

**Minutes of a meeting of the governors of Sparkenhoe Community Primary School held at the School on Monday 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2018 at 4pm.**

**Present**

Lee Jowett – Co-opted Governor (Chair)  
Robert John – Co-opted Governor  
Jo Webb – Parent Governor  
Neil Thorpe – Staff Governor  
Susan Hind – Authority Governor  
Rhian Jones – Headteacher

**In Attendance**

Nazma Hamid – Associate Member  
Penny Cooper – Deputy Headteacher  
Dan Cheetham - Deputy Headteacher  
Robyn Cooper – Clerk to Governors

**1) Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received and accepted from Jenny Bosworth.

**2) Declaration of Governors' Interests**

There were no declarations of interest declared in the business to be transacted. For transparency purposes:

- Jo Webb was a governor at Fosse Primary School.

**3) Confirmation of the Minutes of the Last Meeting – 4<sup>th</sup> June 2018**

The minutes of the meeting held on the 4<sup>th</sup> June 2018 had been previously circulated to all governors and were taken as read, confirmed and signed as an accurate record of the meeting.

**4) Matters Arising**

Item 4 Matters Arising – All governors were to send details of any additional safeguarding training to Mrs Cooper. It was agreed that there would be a training session for governors at the start of the autumn term.

***ACTION: Safeguarding training on September FGB agenda***

All school Safeguarding training was scheduled for October.

Item 12 Any other Business – The end of year get together was arranged for Monday 9<sup>th</sup> July at 6 Degrees.

**5) Headteacher's Report**

The Headteacher's report had been previously circulated to all governors. The following questions had been submitted prior to the meeting:

***Q (JW): Looked-after children (LAC) have additional funding. How does the school spend this to support their needs? How is the effectiveness of expenditure evaluated?***

Ms Jones explained that the school did not receive all the Pupil Premium Plus funding for the LAC as this was held by the Virtual School and the school applied for it. She explained that the application had clear outcomes. Ms Jones explained that

they had applied for an additional grant of £1500 for one family (2 children) for a reading intervention project with their carer including books for home, TA support in school and games and activities. Ms Jones reported that both children had made progress with reading but the main impact was in the children and carer's attitude to reading and their engagement with books.

Mr Jowett queried the funding for the Virtual School. Mrs Cooper explained that there was an agreement that the funding was kept centrally. Mr Jowett would seek clarification on the criteria for the funding with the Virtual Schools Team.

**ACTION: LJ**

Ms Jones stated that the Virtual School provided interventions and events for LAC but the majority of these were for older children. Ms Webb highlighted the importance of early interventions to impact attainment and engagement later on in education. Mrs Cooper highlighted concern about the lack of support for writing Personal Education Plans (PEPs) and sessions had been cancelled. She also highlighted that their LAC officer had cancelled meetings. It was agreed that Mr Jowett and Ms Webb would attend a future meeting with the LAC officer.

**ACTION: JW/LJ**

**Q (JW): Year2/KS1 SATs - disadvantaged children's attainment is lower than other groups. In previous KS2 results there is no significant difference in outcomes between disadvantaged and other groups. I am also aware that that the numbers of 'disadvantaged' children (as defined by the data) is declining. A few questions:**

**- Are the current Year 2 'disadvantaged' children different from previous cohorts?**

**- Could you outline how the school will address the attainment gaps for the groups that seem to be having lower outcomes?**

Ms Jones explained that the current cohort was not different from previous cohorts. She explained that from the initial look at the data for KS1 SATs, of the pupils who were not at expected levels, there were 3 SEN pupils and 1 pupil who was new to English. Ms Jones stated that all pupils would be targeted next year and by year 6 it was predicted that only 2 would be below expected levels. Ms Jones explained that the closing of the gaps by KS2 was about pupils catching up and receiving the right provision and the school recognising their needs.

**Q (JW): Was the provision based around the key assessment areas of SATs or do you look at other areas?**

Ms Jones stated that it was initially based on SATs data and was used to identify where the gaps were. She explained that it depended on the individual and there could also be other needs in other areas, e.g. social.

**Q (JW): The number of Year 5 students with SEN had fallen. Could you clarify - have they moved to other schools?**

Ms Jones explained that 4 students had been taken off the SEN register. She explained that the students were over 2 years behind when coming out of year 3 but the targeted provision and interventions had been very positive.

**Q (JW): For Year 2, the number of SEN pupils had increased - have additional children been assessed or have different children started?**

Ms Jones explained that a few more pupils had been identified and having SEN. She explained that they could not always be sure in F2 as there could be other factors (shyness, not ready for school, selective mutism).

**Q (JW): What was the impact for teachers on having such a high proportion of SEN? How are NQTs supported in working with such cohorts?**

Mrs Copper explained that teachers tried different strategies and interventions with their SEN pupils. Ms Jones stated that teachers ensured that they knew the targets and differentiated. She highlighted that successful strategies were included in the pupil's pen portrait. Ms Jones explained that it was clear that the teacher was responsible for the pupil even if they had a 1:1.

Ms Jones stated that through their training, NQTs were well versed in meeting the needs of SEN children. She stated that the NQTs received plenty of support and there were strategies in place, mentors and other teachers and the SENCo were available to advise.

**Q (JW): How do you ensure that the NQTs do not get too involved?**

Ms Jones explained that they had the support of their mentor, induction tutor and other teacher in the year group.

**Q (JW): Can I confirm the low numbers of Gypsy/Roma are perhaps because of non-disclosure (which is a known issue nationally)? How significant is non-disclosure for other groups, and what impact does this have on target tracking?**

Ms Jones stated that there were 2 Gypsy/Roma pupils recorded on the system. She explained that non-disclosure was not a significant issue as they knew who the pupils were and there were 13 in the whole school (4 families) including the 2 who had disclosed. Ms Jones explained that they tracked them in a group of their own and all apart from 1 pupil was working below age related expectations.

Ms Jones stated that non-disclosure for other groups was not an issue. She stated that it was rare that they did not get information from the parents. Ms Jones stated that parents did disclose the languages spoken at home.

**Q (JW): Curriculum - would welcome more detail on plans to develop coding.**

It was suggested that this should be an agenda item in the autumn term.

**ACTION: November FGB agenda**

Ms Jones stated that this would be a school improvement priority and suggest a governor visit in the autumn term.

**ACTION: To arrange a governor visit (Coding)**

**Q (JW): I note the statement that 'all teaching assistants now have targets.' Was this not the case hitherto?**

Ms Jones explained that previously TAs did not have formal written targets. She explained that the TAs knew their targets but it had now been formalised and were linked to teacher targets.

**Q (JW): Could you explain the difference in a teaching observation between 'good' and 'outstanding'?**

Ms Jones circulated the criteria that the school used from the previous Ofsted framework, which included examples of what lessons could look like. She highlighted that it was a subtle difference but it included ensuring that the work matched all needs and there was good subject knowledge. She took the governors through some examples.

**Q (JW): KS1 SATs - Why was reading below target?**

Ms Jones clarified that they had met the target for expected level but were below target for Greater Depth (GD). She explained that there were 4 children where the teachers were adamant that through teacher assessment they were not consistently GD despite a high score on test. Ms Jones stated that they were confident that the pupils would be exceeding by the end of KS2. She stated that there had been a year on year drop in GD in KS1 and they were looking at this closely, particularly in relation to the organisation and transition from Foundation Stage.

**Dan Cheetham joined the meeting**

**Q (LJ): Unauthorised absence was 1.5%, was the school doing as much as they could to address this?**

Mrs Cooper reported that she had looked at the data and if unauthorised holidays were taken out, overall attendance would be 96.04%. She highlighted that if religious observation absence was taken out it would be 96.25%. Mrs Cooper stated that if both were taken out overall attendance would be 96.98%. Ms Webb queried how many pupils were in school during Eid. Ms Jones stated that it was approximately 60 out of 503.

Mr Jowett noted the drop in overall staff absence was positive. Mrs Cooper highlighted the impact of the return to work meetings.

**Q (LJ): On the KS1 data (Teacher assessments) what was the reason for the big difference between boys and girls in maths?**

Ms Jones reported that there were some girls who had not engaged as well with maths. She stated that this would be scrutinised in the final analysis. Ms Jones reported that this had been an issue previously with girls moving out of KS1.

## **6) Review of Policies, Procedures and Publications**

### **a) Retention and disposal of data (GDPR)**

The policy had been circulated to the governing body and the governors were taken through the key points.

**Q (LJ): What do governors need to be aware of?**

It was noted that governors only needed to be aware of documents with staff names and the majority of documents did not contain personal data. Ms Webb queried the information received for the pay committee. The clerk noted that this should be anonymised.

Mrs Cooper reported that the SDSA were now using the Any Coms system and the school were very strict in relation to information requests. Ms Jones reported that the school had recorded 2 minor breaches and these were recorded on the server.

**Q (RobJ): How does the school back up the files?**

Ms Jones reported that the IT company did this and it was backed up to the cloud. She stated that it was also backed up manually and kept in the other school building. Mrs Cooper stated that they had received statements from other providers that the school used on keeping data safe.

The governing body agreed the policy.

**7) Governor Visits**

**a) Science visit**

Mr Jowett reported that he had asked Mrs Rahman for a written report and this would be included on the agenda for the next meeting.

**ACTION: SR**

Ms Webb reported that she had undertaken a health and safety walkthrough focussed on storage and fed back to Ms Jones where there were areas of concern. She highlighted that the sports storage was a positive point in the walkthrough.

**ACTION: September FGB agenda**

**8) Health and Safety**

**a) Report**

The health and safety report had been circulated to the governing body.

**Q (LJ): Did the school buy into the Single Central Record audit service?**

Ms Jones stated that it was part of the HR service and they would undertake the audit before the end of term.

**Q (JW): Was there enough first aid cover in school?**

Ms Jones stated that there were a large number of staff trained. She explained that every member of Foundation Stage had undertaken paediatrics first aid training (2 day course). Ms Jones explained that Mr Cheetham, Mr Marsh and Mr Storey were trained in the Evolve system (trips).

**Q: How did the 311 incidents compare to last year's data?**

Ms Jones would check the data and share with governors.

**ACTION: RJ**

**Q (JW): Did the school alter supervision in the playground if accidents occurred?**

Ms Jones stated that if they were in a particular spot they would move staffing round. She stated that Mel Thorpe was analysing the accident sheets.

**Q (SH): Was there a policy on changing children in FS1?**

Ms Jones stated that there was a policy in place.

Mr Thorpe drew governor's attention to a new product they were looking at buying into for cleaning in school where COSHH was not needed. He explained that system

which cleaned without the use of chemicals. Mr Thorpe stated that the initially cost was high but it would pay for itself over time.

#### **b) Asbestos management plan**

The asbestos management plan had been circulated to the governing body. Ms Jones explained that it was not a requirement to have one as the LA had a plan but it was seen as good practice for school to have their own.

Ms Jones clarified that there were a small amount of asbestos in the nursery and there was assumed to be asbestos around the heaters in Gopsall. Mr Thorpe explained that it was managed monthly. Ms Webb highlighted that this was also checked on one of the health and safety walkthroughs.

#### ***Q (LJ): Would asbestos management be the school's responsibility when they joined the MAT?***

Ms Jones stated yes and that it would be likely they would still submit monthly returns and the school would lease the building from the LA.

#### **9) Safeguarding report**

The completed safeguarding report was circulated to the governing body. It was reported that it had been submitted.

#### **10) Data trends (from MAT analysis)**

Mr Jowett circulated the data trends document produced for the MAT due diligence. He explained that the same document had been submitted to the RSC for each school. The governing body reviewed the data and highlighted the following:

- The main issue with the small number of Bangladeshi pupils who would not achieve a GLD this academic year was impoverished language and slow language acquisition.
- All statistics for 2018 were compared to last year's National so this may change.
- The governing body discussed those pupils who were joining the school from other city schools and the impact of moving and the potential loss in curriculum knowledge.

The governing body agreed that the format of the report was very useful and would be kept for future monitoring.

#### **11) Finance – CFR report**

The CFR report was circulated to the governing body. It was highlighted that the Community Focussed Revenue balance (£42,636.56) had been moved into other budget headings, as reported at the last meeting, and would not show in future reports.

The CFR report was agreed by the governing body and signed by the Chair.

***Susan Hind and Dan Cheetham left the meeting***

#### **12) Governing Body Business**

##### **a) Training and Development**

There was no training to report since the last FGB meeting. Mr Jowett would put an action plan together for September.

**ACTION: LJ**

### **13)SIP update and outline**

The school improvement plan was circulated to the governing body. There would be an afternoon for governors with Ms Jones and the SLT focussed on the school improvement plan on Wednesday 26<sup>th</sup> September (12:30pm for lunch for a 1:00pm start).

The following was highlighted:

- Coding would be included as a new heading in the teaching and learning section for the new SIP.
- Mr Jowett highlighted the importance of linking the actions to the budget

#### **Q (JW): Were there any actions to carry forward to the new SIP?**

Ms Jones stated that they needed to look again at online safety. She explained that they would look at producing a newsletter for parents to raise the profile. Ms Jones stated that in terms of parent workshops they had not found anything that would engage parents unless it was done in-house. Mrs Cooper highlighted that they knew how best to communicate with the school's parents.

#### **Q (JW): Was healthy cooking a curriculum requirement?**

Ms Jones explained that cooking was part of the curriculum. She explained that the plans for Gopsall would ensure that cooking was included more effectively. Ms Jones stated that cooking had been included within curriculum topics. She stated that Mrs Andrews and Mrs James would take the lead on cooking next academic year.

Ms Webb asked about the teacher's capacity. Ms Jones stated that there was capacity in school. She explained that they offered all subject leaders time for their responsibility.

The governing body discussed potential ideas to promote healthy eating.

The 5 year building plan was circulated for information.

### **14)Partnership Working Party**

There was no update with the next meeting on Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> July.

### **15)Documents Received by the Chair of Governors**

- Governing Matters magazine
- Matters Arising
- Headteacher Appraisal - Dates

### **16) Any Other Business**

There was no other business to discuss.

### **17) Date of Next Meetings**

#### Meetings for 2018/2019

- Monday 17<sup>th</sup> September 2018
- Monday 15<sup>th</sup> October 2018
- Monday 19<sup>th</sup> November 2018

- Monday 17<sup>th</sup> December 2018
- Monday 11<sup>th</sup> February 2019
- Monday 18<sup>th</sup> March 2019
- Monday 13<sup>th</sup> May 2019
- Monday 24<sup>th</sup> June 2019

The meeting closed at 17:40

Signed ..........17<sup>th</sup> September 2018