

GLEBE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Minutes of the Full Governing Body Meeting Held at Glebe Primary School, Sussex Road, Ickenham on Thursday 20th September 2018 – 18:30pm

Mr J Buckingham (Chair) *
Mrs P Swindells (Vice Chair)

Mrs M Penney (ex-officio)	Mrs J Morris +
Miss J Brown	Mr P Niznik
Mrs N Cumberbatch *	Mrs N Ross
Mr R Everett	Dr S Tempest
Miss J Griffiths *	Mr S Youens
Mrs K Hampshire	
Mrs J Heggie	Mrs T Connick (Clerk)
Mrs D Joyce	



* Denotes apologies received ^ Denotes associate member
+ Denotes member absent ~ Denotes member late

Action

2716	<p>Apologies / Guests Apologies were received from JB, JG, NC and accepted as indicated above. JM absent. (PS to Chair in JB's absence)</p>	
2717	<p>Minutes of the last meeting Agreed by all Governors.</p>	
2718	<p>Matters Arising NC has given apologies for tonight but resigned from her post with immediate effect. Due to work and family commitments she sadly cannot continue, this leaves a vacancy for Parent Governor.</p>	Clerk
2719	<p>Matters for any other business Office hours - MP CCTV - MP Dropbox – NR/PN Class sizes over 30 - MP</p>	
2720	<p>Headteachers Report - <i>distributed via email prior to meeting.</i></p> <p><u>Areas Covered in the Report (Full report appendices 1)</u> See full report Appendices 1.</p> <p><u>Question and Answer Session - based on report content</u> Who is disallowed from SATs testing? Advice from DFE about disapplying children Pupils shouldn't take the tests if any of the following apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They have not completed the relevant KS1 programme of study • They are working below the overall standard of the KS1 tests (and are considered to be unable to answer the easiest questions) 	

- They are unable to participate even when using suitable access arrangements
- **What is the definition for "significant SEN"?**

Children with an EHCP who are either in need of highly specialist intervention (SRP) or pupils who are not at a developmental stage to be able to access the curriculum and would be better placed in a specialist setting. The pupils who are classed as significant SEN fit all of the criteria set out above.

Do the National figures also show without these two groups? If not then why are we doing it?

Our school percentages include those pupils who did not sit the test so the average is brought down by the 5 children who would be recorded as scoring zero (even though they were disapplied).

No, the national figures do not show results without disapplied, however we were advised by both the Ofsted inspector and Paul Wiggins to show the impact that such pupils are having on the results. That way we can demonstrate to Governors and 'outside' advisors/professionals that a 'dip' in a particular year group is not a drop in standards but rather due to higher than average numbers of children with significant needs. The current Year 3 cohort are the only year group with such significant issues. However, we have also been advised that it would be prudent to do this with year groups where there has been a significant amount of casual admissions over time to demonstrate the negative impact that this can have on a cohort (in comparison to other years groups). I do think that the casual admissions issue will reduce as we are full in almost all year groups.

Target 3 Professional Development: are they linked to the SDP? If every teacher has an individual initiative that is a lot of work for the monitors. Long / short term initiatives? Any reporting to Governors?

It is no more onerous than having to monitor other targets. All subject leaders implement an initiative (small scale or large scale) each year – whether it be re-vamping the curriculum or assessment processes or having a themed/creative day in their subject. The key is impact.

2018 Data

The EYFS results show 76% for Glebe in 2018, against 77% for Glebe in 2017. How volatile is this measure? i.e. is a 1% drop over a year significant, or is a variance of 1% not unreasonable? To put this into context each pupil in a year group has a percentage value of 1.1% so this drop is one pupil less than last year not achieving a Good Level of Development (GLD). So we would not consider this an issue. The abilities of cohorts vary year on year which is why there are discrepancies in comparisons annually. I also think it is important to point out that GLD is not purely based on academic achievement – to achieve GLD pupils must be at the expected standard in terms of self-care and behaviour as well as academically.

The End of KS1 SATs results show excellent results with increases and better than the national figures for all areas with just the one exception. It looks like greater depth in writing for us is lower than the national figure, is this an expected result? and is there a plan to focus on getting closer to / above the national figure in this area as well?

The writing result is teacher assessed (not a 'marked' test) and, because of this, the result was not a surprise. We obviously have no idea of that years' national averages during the school year and only have the previous years' percentages to compare to. As Governors will be aware, writing is a focus (especially greater depth) writing of our School Improvement Plan (SIP) so we have pre-empted this and are focused on improving this area.

	<p>Danielle, Jenny and I have already started Phase monitoring which involves observing writing lessons and our first phase as a priority has included Year 3 to ensure that these pupils are targeted as a result of their end of KS1 outcomes.</p> <p><u>School Development and Monitoring</u> You mention more stringent targets for this year, and I have no issue with challenging targets, but just wanted to check the targets are attainable. For Target 1 moving from a 70+% target to a 73% target, how challenging is a 3percentage point increase in 1 year given previous performance or comparators with other schools?</p> <p>The targets are performance management related and therefore based around pay progression so it is vital that they are challenging. Teachers need to prove that they have added value to the pupils in their class. As each pupil per class is worth 3.3% we are, in effect, talking about 1 more pupil reaching the expected standard by the end of the school year (22 out of 30). However, 73% is a baseline which I hope to build on in the future (all will be revealed in my Road to Outstanding presentation during the full Governing Body meeting on 20th September).</p> <p>Also for Target 1 with respect to the greater depth increase, 5% seems to be a significant increase. With the example given, if you're moving from 11% to 16%, would it be reasonable to expect around 50% more children to reach the greater depth in reading over the year?</p> <p>11% is the equivalent of 3 pupils achieving greater depth in a single class, increasing this to 16% is effectively targeting the teacher with getting 2 more pupils achieving greater depth. I don't think it is onerous and, again, is building on the standards we should be achieving if we want to be judged as outstanding.</p> <p><u>Additions to questions and answers already supplied by MP</u> MP confirmed that staggered playtimes have begun as part of RFC. She stated that in the same period last year there were 44 behaviour related incidents in the playground and over the same period this year there have only been 20.</p> <p>Governor asked if it was still the case that incidents were due to the same pupils, did the names keep reoccurring. DJ confirmed yes this was largely still true, strategies and consistency in the behaviour framework help to resolve this. SIP has an entry for the behaviour framework and it is important that all staff are consistent in delivering this, grey areas such as uniform policy and rules must be adhered to. MP stated that LSA's and SMSA's are also expected to follow policy with children.</p> <p>Governor asked if they receive an induction. MP replied yes as well as a handbook and training.</p>	
2721	<p>Presentation – “3 Years To Outstanding” Copy of presentation attached.</p> <p>MP delivered her presentation about the strategy she would like the school to follow in order to achieve outstanding at the next Ofsted inspection. Governors watched a 25 minute presentation, setting targets and how to obtain an increase in R.W.M and Greater Depth.</p> <p>Governor asked what other methods will help with this. MP replied Venn diagrams, new literacy books that will be passed up with the pupil each year so as the next teacher can draw on making progress from last year's work, tick sheets for pupils to see their progress at a glance.</p>	

	<p>Governor asked what methods were in place to allow teachers to share examples of best practice and secondly for SLT professional development what experience do they have in this.</p> <p>DJ explained - three Insets a year (termly), teachers share examples of work and look at the previous years' work to build on what their year groups are doing, observations are filmed and looked back on, NQT's watch video clips, staff work with peers where necessary.</p> <p>In response to the second area of SLT there are phase leaders, release time, support in particular subject areas, marking policy where one set of books is looked at together for consistency which is very simple and time effective.</p> <p>MP added that she had also been mentored by three different people last year and had coaching in SLT for several years.</p> <p>Governor enquired if new staff are aware of how assessment is carried out.</p> <p>MP said yes, they are informed in interview that video assessment is used and once the reasoning behind it becomes clear they realise the value of this method.</p> <p>Governor enquired how staff feel about the strategy.</p> <p>MP said the feedback had been positive, they liked the clarity of targets and once they realised that it was only 2/3 children each year that needed to make the added progress it was quite attainable.</p> <p>Governor enquired if parents are made aware if their child is selected to work at greater depth for that year.</p> <p>MP stated that all parents are kept up to date with pupil progress, however it's very subtle enrichment to increase the GD so not necessary.</p> <p>Governor commented that the strategy was excellent but that they could see a problem given the high mobility of pupils that Glebe encounters with forces pupils, is there any way that can be addressed.</p> <p>MP said that there wasn't much that could be done about pupil demographics, Years 5/6 were currently full so three wouldn't be much movement in those.</p>	
2722	<p>GDPR – rolling item to ensure compliance.</p> <p>MP stated the health check report was expected mid-November.</p> <p>Clarification that all communication between governors must be undertaken on the Glebe email only to ensure security and compliance.</p> <p>Discussion around this and the use of Dropbox for documents.</p> <p>Decision that we should look at a governor's secure area on the main website using cloud storage. MP/KH to check with LGFL.</p>	MP/KH
2723	<p>Finance Report – distributed via email prior to meeting.</p> <p>JBR summarised report.</p> <p>FOG had confirmed figures of £2515.80 from the summer fair.</p> <p>Discussed Premises Apprenticeship, Capital spending projects and CCCTV.</p> <p>Teachers proposed pay awards explained, Governors agreed. RATIFIED.</p>	CLERK/ JR
2724	<p>Academy Status</p> <p>Rolling item, no discussion.</p>	
2725	<p>Governor Mark</p> <p>PS said that the final submission had been sent and the inspector had been allocated to come and assess the Governors Mark, date 10 October.</p> <p>PS explained that we needed to ensure the GB worked purposefully in order to match MP's strategy of being "3 Years To Outstanding", circulated exercise to</p>	

	<p>complete in pairs. Choosing most important factors to focus on in meetings relating to Ofsted frameworks and strategy.</p> <p>PS will compile results for next meeting, also suggested all governors google “strategies for primary FGB” as there is a n abundance of information out there.</p>	PS
2726	<p>Promoting the School</p> <p>JH reported that the committee had not yet met this academic year. Future of committee still to be decided. FOG will meet next week, all welcome.</p>	
2727	<p>Working Parties</p> <p><u>Parking permits.</u></p> <p>All permits have now been allocated and given out by the LA.</p> <p>Governor made it clear that Hillingdon LA have not been communicating effectively and leaving it to the school to administer queries, this was not our job.</p> <p>MP gave a huge thanks to PN for once again sorting the applications (on distance criteria) and helping to reply to queries.</p>	
2728	<p>Governor Training.</p> <p>NR – undertook two courses at the end of July - “Autism a lack of understanding in ethnic communities” and “coordinating difficulties”</p>	
2729	<p>Sub Committees</p> <p>- Allocation for academic year 2018-2019.</p> <p>Completed list will be distributed via email by Clerk.</p>	Clerk
2730	<p>Link Governors</p> <p>- Allocation for academic year 2018-2019.</p> <p>JH said she could no longer act as link for PSHE.</p> <p>PS reminded governors that there was a vacancy for a literacy link. She stated that she was happy to swap from science to literacy to ensure that literacy as a core subject remained covered.</p> <p>Request for someone to cover science and PSHE. No volunteers this meeting.</p>	Clerk
2731	<p>Adopted Governors</p> <p>- Allocation for academic year 2018-2019.</p> <p>List circulated, completed list will be distributed via email by Clerk.</p>	Clerk
2732	<p>Agenda items for the next meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Election of Chair and Vice Chair - Terms of Office - Governors mark submission results - CCTV - Link governors 	
2733	<p>Dates for Future Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 22nd November 2018 - 24th January 2019 - 14th March 2019 - 9th May 2019 - 20th June 2019 	

Any Other BusinessOffice hours

MP stated that there had been some requests to change hours by the office staff. AM had dropped a day and would now like to drop a second only working 3.5 days a week – JC had alternate Mondays off – DK was employed for 20 hours a week – JR wanted to reduce to 3 days per week.

Governor stated they thought the HR post that JR was working in had been advertised as full time so was this not required, if not this would mean an approx. £15k saving.

MP said the role was new and so they were still uncertain how many hours it would need per week however JR thought this would be sufficient so the proposal was to trial it and see it.

Governor stated they thought the aim of these roles was to increase office hours so as the school had adequate administrative support as our “benchmarking ratio” had been very low compared to other schools.

Governor asked if these reductions would mean that the office still had adequate cover.

MP said there would still be someone in the office at all times, it was agreed to make the changes on a trial basis until Christmas (ringfencing the saved money) and see how things went.

CCTV

MP explained the necessity for this given a recent incident.

Full discussion under Finance minutes and capital spending (detailed above)

FGB informed of this and agreed to look costs and options.

Dropbox

Discussion as part of GDPR (detailed above)

Class sizes over 30

Copies of emails between the LA and MP have been sent to governors.

The LA are requesting that Glebe take a set of twins and they are refusing to acknowledge this would push admission numbers (PAN) over 30 in both reception classes. They state that SRP pupils do not contribute to main class numbers as they get separate funding.

MP has explained the school’s concerns that:

- Health and safety is compromised with large class numbers
- SRP pupils need a suitable environment to learn in and extra noise generated by class sizes over 30 can seriously impact this, mainstream learning is encouraged where possible.
- SRP exists in Glebe and we may have to take further pupils as requested that require these resources pushing the PAN higher over quota.

Governor stated it is discriminatory not to count SEN/SRP pupils in the main numbers, it breaches the equality act. The amount of time that is given by an SRP teacher to each child is no more than a simple peripatetic allocation in a mainstream school meaning class teachers still include them in main numbers the majority of the time.

Governor asked where the twins were now.

MP said they were at another school within this borough.

Governor wanted to know why they were moving.

MP replied the mother has chosen Glebe as a better school, she explained that also subsequent to receiving this request it has become apparent both twins have considerable additional needs, but no EHCP is in place.

Governor enquired why this was.

	<p>MP said the mother had not even heard of an EHCP, the current school had failed to assess the pupils or provide support needed but do know of their needs as the SENCO has now rung ours four times to “demand we take them”</p> <p>Governors expressed concern as this failure and unhappiness that the pupils were not receiving the support they needed before now.</p> <p>Governor suggested that the LA should be informed the current school had failed in its duties, they also said since the twins were in a school it should be this school addressing the EHCP with the mother not Glebe.</p> <p>Governor asked how long it takes to obtain an EHCP.</p> <p>MP replied around 20 weeks</p> <p>Governor stated therefore if we are forced to admit the two pupils above number there would be no funding for 1-1 for the best part of the school year meaning Glebe would have to take support from where it’s needed elsewhere or find monies to employ 1-1 support ourselves.</p> <p>Second Governor asked if the LA can impose the decision to take the twins and go over numbers.</p> <p>MP replied it would go to a panel who are independent.</p> <p>Governor asked if there is a mechanism for face to face meetings to try and resolve this before the appeal as all communications so far are by email.</p> <p>MP replied none that she was aware of, will check with JB.</p> <p>Governor asked what the GB could do to support Glebe now.</p> <p>MP replied she would contact the LA and let governors know, also agreed to cc Emily Wright and Dan Kennedy at the LA.</p>	
	Meeting closed at 20:54pm	

I agree that this is a true and accurate record of the meeting dated above:

Signature: _____
 (Chair of Governors)

Date: _____