

**Eastburn Junior & Infant School Governing Body  
Meeting held on 26 November 2018  
Minutes**

**The meeting opened at 5.45pm**

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

**In Attendance:** Helen Osman (Clerk – BC/SGS<sup>1</sup>)

*The Clerk took the chair pending the outcome of Items 24/18 and 25/18*

**24/18 Co-opt Governor: Katy Walsh**

- **The Governing Body unanimously agreed** to appoint Katy Walsh as a Co-opted Governor.

*[Katy Walsh joined the meeting]*

**25/18 Elect Chair**

As agreed at the last meeting, **the Governing Body confirmed** that the term of office of the Chair should be the academic year 2018-19, extending to the first meeting of the Governing Body in academic year 2019-20.

Katy Walsh was nominated as Chair and indicated her willingness to serve in that capacity in 2018-19. The Governing Body had noted at the last meeting that she did not plan to accept any nomination as Chair beyond that period.

*[Katy Walsh withdrew from the meeting]*

- **The Governing Body unanimously elected** Katy Walsh as Chair for academic year 2018-19.

*[Katy Walsh rejoined the meeting and took the chair.]*

**26/18 Apologies for absence and their acceptance**

All governors were present.

<sup>1</sup> BC/SGS – Bradford Council's School Governor Service

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Action**

**27/18 Notification of any urgent other business**

No other business was notified and there were no requests to vary the agenda.

**28/18 Declarations of interest in items on this agenda**

No interests were declared in items on this agenda.

**29/18 Minutes of meeting on 15 October 2018 and matters arising**

*Item 18/18* – John Hughes said that he was, in fact, able to attend the SFVS<sup>2</sup> training on 04 December 2018 and intended to do so: it had been the next available New Governor Induction course that he had been unable to attend. The Clerk amended the master copy of the minutes accordingly in manuscript

- Subject to this amendment, ***the minutes were agreed as a true record of the meeting.*** The master copy of the minutes was signed by the Chair, who also initialled the manuscript amendment made by the Clerk, and passed to the Headteacher.

*Item 20/18 (b)* – Sarah Teal confirmed that she had read and understood *Keeping Children Safe in Education*. She would arrange to sign the document that had been signed by other governors at the last meeting.

S Teal

*Item 20/18 (f)* – The Head said that the new Governor Induction procedure had not yet been fully written up: it would be brought to the next meeting instead of this one. John Hughes had been indicted according to the new arrangements and would attend the New Governor Induction course as soon as possible.

Head

J Hughes

*Item 20/18 (f)* – The Head said that Janet Keefe was due to visit school on 06 December 2018 for the meeting of the Headteacher Performance Management Committee. Contractual arrangements for this and for her role as School Improvement Consultant would be put in place prior to this date, as agreed at the last meeting.

Head

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

**30/18 Discuss Headteacher's report**

*Agenda papers attached*

Governors thanked the Head for her report, which they had read with interest. They had been pleased to see the reduction in Persistent Absence, and **asked** whether it had been possible to identify the cause. The Head said that the school had issued another round of attendance letters at the October half term break. Persistent Absence was now concentrated in a small number of families, with whom the Pastoral Manager was working. The school was ensuring that a consistent approach was taken in all cases.

**Replying to questions**, the Head confirmed that safeguarding arrangements in school were up to date and compliant with Regulations. This would be discussed in more detail under Item 39/18.

**Asked** whether further investment was planned in Read Write Inc<sup>3</sup> training, the Head confirmed that it was. The Deputy Headteacher (DHT) was currently underway and a

<sup>2</sup> SFVS: Schools Financial Value Standard - an internally assessed financial standard introduced in 2011 by central Government to replace the more complex Financial Management Standard in Schools. Bradford Council requires that it be completed annually (by 31 March) and approved by governors.

<sup>3</sup> 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

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

trainer would visit school later in the week to provide wider training for staff on implementing the programme in school. The DHT said that some additional expenditure would be required on books. There would also be a cost associated with additional development days: it would be important to hold these development days from time to time not just to enhance staff training but because the school was given access to training videos for six months after each development day.

**Asked** about the ongoing training commitment for Read Write Inc, the DHT said that they advocated one session per week for all staff on a continuing basis. It was for schools to determine what they needed and could afford. **Asked** about other schools that had adopted Read Write Inc, the DHT said that Silsden Primary School had adopted the programme some time before Eastburn had done so but had chosen to implement only the Phonics element. The Head said that Silsden had chosen to adopt alternative, cheaper Reading resources: she had viewed those resources and had considered them to be of lower quality than those available through Read Write Inc. Eastburn had invested in the Reading resources for Read Write Inc and this was not an ongoing cost. The sourcing of good quality Writing books at an affordable cost was presenting more of a challenge, and the school was currently considering how to secure best value for money.

### 31/18 Note reports from Committees:

- a) Resources Committee meeting of 19 November 2018 – Ann Craggs, as Chair of the Resources Committee (Chair/Res), said that the Committee had reviewed the budget position. The forecast deficit was now £10k, or 1.14% of budget, which was significantly better than had been feared. However, this assumed that £11k owed to the school in respect of supply teacher insurance claims was actually paid. As previously reported, the original insurer had folded, the insurance ombudsman had been involved and the second company that had taken on the business had agreed to pay. However, the Committee had heard on 19 November 2018 that the e-mail account of the Business Manager had been hacked and the payment of the sum owed had been diverted to a private bank account in Germany. The Committee had heard that Bradford Council's Legal Team (BC/Legal) was seeking to recover the sum and had been assured that the school had taken all necessary steps to inform the appropriate bodies and secure the school's e-mail and other systems.

The Committee had reviewed the financial benchmarking data from 2017-18. The exercise had been interesting, but the significant changes that the school had undergone in the last two years had limited its usefulness on this occasion.

The school had undergone a financial audit that had uncovered no significant issues. The Head said that the school had welcomed the recommendations in the report for further tightening of systems, and was implementing them.

The Committee had worked through the first section of the SFVS document. They had found the experience useful and thanked John Hughes for his work with the school on this. Further sections would be reviewed at future meetings.

The Committee had approved the school's three to five year building maintenance and development plan, received an update on the implementation of GDPR and approved the eSafety policy.

- b) Pay Committee meeting of 19 November 2018 – Richard Grayson, as Chair of the Pay Committee (Chair/Pay), confirmed that the Committee had satisfied itself that the school's appraisal system was robust and rigorously applied; that the Headteacher's pay recommendations were based on an objective system that took account of Career Stage Expectations and the Teaching Standards; that the recommendations were consistent with the Committee's knowledge of the quality of teaching and

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

learning in school and with pupil outcomes. The Committee had approved the Headteacher's pay recommendations. The Head confirmed that instructions had been issued in school to give effect to the pay decisions.

Chair/Pay said that the Committee had also considered the Head's recommendation to shift the timing of the performance management cycle to fit better with the academic year. The Committee had approved the change for a trial period of one year, after which the impact on leadership workloads would be reviewed.

### 32/18 **Review pupil progress and attainment and consider any action required**

#### *Agenda papers*

The Deputy Headteacher (DHT) reminded governors that the expectation was that every pupil should make at least three points progress per year, or one point per term. Thus, at the October half term, the expectation was that some, but not all, pupils would already have made the one point progress for the autumn term.

Referring to the progress and attainment overview, **a Governor asked** whether the first two bullet points were not contradictory. The DHT said that they were not: one addressed progress and one addressed attainment.

Referring to the final two bullet points in the Key Stage Two section of the progress and attainment overview, **a Governor asked** whether there was a reason why the proportion of pupils working at Age Related Expectation (ARE) in Year 6 Writing and Maths had declined. The DHT explained that assessment consisted of two parts: (a) the pupil's knowledge and (b) how the pupil applied that knowledge. Thus, a pupil who had Achieved ARE in Year 3 and who was now Working Towards ARE in Year 4 would have made the expected 1 point of progress; the child would also know more than they had in Year 3; but they were unlikely at this stage in Year 4 to be applying that knowledge as well as they had applied their Year 3 knowledge.

Referring to the data sheet headed "Pupils at ARE at Autumn half term 2018-19", the DHT said that the key figures were those in the top line which showed that 71.8% of pupils were at or above ARE in Writing across school, with 31% above ARE and 9% well above ARE. The green and blue-headed columns gave similar data for Reading and Maths respectively, and the tables in section 2 broke this down by year group. **Governors commented** that the Year 4 data stood out, with the proportion of pupils working at ARE only in the 50% to 60% range in all three subjects. **They noted** that Year 4 had a particularly high proportion of pupils with SEND and/or who were eligible for Pupil Premium funding. The Year 3 data was also lower than that for other year groups.

**Replying to questions**, the Head said that the Year 4 teacher had inherited a complex cohort with a high level of SEND and other needs. This teacher was now developing confidence in assessing these pupils, and the pupils themselves were settling into the Year 4 expectations. The attainment of the Year 4 cohort at the end of Key Stage 1 had been low, and progress since then had been good. The Year 3 cohort was taught by new staff in a new job share arrangement, which was currently bedding in. Both the Year 3 and Year 4 cohorts had a high proportion of pupils who accessed Nurture provision due to their complex needs.

**Governors asked** whether Ofsted would take into account the particularly high proportion of pupils with complex needs in these cohorts, or whether they would focus solely on outcomes. The DHT said that the school could explain what it was doing to support these pupils to achieve as much as possible. The Head added that pupil progress and attainment data needed to be aligned with the quality of teaching grid. Attainment would fluctuate according to the characteristics of each cohort, but progress should be steady.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Ofsted would look at both, and would expect governors to understand the overall picture for the school and how it compared nationally. The school was broadly in line with national attainment, and well ahead of national in terms of progress – in fact, Eastburn’s progress was well above that of many schools that had been judged as Good by Ofsted.

**Governors noted** that the data appeared to show that boys were underperforming in all three subjects. The Head said that there was little difference in provision for boys and girls. The DHT said that girls did tend to perform better than boys at the primary school stage. It was important to ensure that the gap between boys’ and girls’ performance at Eastburn did not exceed the national gap. **Governors suggested** that it might be necessary to adapt provision for boys so that it more effectively met their needs and enabled the school to narrow the performance gap with girls.

**Governors asked** how confident the school was in the Year 5 data, which showed very high proportions of pupils working at ARE in all three subjects. The DHT said that, when this cohort had been in Year 4, the teacher had provided a great deal of evidence to support her assessments. The school was therefore confident in the Year 4 baseline data for this cohort. The Head added that internal moderation had also been undertaken. She noted that this cohort was characterised by having unusually few outliers: most pupils were at or around ARE. This contrasted with cohorts such as Years 3 and 4, which were (and had always been) more polarised in terms of the numbers of pupils above or below ARE. The Head added that the Year 6 cohort was also polarised: a larger group than usual was expected to reach Greater Depth, but the cohort also included an unusually high number of pupils who were working below ARE.

Noting that the Year 3 and Year 4 data were below national averages, the Head said that the needs of these cohorts had been investigated in depth and addressed at the October half term stage, including through Pupil Progress Meetings (PPMs), interventions, timetabling and deployment of staff. This would be repeated each time, with particular focus on individual pupils who had not made the expected progress. **Asked** whether this was done termly, the Head said that it was done every half term. National data was available only once per year, and only for Years 2 and 6. As governors had seen at the last meeting, the school’s 2018 Year 2 and Year 6 SATs outcomes had been broadly in line with national outcomes, which represented a significant step forward for the school.

**Replying to questions**, the Head confirmed that large swings in data were typical of small schools. She said that pupils at Eastburn tended to make strong progress and explained that progress was measured in relation to other pupils with similar prior attainment nationally.

**A governor asked** whether the aim was that the progress and attainment of pupils eligible for Pupil Premium funding (“PP pupils”) should be the same as that of such pupils nationally. The Head explained that, on the contrary, the performance of PP pupils in school was considered in comparison to that of non-PP pupils nationally – the intention was that schools should narrow the gap, and this was the purpose of Pupil Premium funding.

**A governor noted** that the data showed the proportion of pupils working at ARE in combined Reading, Writing and Maths was below 50% in three Year Groups: he **commented** that this seemed high.

**A governor asked** at what point the number of pupils in a group was too low to be of statistical significance. The Head said that there was no specific guidance on this. Typically, national data considered more than two pupils in a cohort to be statistically significant, but with low numbers having an impact on the confidence limits. Eastburn currently had nineteen PP pupils in school, a significant proportion of whom also had high range SEND needs; were boys; and or had poor attendance. PP pupils were

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

concentrated in Years 3 and 4 which, as governors had noted from the data, were those with the lower proportions of pupils working at ARE. Governors noted the need to monitor the impact of the PP strategy on these pupils, particularly in light of staffing reductions.

**They asked** that the Headteacher seek in her reports to the GB to draw these various threads together to help the GB to monitor the needs for this particularly vulnerable subset of pupils and the impact of the school's actions to address those needs.

Head

Noting that part of the role of the Governing Body was to be sufficiently familiar with the data and its basis in the school's assessment systems to assure itself that the summaries provided by leadership (eg the progress and attainment overview in the agenda paper) were well-founded, governors agreed that it would be useful for one or two governors to develop this deep familiarity on behalf of the whole GB.

Head

The Head undertook to bring to the next meeting end of 2018-19 targets for each Year Group and vulnerable group in each subject. The GB would monitor progress and attainment against these targets.

Head

The Head would also send to governors:

- end of year progress and attainment data for the last three years to enable governors to see trends over time; and
- the summary information that she had previously provided which showed how the school's headline data compared nationally.

DHT

The DHT would give a short presentation at the next meeting on the on-track reports and how they linked with Pupil Progress Meetings.

**Governors agreed** that progress and attainment should be the main focus of the next meeting.

**33/18 Review monitoring and evaluation of teaching, learning and assessment and consider any action required**

*Agenda paper*

The DHT said that the information in the agenda paper was based on lesson observations conducted over the past fortnight, book scrutinies and pupil tracking data. The downward arrows shown for pupil outcomes in Lower Key Stage 2 reflected the discussion under the previous agenda item.

Governors were disappointed to see downward arrows in Lower Key Stage 2 for handwriting and presentation: this had been an area of real strength last year, and they hoped to see it recover over the next half term. They were, however, pleased to see a number of upward arrows and new blue ("Areas To Be Shared") indicators in the work scrutiny section.

**Replying to questions**, the DHT said that white boxes on the grid indicated that no data was yet available, for example because pupil discussions had not yet been held with the classes concerned or because staff members were new in school.

The DHT said that it would be reasonable to expect an NQT's<sup>4</sup> practice to show as yellow ("Area to be Developed") against most indicators at this early stage of the year – indeed, it would not be unusual to see some red ("Area Causing Concern"), so the absence of any

<sup>4</sup> 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.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

red on the grid was a positive sign. He said that both NQTs were settling in and were on track. The Head added that it would be reasonable to expect NQTs to show substantial proportions of green by the end of the year, but probably not blue.

**Governors noted** that the practice of a lot of staff was shown as yellow against the "Responding to feedback" indicator. The Head agreed: the introduction of new Writing books had highlighted some issues around marking that were being addressed through amendments to the Marking and Feedback policy, and the school had undertaken staff development work in this area to ensure that they implemented the policy effectively. Governors welcomed this: staff spent a significant amount of time on marking and feedback, so it was important that it was effective.

**Asked** whether the school was concerned to see a drop in Lower Key Stage 2 outcomes despite strong (green and blue) teaching, the DHT said that it would be a matter for concern if it became a trend. The Head said that the Pupil Progress Meeting with the teacher concerned had been constructive, and the drop in outcomes appeared to be a one-off.

**Governors asked** whether there were any indicators that could be addressed quickly so that they turned green across school. For example, the school had recently focused on handwriting and presentation, so they were surprised not to see more green against this indicator. The Head said that some inconsistencies remained in handwriting, particularly in classes taught by NQTs and other staff who were new to school as they adapted to the school's way of doing things. The DHT added that the downward arrows against the handwriting and presentation indicator had been a reflection on presentation in maths books, which was not directly affected by the work to improve handwriting.

The Head welcomed governors' challenge on indicators that did not start to turn consistently green across school as the year progressed. **Replying to questions**, she confirmed that governors should expect to see more green and blue boxes overall by Easter 2019.

**Asked** whether individual staff members were motivated to improve their practice, the Head said that they were willing and committed but were currently embedding a range of new initiatives.

#### 34/18 **Discuss report on impact of Sports Premium and plans for coming term**

*Agenda paper*

Governors noted the information added to the final column of the agenda paper for Key Indicators 3 and 4. This was an ambitious plan and they looked forward to seeing further progress as the year unfolded.

The Head said that, rather than monitoring both the Pupil Premium and Sports Premium Plans at every GB meeting, she and the Clerk had discussed alternating them so that each Plan was reviewed termly. **The GB agreed.**

#### 35/18 **Approve the post-Ofsted Action Plan for 2018-19** (including Safeguarding audit action plan, GB Action Plan, actions arising from GB skills audit)

*Agenda paper*

- **The Governing Body unanimously approved** the post-Ofsted Action Plan for 2018-19.

The Head said that, as with Pupil and Sports Premium Plans, she had discussed with the clerk the best way to manage the monitoring of the Post Ofsted Action Plan (POAP) now that it also included the Safeguarding Audit action plan and the Governing Body Action Plan. They proposed that each GB meeting monitor in detail:

- one of the Main POAP priorities; plus

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

- either the Safeguarding Audit action plan section or the Governing Body action plan section.

This would mean that each main priority was reviewed in detail over the course of the year, and the Safeguarding and GB action plan sections would each be reviewed termly. **Governors agreed this proposal.**

### 36/18 Review progress to date against 2018-19 Post-Ofsted Action Plan (POAP)

Agenda paper

- a) Priority 1: Enable pupils to reach higher standards in writing by ensuring: (a) lessons build on the skills pupils need to learn; (b) there is a consistent approach to the correcting of pupils' spelling; (c) pupils' written work is tidy and well presented; and (d) younger pupils form their letters correctly when handwriting.

Noting that section 1(iii) was highlighted as red in the agenda paper (no measurable impact/evidence), the Head referred governors to page three of the agenda paper for the previous item (Paper FGB 35/18), which set out the actions being taken to improve Writing and identified the need for further work to address remaining inconsistencies. She reminded governors that several weeks remained to the end of the autumn term, and that the school only rated a section as green (Objective fully achieved/measurable impact) if it was confident that the objective had been completed effectively.

**Replying to questions**, the Head confirmed that the planned meetings with parents had been booked.

- i. Writing Book scrutiny – Governors examined a selection of pupils' books from the Get Writing portion of Read Write Inc. The books came from a range of year groups and abilities. In each Read Write Inc group, pupils were assessed according to reading ability rather than their age. Governors noted that the new approach to marking and feedback could be seen in the books.

**Asked** how Read Write Inc differed from general literacy teaching, the Head said that Read Write Inc covered Reading, Writing and Phonics. **Asked** whether the school still used Talk For Writing<sup>5</sup>, she said that it did not: Read Write Inc had taken over from Talk For Writing in Key stage 1, though pupils were still asked to produce extended pieces of writing. The DHT said that it was anticipated that the more able pupils would move off Read Write Inc at Christmas onto the Key Stage 2 programme. The Head said that, because this was the first year in which Read Write Inc had been used, there was a need to plug some gaps for some pupils.

- b) Governing Body section – The Governing Body agreed that the Chair and Vice Chair would draft text for the Impact column and send it to the Head by 04 January 2019 for addition to the POAP in time for it to be circulated with the agenda for the next meeting. At that meeting, the text would be discussed and agreed by governors and the appropriate RAG<sup>6</sup> rating agreed.

Governors were sorry to note that it appeared that Bradford Council's School Governor Service (BC/SGS) no longer ran the useful training course on Asking the Right Questions. The Clerk undertook to seek further information on this.

<sup>5</sup> Talk for Writing – an approach to teaching writing that encourages pupils to imitate the language they need for a particular topic orally before reading and analysing it and then writing their own version.

<sup>6</sup> RAG rating: Red, Amber, Green ratings - a visual representation of progress

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Chair  
Vice Chair  
Head

[*Clerk's note: the School Governor Service has advised that it plans to run the course again in the Spring 2019 term.*]

### 37/18 **Note report from Inclusion Leader**

*Agenda paper*

The Governing Body noted the agenda paper with thanks. The report had been very clear and they were pleased to see the high level of aspiration for pupils.

**Asked** how Ofsted viewed aspiration as opposed realism, the Head said that schools were expected to draw an appropriate balance between the two. The school had compared the prior attainment of SEND pupils in school with national attainment for SEND pupils, with the aims of setting a target that was challenging but credible and narrowing the gap with national average.

### 38/18 **Discussion: Erasmus<sup>7</sup> project**

*Agenda paper*

The Head explained that Erasmus Key Action 1 funding could be used to support pupil and staff mobility (ie exchanges) within the EU. The school had been considering a project involving pupil mobility exchanges with Croatia and another country. Although the school would like to be involved in the project, which could have many benefits in terms of broadening pupils' experience, it would be challenging in terms of safeguarding and Health and safety. As the school lacked capacity at the current time to take on these challenges, and as the project did not directly support the POAP priorities or have a direct impact on basic standards, she had reluctantly concluded that the school should not be involved at this time – it needed to be meeting expectations across the board before it engaged in such projects.

**Asked** whether the school participated in Linking Schools<sup>8</sup>, the Head said that it did not. The DHT said that the school planned to participate in an e-twinning project for pupils.

However, the Head would like to support a separate Erasmus project around staff mobility, which had been researched and brought to her attention by a staff member. The project would broaden staff mobility, enhance morale and develop pedagogy. The project would be pioneering, and she believed that staff could sustain it alongside the school's POAP priorities.

➤ **The Governing Body unanimously agreed** that:

- the pupil mobility project should not be pursued at this time on the grounds that it did not directly contribute to reaching basic standards or achieving POAP priorities and there was insufficient staff capacity at present to manage the safeguarding aspects of such a project; and
- the staff mobility project should be pursued on the grounds that it contributed to developing the experience of staff and pedagogy in school.

### 39/18 **Safeguarding**

*Agenda papers*

<sup>7</sup> Erasmus - European Union programme, administered in the UK through the British Council, for education, training, youth and sport, running from 2014 to 2020.

<sup>8</sup> Linking Schools – The Linking Network supports schools and communities to develop a positive, cohesive ethos by helping children, young people and adults to explore identity, celebrate diversity, promote community and champion equality. [Website](#)

**Signed** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

- a) Note report of s175 Safeguarding self-audit commissioned by the LA – Governors noted that the s175 audit had been completed and reviewed by Sarah Teal in her capacity as Named Governor for Safeguarding (NG/SG). NG/SG said that the audit had been positive: no area had been rated as red and the small number of ambers had been addressed promptly. The Head confirmed that the action points arising from the audit had been reflected in the Safeguarding section of the POAP and would be monitored by the school’s safeguarding group.

The Head said that the school had just obtained software that enabled it to monitor the ICT system internet searches and sites used by pupils and staff: the school had always had the capability to block sites, but it could now monitor usage more closely.

- b) Note half-yearly report to governors on safeguarding – Governors thanked the Head for this clear and concise report, which they would keep to hand for reference in discussions with Ofsted and others about safeguarding in school.

**Asked** whether the school maintained a folder of the up to date versions of key documents to send to governors when the school was notified of an Ofsted inspection, the Head said that it had an “Emergency Response protocol” and would add such a folder to this protocol.

Head

- c) Note update on any safeguarding issues since the last meeting – The Head said that there had been no safeguarding issues since the last meeting other than as described in her report at agenda paper 30/18.

#### 40/18 Note stress audit action plan

*Agenda paper*

The Head said that this was the first time that the school had sought to develop a stress action plan. Staff had been asked to identify the main causes of stress: overwhelmingly, they had cited lack of time, workload and interruptions. The school had looked for ways to minimise these factors. Otherwise, the response to the survey had been very positive. Staff had been positive about the structures that had been put in place and the increased consistency across school. NQTs had responded positively in relation to the support provided by the DHT and others.

Governors welcomed the school’s approach in enabling staff to feed in to how the school did things and what support they needed. They recognised a need to take the opportunities provided by their visits to school to chat to staff – and pupils – informally about how they felt things were going in school, so that they could gain for themselves a sense of overall morale, stress levels etc to validate reports from leadership.

**Asked** whether training had been provided on recognising the signs of stress, the Head said that such training had focused on stress among pupils. The Site Manager had undertaken some training on stress as part of Health and Safety, but there was more that could be done in this area and it would be factored into the ongoing CPD<sup>9</sup> programme.

**Replying to questions**, the Head confirmed that the staff room was the only work space that was regularly available for PPA<sup>10</sup>. This lack of appropriate space was a real challenge: it was addressed in the school’s three-year buildings plan, but the school’s budgetary position and the limited number of computers and laptops for staff were significant constraints. **Asked** how many staff typically undertook PPA at the same time, the Head said that there were usually up to three. Senior leaders used a hot-desk

<sup>9</sup> CPD - Continuing Professional Development

<sup>10</sup> PPA time - Planning, Preparation and Assessment time (teachers must spend 10% of their working week out of contact with their class in order to plan, prepare and assess class work)

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

arrangement in their office. **Replying to questions**, she said that leaders did not have their own school laptops: they used their own kit with encrypted USB drives.

**Replying to questions**, the Head said that there had been no stress-related leave in the current academic year. In the last two years, two members of staff had gone off with stress-related conditions at the commencement of capability proceedings.

A governor with a background in education and experience of implementing Read Write Inc said that the scheme involved a lot of hard work to keep up with the high pace that it set and avoid the risk of elements being overlooked. This rapid pace could be particularly challenging for NQTs. Governors were responsible for overseeing the health and wellbeing of staff, as well as for pupil progress and attainment. For reasons that were well understood by the GB, it had been necessary to introduce a number of initiatives, but **governors expressed concern** about the cumulative impact on staff, including leadership. The Head said that a staff survey had recently been completed on Read Write Inc. The outcome had been very positive, and the matters that staff had asked leadership to consider had been around making procedures work more effectively rather than around workload. They welcomed the highly prescriptive approach of Read Write Inc, which significantly reduced the time spent on planning, and were trying to develop a practice of marking as they went along, rather than taking it home to do.

A governor said that the question of overload related not just to Read Write Inc but to the overall load related to the range of new initiatives and approaches and whether the balance was right. Ofsted was now paying increasing attention to the wider curriculum and whether the different elements were working effectively together.

**41/18 Receive update on Headteacher's performance management review**

The Chair said that the Headteacher's performance management review had been arranged for 06 December 2018.

**42/18 Note reports on Governor visits to school, training and development – including:**

*Agenda papers*

- a) Visit of Named Governor for EYFS on 15 November 2018
- b) Visit of Named Governor for Safeguarding of November 2018

The Governing Body noted the agenda papers with thanks.

**43/18 Note report on Chair's actions and correspondence and consider ratification as necessary**

No actions reported except as covered under other agenda items.

**44/18 Review policies and other key documents**

*Agenda papers*

- a) Pay policy – Governors noted that this policy had been recommended by the Pay Committee subject to the following amendment:

*Page 5, section 11.1, second full paragraph: after "school improvement projects" insert "not lasting beyond the end of the financial year".*

- **The Governing Body unanimously ratified this amendment and approved** the Pay policy. The Chair would come into school to sign a clean copy of the policy.

- b) Attendance policy – Governors asked that the appendices be amended to remove references to the "Executive Headteacher" and replace them with "Headteacher".

Chair

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Governors noted that they had asked to review this policy after it had been in place for one year, alongside an analysis of the reasons given for absences during that year: their concern had been to determine whether it was necessary to make specific provision in the policy for the children of front-line emergency workers. The Head said that absences during the year had been essentially for holidays in termtime.

- Subject to this amendment, ***the Governing Body unanimously approved*** the Attendance policy.
- c) *eSafety policy* – Item included in error: policy approved by the Resources Committee on 19 November 2018.
- d) *Sex and Relationships policy*
  - ***The Governing Body unanimously approved*** the Sex and Relationships Education policy.

#### 45/18 **Governing Body matters**

*Agenda paper*

- a) *Appoint additional governor to Resources Committee*
  - ***The Governing Body unanimously appointed*** John Hughes to the Resources Committee.
- b) *Approve Governing Body training plan* –
  - ***The Governing Body unanimously approved*** the GB training plan and ***agreed*** to monitor progress termly.
- c) *Report on actions to fill co-opted governor vacancy* – Ann Craggs said that she was pursuing this actively and on a continuing basis. Governors suggested asking the Parish Council to put up another notice, and putting a letter on the notice at the Children’s Centre.

#### 46/18 **Urgent other business referred from Item 27/18 above**

There was no other business.

#### 47/18 **Date of next meeting**

The next meeting would be held at **5.45pm on Monday 21 January 2018**

**The meeting closed at 8.05pm**

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_