

## MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING BODY – FOUNDRY LANE PRIMARY SCHOOL

TUESDAY 30<sup>th</sup> APRIL 2019

Governors present:	Sean Taylor [ST]	Marie Loftus [ML]
	David Higlett [DH]	Kathryn Lugg [KL]
	Andrew Tindall [AT]	Jack Davis [JD]
	Debbie Wyatt [DW]	Liz Smith [LS] [6.57]
	Cathy Baggott [CB]	Jack Davis [JD]
	Kristin Jones [KJ]	Robbie Turkington [RT]
	Sid Watson-Rose [SWR]	Stephanie Crispin
	Ben Penfold [BP]	
Associate Governors:	Helen Aldred [HA]	
Other:		
Clerk:	Elisabeth Ruggles	

## 01. APOLOGIES

Apologies had been received and accepted from Emma Wareham and Paul Candy.

## 02. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

ML declared an interest relating to the leadership structure, which would apply to all staff governors.

## 03. AGREEMENT OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

The Minutes were agreed, as being a true and accurate record of the meeting and were signed by the Chair.

Confidential Item - please see additional sheet

## 04. MATTERS ARISING

AGENDA ITEM	DECISIONS / COMMENTS	ACTION	DUE DATE	PERSON
<u>GB MTG</u> <u>02.04.19</u>				
(07)	SEF paperwork	JD suggested inserting 'good' in front of support (p2). No further questions or comments. The SEF is to be sent to the SIO prior to her visit (cc to DH)		
(11)	Decision on lunchtimes	To go in Newsletter 1 <sup>st</sup> May. Staff and the midday supervisors have been made aware End of Easter term		

Signed  
Chair of Governors  
Dated

(15)	'Keeping Children Safe in Education'	HA will send out a new list of governors who need to send in their certificate
(16)	Staff Survey	EW, RT, JD, DH met before Easter. A meeting to be set up with ST and SLT in summer term. RT considering next steps and will send out to those involved.
<u>GB MTG</u> 12.02.19		
(05)	Phones	KL has investigated cost. £423 for 40 lockers. The school would need to invest in at least 2.

## 05. BUDGET AGREEMENT

DH thanked KL and DW in advance for all their hard work on looking at the budget for the next academic year.

KL reported that they were unable to bring a finished budget to the meeting, as it was not as straightforward as they had initially thought.

Some budgets, such as the money received for PP children has decreased. In addition to this, SCC has changed the structure for support staff, which means that the costs for LSAs is now considerably higher.

Everything the school would like to budget for has been included. However, it needs to be reviewed, as the school is unable to set a balanced budget at the end of year 2 (of a 3-year budget plan). When setting a budget, there is an assumption that costs will rise, but income will stay the same. This means that the third year of any budget forecast plan shows a challenging scenario; however, the second year needs to balance, which is not the case here. The first year is fine, but costs in the second rise, which results in the budget not balancing. LS asked if the budget for the second year was way off target - it is and when carrying this forward to the third year, it becomes totally unbalanced and unsustainable. The school does not want to find itself back in the financial situation of a few years ago. The school needs to have a surplus, which can be carried forward. This surplus currently masks the shortfalls in the budget forecast plan.

KL and DW have spent a long time analysing where savings could be made and looking at where costs have risen. They also found out that the balances brought forward from last year are not correct. They are £10,000 out. Therefore, the surplus, which was in the region of £100,000 is now closer to £90,000.

The D budget is showing a surplus of £56,000, but it would be dangerous to use this to sustain the staffing budget. ST pointed out that the school can take a calculated risk, but a wild risk, such as this, does not come into question.

SEE CONFIDENTIAL ITEM – MEETING 30.04.19

Signed  
Chair of Governors  
Dated

It was agreed, that whilst discussions on the budget could take place during the Resources Committee meetings, the budget would require the agreement of the full Governing Body, prior to being signed off. KL pointed out that the school could ask SCC for an extension if governors would like to discuss it at a full Governing Body meeting. The decision was made to move the next full meeting to 11<sup>th</sup> June.

## 06. PROGRESS AND ATTAINMENT

Data details were handed out during the meeting.

In terms of the annual cycle, staff are given time to meet as a year group to discuss the children and enter their data onto the pupil progress tracker. Phase leaders then meet with staff members and moderate as necessary. They discuss the data with the teachers to make sure it is right. The SLT then looks at the overall picture, looking at patterns, things that are off track or surprising. From all of this ST produces the data sheets.

The data is shown in a descending order – from the highest to the lowest attainers. The school would expect 27% to achieve greater depth, in line with the FFT data. Staff will look at children who are on the edge of this group to see if they are able to progress into it. The same is true further down the list. FFT data shows 77% should be working to ARE; it is currently 76%.

The data also allows teachers to see whether the children are EAL, PP children or boys/girls. Children can be compared. For example, those children in the shaded yellow block (right hand block) are a little vulnerable. There is progress, but they are only just achieving, so these children are discussed at an intervention meeting, so support can be put in place for them.

The shaded blocks show the following:

Yellow – children are making the expected, typical progress (ARE)

Green – children are achieving greater depth

Red – children are not making typical progress

The SLT looked at year group patterns, shown in Tables 1 and 2. A red box shows the number not yet on track, a green box shows the number who are moving towards it and the white box shows the number of children who are where they should be.

The milestones are lower than where they should be, but this does increase the higher up the school you go; YrR shows 70% making ARE, in KS1 it is 77% and by KS2 it is 80%.

### Issues

Signed  
Chair of Governors  
Dated

Maths in Yr1. A ‘mastery’ curriculum has been implemented, which has made it problematic. Previously all the children were doing different things and the lesson was strongly differentiated. Now there is one learning objective for the whole class. This means there is whole class teaching, although there are different types of support, depending on ability. This works well for most year groups, but not for Yr1. This is a common feature for all schools within the Trust. In this group, three children are not on track.

Similarly, writing is only just where it should be. Assessment here is very tricky as it is reliant on external assessment.

In KS2, writing is again a major issue. Yrs 3 and 5 are slightly behind where they should be.

Yr5 as a whole cohort, are behind, so the school is looking at ways to address this. Once the SATS tests in Yr6 have been completed, one of the Yr6 teachers will go into Yr5. The entire year will be split into four groups, instead of the usual three and will have extensive preparation for Yr6. This cohort has very complex and high needs.

### Groups Exceeding Expectations

Yr1 are on track.

In Yr2 reading and writing are an issue, writing more so. The school is preparing for the possibility of external moderation of work for this year group.

Yr3 is in a very good position.

Yr4 is in line with expectations.

Yr5 are matching ARE, but writing and maths require more work to mirror the rising national expectations.

In Yr6 writing will be moderated.

DH pointed out that whilst writing in Yr2 was on target, it has dropped. This is because teachers are more cautious, due to the external moderation that may take place. Sally is also going into Yr2 on Thursday mornings to do some support work with some of the children. The school has also invested in some time out of class for two Yr6 teachers, who have not been externally moderated before. ML has been allowed time to prepare them for this experience and she thanked the SLT for the opportunity to do so.

ML spoke at the recent Resources Committee meeting about the data for Yr5. In Yr4 their writing was at about 60%, but they are making good effective progress with Sally’s help. She is now in Yr5 working with 17 PP children. JD said she would look at the moderation report before the next Teaching and Learning Committee meeting for an update on five children. These children have not been on track since December – prior to then, they were.

Signed  
Chair of Governors  
Dated

JD also pointed out that the writing in YR3 has made excellent progress, when compared with their data in Yr2.

### Progress

The percentage of children making typical or more than typical progress is added together and a figure in excess of 100% is aimed for.

This is not the case in Yrs 1 (maths) and Yrs4 and 5.

DH asked why these tables showed red blocks. This is because the percentages, when added up, show less than 100%. Whilst Yr4 writing is on target, making typical progress, it must be looked at closely as it stands at 97% overall.

On the next page of the data, the vulnerable groups are considered and patterns across the school examined. It is clear that there are no obvious patterns. The data shows the proportion of children in borderline groups. The percentage number refers to the percentage of that group in a year group who are not making strong progress, e.g. in Yr1 25% of girls are not making the expected progress as opposed to 17% of all boys. This might mean that the curriculum needs to be looked at. In YrR writing was geared towards boys as they were the group not making expected progress.

BP asked whether all schools used the FFT50. All schools use this data as well as the FFT20.

DH asked what the final milestone at the end of the year is. It is between 73-78%. KJ asked whether it would be useful to have an overall percentage showing those not making the expected progress. ST says he has flagged up the different groups on the data charts only where there is a big difference between certain groups. When looking at vulnerable children there are all sorts of different characteristics. The aim is to give an overview.

ML pointed out how many EAL children there are in the first column of the other document making greater than expected progress. SWR asked why Yr6 was not included in the data – the year group is pretty much on track and there are only nine days to go until their SATS tests. In terms of intervention, ML said teachers are looking at writing until the actual test. They are going through all the reading and writing; there is no teacher assessment of this this year.

RT spoke about the agreed format. The last set of data governors looked at was in February and the changes since then are shown in brackets. DW said that those figures had to do with assessment, but children make different progress at different times.

SWR asked if the figures included SEN children. He felt it would be interesting to see what the figures would be if they were not included. CB pointed out that the attainment of SEN children is not the same as other children, but they do make progress in smaller steps. However, SEN does have an impact on data. It is also included in the FFT data, but this is an 'average' SEN. They are looked at very carefully and the children who are 'working towards'

Signed  
Chair of Governors  
Dated

are supported as this has a big impact. In Yr6 there are four children who are not accessing the curriculum at all. There might also be triggers to show why progress has not been made – for example, there is one SEN child who has an attendance of 6% (=1 day at school). A member of staff has visited the child at home for three mornings each week. The transition to Great Oaks is being made already. This type of progress cannot be monitored and OFSTED is not greatly interested in it, but it is nevertheless important. Three children have been accepted to go on to special secondary education, one of the children is not accessing this, but this is due to parental choice. BP suggested that governors look at this aspect as a case study.

#### 07. LEARNING BEHAVIOUR

There was nothing to add to the discussions from the previous full Governing Body meeting.

#### 08. LEADERSHIP STRUCTURE

This was discussed under (05) Budget Agreement.

#### 09. OFSTED PREPARATION

Everyone has the data – the key points are the headlines and the details have been discussed. Vulnerable groups have also been discussed.

Bitterne C of E Primary has recently been visited by OFSTED and the head teacher has talked ST through it. It is very hard for the inspectors to find and capture all the information they need in one day.

A broader curriculum has been the focus of recent OFSTED visits. There is a feeling that the broader curriculum is being lost as schools have been concentrating on English and Maths. They are looking at the ethos surrounding the curriculum, how the school delivers a wider curriculum and whether it is delivered with quality.

The delivery of a wider curriculum is very strong at Foundry Lane. There is a strong emphasis on Art, Music and Dance. Sally, the art subject leader, has met with ST and discussed applying for the ‘art mark’. She has done some training with a charity, written an arts plan, looked at enrichment (going out to dance workshops, creative arts evenings etc.). It involved a lot of work to create an action plan and send it in with a commitment to make it happen.

She is looking for a governor who will work closely with the team of herself, Hannah and Helen to inform them about what is happening in school. SC is happy to do so as she is already involved. KJ would also like to be involved. They generally meet on a Tuesday, but Sally is happy to meet at any other time.

The parental voice was also captured very well at Bitterne. Foundry Lane took this and handed out a survey at Parents’ Evening. The response was very positive. Parents were asked to rank from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’ on the teaching and progress of their children. Not a single parent, out of 150 replies, ticked lower than ‘agree’ that their children

Signed

Chair of Governors

Dated

had been taught well this year. In addition ‘strongly agree’ outnumbered ‘agree’ by 2:1. This will be brought to another meeting. It has been shared with staff. RT wondered whether governors should do something – DH will write to them.

Two sheets were handed out to governors. One was headed ‘What do you like about Foundry Lane’ and the other asked what parents would change about the school. KL asked governors to look at the Top 5 things from both sheets that have struck them. Please email them to her by the end of the week. Strong positives were the community feel to the school and the fact that staff really care about the children.

JD asked for an update on ‘Marvellous Me’. 82% of all families have signed up. ML pointed out that those from her class who had not signed up, were also the parents who did not attend parents’ evenings. Her other colleagues in Yr6 reported the same. SC echoed this. In the school year (since February half term), over 13,000 updates have been sent out to parents. DW suggested keeping track of all the badges sent out – KL said that 6H, 5C and 1W have the top badge awards. Parents will high five back.

DW went to see ST and looked at a schedule for OFTSED purposes. She has typed it up and sent it out to governors. Any additions welcome. Staff governors asked if they could have a copy too. During the meeting, it became known that the last HT report was not as comprehensive as usual. To be included:

Racist incidents – 3

Attendance data – when compared with last year, it is worse than then, although it is still considered ‘good’ when looked at with OFSTED criteria and better than the national average.

This is something governors might have to look at, as there are many strategies available (SAMS, working with children, the board used in reception). ST is not authorising a lot of absences. Many parents feel they have a right to take their children out of school. CB is very good at challenging parents – there is an issue with a group of children who are persistently absent (with less than 90% attendance). The EWO comes in and discusses attendance with CB each half term. The issue is slowly getting worse. Last year it involved 17-18 children (7.6%), which this year has crept up to 8.7%.

KJ asked if this figure included the child who has been to school once this year. It does and there is another child, who has an attendance of 40% since Christmas. A meeting with the mother is due to take place next week. CB told governors that the school has offered many different things to support the mother, but it is a tricky situation with CP issues. KL said that contextually attendance is up, but it has dipped across the city.

Measures to increase attendance has had a positive impact on PP children. Last year persistent absence was 45%; this year it is 35%. 38% of children who are persistently absent are SEN children. This is due in part to medical needs or issues of behaviour. The EWO has changed since last year. She is lovely with the parents, but equally challenging. There is an

Signed  
Chair of Governors  
Dated

audit each half term and governors are welcome to attend the meeting. KL will send out the dates.

#### 10. PARTNERSHIP UPDATE

Funding (£35,000) has been received by the Trust to look at raising attainment for certain groups of children. The theme chosen was writing and it is aimed at upper KS2 writers. Two teachers have taken this on board and they are targeting lower attaining Yr5 children, who were either just on track or not at KS1. They are given enrichment opportunities. Each Trust school has an advocate and they are using their CPD to improve writing. Hannah has gone on a course and shared this with Phase 3 teachers. It is helping the children to have autonomy over their writing. Emily White is going on a course for Yr1. The children have been to a Poetry Day with Chloe and Hannah. Some of the children were shyer than those from other schools, so teachers hope that the next enrichment day will be of benefit to them. Yr6 will use the same format next year. JD will be updated next time she meets with the English leaders.

The Trust schools are hoping to get more money for CPD from the project. The money is coming from the LEA to fund projects to increase attainment. The Trust has just been successful in a new bid for money to carry out a whole Trust INSET day at a large venue to improve writing (in December).

The WEA has been running a course at school for EAL parents in school and other schools in the Trust. It has been very successful - sixteen families have attended to improve their English. The WEA is hoping to keep such courses going.

#### 11. SAFEGUARDING

There are no safeguarding issues to report.

However, the use of Foundry Lane as a polling station is a big issue. ST pointed out that the school has recently made a big investment to keep the school site safe and secure. SCC require any council owned site to be available as a polling station when the need arises. Although KL suggested three other potential sites, they were all rejected. She also pointed out that with Foundry Lane being a Trust school, it holds the land in trust, but SCC said it provides funding to the school and this gives them the right to use it. With two elections in two weeks, the school is severely inconvenienced. The canteen cannot be used and there are therefore, no hot dinners.

The use of the back gate was to make the school safe. Now the school will have to use temporary fencing. Just when parents and children have got used to using the back entrance, they will have to come through the front entrance again.

Governors could perhaps write a letter underlining their safeguarding concerns. Regents Park is no longer a polling station and KL will investigate why this is the case. SWR said he could complain to SCC as a parent and not as a governor.

Signed  
Chair of Governors  
Dated



JD wondered if the blue room would be an option. It would make it easier to access the site, but the temporary fencing necessary would be a lot longer. DW suggested closing the playgroup for a day. LS thought they might have obligations regarding funding, but it was worth asking. BP suggested speaking to Regents Park and seeing if they had any good suggestions.

## 12. TRAINING

Nothing to report. KL asked if any governor wanted to take on this role. Please speak to her if so.

## 13. AOB

SIO visit Thursday 9th May. If a governor can to attend, they would be very welcome.

Teaching & Learning Committee: Thursday 9<sup>th</sup> May at 4.30

It was agreed to hold the full Governing Body meeting at the beginning of each term or half term. The meeting could look at data and set targets. The committee meetings would follow on afterwards, with Minutes being sent out. Any questions would be followed up at the next full meeting.

A social meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> July. Any suggestions on format to KL.

KL will send out revised meeting dates.

ML and RT met the week before the Governing Body meeting to look at strategic and operational governance.

LS and RT will meet Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> May to discuss safeguarding with the LSA and lunchtime staff. All policies need to be covered. One meeting at 9.15; the next at 11.15. In the time between each meeting, they will meet with HA to look at attendance.

KJ needs an email address and to be DBS-checked.

There being no further business the meeting ended at 8.35.

Date of next meeting: Tuesday 11<sup>th</sup> June

Signed  
Chair of Governors  
Dated