## ST' MATTHEWS PRIMARY SCHOOL GOVERNING BODY COMMITTEE MINUTES OF MEETING THURSDAY 12 JULY 2018 at 18.15pm

**PRESENT:** Z Thorn Chair

N Perry
T Lloyd
M Hatcher
M Tinkler
D Lucarelli
L Walker
R Mottershead
C Bates
R Herbane
L Silver
L Steel

K Spencer-Allen

T Davies Headteacher

A Lewis Assistant Headteacher

IN ATTENDANCE: B Jones Clerk

Item	Agenda Item	Action
1	WELCOME	
	The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.	
2	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
	There were apologies from	
	Carole Mills, Vice Chair Angel Gurria Kevin Blencowe	
	The Chair informed governors that Melissa Hatcher and Gavin Ayliffe terms of office had finished.	
	No declarations to note	
3	MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING	
	The minutes of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> May 2018 were <b>accepted</b> as a true record. There is a letter missing, T by itself item 7	
	Point 2, 'impressed with his experience' rather than 'at'.	
	Matters arising	
	IT will be providing some new e-safety updates on the 13 <sup>th</sup> November 2018. It was agreed that the Link Governor will attend the training at 3.40pm	
	Question: Will the IT governor be the e-safety governor? Head: As there is no IT link governor, it could be the Safeguarding governor that attends the training.	

Item	Agenda Item	Action
	Governors were advised that the Cambridgeshire schools forum have issued a press release regarding the fairer funding formula of schools. The schools forum has written to the Minister with a general response that had already been sent to primary heads for information.	
	The remaining matters arising are included elsewhere on the agenda.	
4	RAISING STANDARDS	
	DRAFT MINUTES OF THE TLOC COMMITTEE MEETING	
	The minutes were <b>accepted</b> as a true record.	
5	HEADTEACHER REPORTS	
	The Head introduced this item.	
	Attendance is at 96.4%, which is above the national average. It was noted that it has been consistently around the national average.	
	Question: What have you done around persistent absence to improve this? Assistant Head: We follow up immediately with parents. We work with the school office to go through the registers every half term, target people with letters' as and when they need them. However, parents believe the language of the letter to be aggressive.	
	Governors were advised that the school has completed a successful teacher recruitment process.	
	Statutory assessment results	
	The school would usually provide more data next term, however, the Head advised that the school has undertaken some work to identify and extrapolate some data. The school is really disappointed with the maths results but confirmed that it is on top of this with actions being developed for next term.	
	It was noted that in early years, there had been a very big turnover of children, 15 left and 13 arriving in year, with a number that have no prior schooling and have SEN.	
	Question: Would you normally just have a couple of children leaving in reception? Head: No, it is very high in comparison. We believe that this is a result of people moving out of Cambridge.	
	It was noted that the outcomes for phonics was above the national average. The head confirmed that the children receive a test in year 1 and those that do not meet expected standards; retake the test in year 2.	
	Key stage 1 reading and writing results are very strong and above average in all areas whilst key stage 2 is strong in reading and writing.	
	The governors were reminded that these are provisional averages.	
	A note of thanks was made to Liz who has been leading on the work on improving outcomes in writing across the school.	

•		
Item	Agenda Item	Action
	Percentages of greater depth figures are not available yet.	
	If the thresholds are the same as last year, then we will have 48% in reading and the national average was 25%	
	30% in maths, this was 23% as a national average last year	
	28% for English Grammar, Punctuation and Spelling	
	The one that is below is that of the percentage of children reaching age related expectations in mathematics.	
	Question: Was that one mark? Head: Eleven were one standardised score mark away in maths. A small number with one raw score mark away, 5 children with two marks off the test.	
	Question: Do you think its something to do with the change in the size of the cohort? Head: No, we have the same number of teachers per child. It is early days for analysis. Initial impression of those who narrowly missed ARE is that for some there were just a few little mistakes in the test papers.	
	Question: Where the children spread across the three classes? Head: Yes. Children were in sets rather than lasses for maths. There were one higher attaining set in maths and two that were average.	
	Question: Is there anything around the target settings. Head: When setting targets, we have to set higher aspirational targets for each child that results in a high overall target.	
	The Head advised the governors that the school is a bit disappointed that it wasn't aware that some of the children may not have achieved their target, however, they have made significant progress.	
	I think the teachers have reported there are more children that have found it difficult for additional teaching and intervention to stick in the course of the year.	
	Question: Moving into the power maths, will this cost anything additional? Head: No it is likely to be cheaper.	
	Question: What is the information that the children get in terms of the mark? Head: I prefer what we have done this year. We have sent the results home today and normally what we provide is a standardised score with a statement above it saying that a score of 100 above is meeting the expected standard and if below; your child has not yet met the expected standard.	
	The school also send's a leaflet to the parents using guidance from DfE which explains the results.	
	Question: Are you expecting some anxious parents? Head: Don't know. We always get some children that do not pass the test. There isn't that many more when compared to last year that didn't pass the test.	
	A child's result shouldn't come as a big surprise to a parent as we communicate with parents about how the children are attaining throughout their time in school; that is one of the nicer things about having a standardised score.	

Item	Agenda Item	Action
	Question: How many children do you not enter for the tests? Head: 2.	
6	SCHOOL SELF EVALUATION	
	CONSDERING REVIEW OF PUPIL, PARENT AND TEACHER SURVEYS	
	Introduced by the Head	
	What do we think about the homework policy? 56% of teachers strongly agree that the children get the right homework.	
	The head explained that, in relation to homework, some parents would like more, some less and there wasn't a huge amount of commentary provided. We need to have a teacher meeting to discuss homework generally.	
	Question: Is the question wrong? Rather than saying do you want more or less homework or should it be what do you like about homework. Head: Yes.	
	The head advised governors that 90% children feel safe whilst 10% don't. It was noted that there were a few classes that had scored lower than others and the head confirmed that staff had been sent to speak with the children to understand what the children meant by this. Children reported that their conflicts hadn't been resolved by the adults and, as a result, the school will be exploring this further.	
	Question: How many people filled in the questionnaire? Head: 93 responses from parents, all teachers and all children.	
	Question: On the question about dealing effectively with bullying in the parents survey, are the comments about issues that you do know about. Head: the survey is anonymous but you can often determine whether you are aware of an issue or not.	
	Question: Is the pupil survey anonymous? Head: Yes, but you know what class it has come from and with the younger children, the staff lead a discussion.	
	It was noted that 97% of parents say their children are taught well.	
	Question: Is this showing up anything that you hadn't expected? Head: it is really positive and nice. What I thought was interesting was that all of the surveys were saying the same thing and made it easy to develop with the strategic targets.	
	SCHOOL SELF EVALUATION FORM	
	Question: Do you submit this to the local authority? Head: Not formally, though it is viewed by our Assigned Inspector from the Local Authority, Val Palmer	
	The head explained that the SEF serves two purposes, if Ofsted were to advise the school of an inspection, we would send them two key documents, one of which would be the SEF and the second being the school development plan. It's our chance to evaluate the school against the Ofsted schedule.	Head

Item	Agenda Item	Action
	It was noted that the governors only wish to receive the SEF once a term or if	
	there are any material changes. Action.  Question: In terms of the 'overall effectiveness', what is informing the outstanding behavior? Head: We have drawn a little on survey data but the biggest things are lesson observations and learning walks and the children are behaving incredibly well.	
	Question: A lot of your accidents happen during the lunchtime break, if someone came around lunchtime, do you need more supervision?  Head: In 2016, we invited an external person to visit the school and observe the playground and supervision. We have got more children with challenging behavior now than we had some years ago.	
	In terms of accidents, there was an issue with the monkey bars, however they were removed.	
	There is an issue with midday supervisors and the turnover of staff. There is the right number of adults but there is work to do to make them more confident and ensure that the children are happy to speak with him.	
	Question: Is 'the factory' an issue for concern? Head: There are no concerns.	Head
	Within the effectiveness page, it was agreed that the head would remove the phrase 'at least good'. <b>Action</b>	
7	RAISING STANDARDS – DEVELOPING OUR NEXT SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PLAN	
	PRESENTATION OF DRAFT STRATEGIC TARGETS	
	The Head explained that, at the last meeting there had been a presentation of the points that came from the senior leadership team, governing body discussion and surveys. In summary, these formed six broad target areas, which will have work programs underpinning them.	
	Question: How do the teachers at this meeting feel about the strategic target areas? Teachers: Yes, we have spoken about this many times. It comes up at staff meetings.	
	Question: On the point titled 'revise the curriculum to ensure that this reflects the school community', How do you know that you have done that? Head: We need to make sure that the curriculum isn't merely focused upon white males that have done exciting things.	
	Question: Are there financial implications? Head: The biggest threat is the required time to deliver the curriculum.	
	Question: Do you feel like that, as teachers, you need to study to introduce some of these? Teachers: We work quite closely within year groups to understand and deliver key subjects.	
	Question: Has the school hired a language teacher? Head: We are still looking at this. We know that there are some people that are interested and in Sept. we will start a formal recruitment process.	

Item	Agenda Item	Action
	Question: Would that be for French? Head: Yes. There is a constraint to the amount of time that we have to deliver the subject therefore we need someone that is good to be able to do it.	
	Question: Would that be a teacher that floats across different classes?  Head: Yes, it would be for two afternoons per week.	
	Question: In terms of the playground development, would that be dependent upon funding? Head: Yes.	
	Question: In terms of where there is a success criteria of 'above national average', in some cases we are already there, should it be further increased above national average? Head: It's the progress that needs to be above national average.	
	Question: In relation to the improved outcomes for vulnerable and disadvantaged pupils, how big is the cohort? Head: 14% of the children are pupil premium across the school.	
	Question: Is there someway of reflecting adding value from the school? Head: Yes, that's what the progress measure does which is reflected within the document.	
	The draft school plan with the key areas and success criteria received Unanimous approval.	
	ALLOCATION OF LINK GOVERNOR ROLES	
	The Chair invited governors were to consider which 'link roles' they would like to undertake from Sept. The following link governors were agreed:	
	Angel Gurria: Literacy or maths. Deborah Lucarelli: Science and ICT Neil Perry: Pupil premium Ricardo Herbane: Outdoor learning Zoe Thorn: Aspects of leadership	
	GOVERNOR ACTION PLAN	
	This item was not discussed.	
8	GDPR	
	Governors were presented with an updated Data Protection policy that incorporates key responsibilities related to GDPR.	
	The head confirmed that the policy will be placed on the website whilst the Privacy notice is already on the website.	
	Question: On a teachers' laptop, is the information synchronised to an encrypted drive? Head: Yes, most of the drives, the information doesn't sit directly on the laptop and can only be accessed when in school.	
	Question: What secure measures are in place for the server? Head: It is in a locked room.	
	Question: Is there someone in the school with overall responsibility for ICT apart from you? Head: Yes, Adrian, school business manager.	

Item	Agenda Item	Action
	The policy was approved.	
	E-safety Policy. The head informed governors that two new points have been added.	
	The policy was approved.	
9	LINK GOVERNOR REPORT ON SAFEGUARDING	
	Governors were provided with a report from the link governor.	
	It was noted that all governors should be able to demonstrate that they have completed some training. It was noted that school is offering basic children protection for staff on the 5 <sup>th</sup> Sept. 2018 at 9am. Governors were invited to attend. <b>Action</b>	Governors
10	LONG TERM SUCCESSION PLANNING FOR THE CHAIRMAN	
	The Chair informed governors that, at the last meeting she had advised the governing body that she would stand down. Governors were informed that Rosa and Deborah have advised that they would be interested in becoming Co-Chair.	
	It was confirmed that a comprehensive framework of how the role will be undertaken by two chairs would be developed.	
	Question: Will you have one email address? Rosa: We will need to consider this.	
	It was noted that Rosa and Deborah are undertaking training at the moment and over the next year will start to take over the role.	
	RAISING STANDARDS – GOVERNOR TRAINING	
	Ricardo Herbane attended the termly briefing and emphasized to governors that the website needs to be updated. The minutes are quite old. <b>Action</b>	Head
	Question: What are the checks and balances to ensure that the website is updated? Head: There is a website audit once per year.	
	Governors were advised that it would be helpful for their photos to be included on the website. It was agreed that governors would provide individual photos to the head. <b>Action</b>	Governors
	FORWARD PLANNING – DATES FOR FUTURE MEETINGS	
	Thursday 4 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 6.15pm FGB	
	Wednesday 12 <sup>th</sup> December 2018 6.15pm FGB	
	Thursday 14 <sup>th</sup> March 2019 6.15pm FGB	
	Wednesday 1 <sup>st</sup> May 2019 6.15pm FGB	
	Wednesday 10 <sup>th</sup> July 2019 6.15pm FGB	

Item	Agenda Item	Action
11	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
	It was agreed that the Clerk would check schools' instrument of governance for co-opting governors. <b>Action.</b>	Clerk
	It was agreed that there would be a 'Prevent' update on the next agenda.  Action	Clerk
	SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT ACTIONS AND OUTCOMES FROM MEETING	

The meeting closed at 20.58

Signed: Zoe Thorn Date: 4<sup>th</sup> October 2018