assessment for EYFS.</p> <p>CC and YD were in school for 2 full days for teacher recruitment procedure and were impressed by the pupils' behaviour.</p> <p>SC visited and met with Liz Holmes to assess the system for tracking attainment for the SDP.</p> <p>SC also met with LM to look at PP spending and its outcomes. The number of PP is small here. He suggested that staff prepare testimonials explaining monies spent on a particular pupil and what their progress has been. SC is to work more on this aspect.</p>	<p>SS</p> <p>YD</p> <p>Staff??</p> <p>YD/RT</p> <p>VM</p> <p>SC</p>

2343.	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>(i) Governor recruitment – VS is not able to return until after at least September; she has asked the FGB to make a decision on how to progress. She is happy for the FGB to approach the LA to provide a governor in the meantime and she will return as either an LA or co-opted governor as required. It was agreed that SS contact the governor service for clarification on how to proceed.</p> <p>(ii) Governor action plan – CC has updated and put it on the website. Areas to complete:</p> <p>a) governors have access to and complete training as well as compiling a central governing training record – DH to take over this role;</p> <p>b) succession planning – CC to action;</p> <p>c) partnership with Netherthong – CC to action;</p> <p>d) Review GLAD package and further training package for the next financial year – DH to action;</p> <p>Q Do you buy yourselves or in conjunction with other schools?</p> <p>A: We can only use on our own. It is a big expense if it is not used.</p> <p>(iii) Governors' profile on the website – areas to highlight:</p> <p>a) governors' responsibilities – the GB review is to take place in November 2018.</p> <p>b) SDP – develop 3 year vision and budget and 5 year strategy;</p> <p>c) SEF – establish the role of the governors as strategic stakeholders; tracking SEF.</p> <p>d) Increase the visibility of governors to parents. New governors to provide a photo to go on the website.</p> <p>(iv) MUGA – it is intended to create an all-year surface on the field. CC has made some investigations into the company originally chosen and discovered they are not very reputable. Another company has looked at the field who can also improve the drainage problem. Another quote has also been received from a further company. Planning permission will be required as the area is over 50sq m; an application will need to be made as soon as possible. £10K lottery funded money has been received for the MUGA.</p> <p>Q: What is the lead time for planning permission?</p> <p>A: This is unsure. School will contact the companies to discuss the exact information needed by Kirklees. AH to speak with planning officers to clarify likely timescales.</p>	<p>SS</p> <p>DH CC CC DH</p> <p>FGB FGB FGB DH/AH/SC?</p> <p>AH</p>
-------	---	---

2344.	<p>Date(s) of Next / Future Meeting(s) and Possible Agenda Items</p> <p>The next two meetings were agreed as follows:</p> <p>A meeting between governors and subject leaders is to take place before the next FGB, but is yet to be confirmed.</p> <p>Thursday 20th September 2018</p> <p>Full Governing Body 6.30pm – HT report; review SDP; feedback from committees; governor representation.</p>	
2345.	<p>Agenda, Minutes and Related Papers – School Copy</p> <p>RESOLVED: That minute 2333 be excluded from the copy to be made available at the School, in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act.</p>	