

**NORTH YORKSHIRE CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICE
LEEMING (RAF) COMMUNITY PRIMARY SCHOOL
Minutes of a Governing Body Meeting held on Wednesday 20 April 2016**

Present: J Rosamond (Chair), R Campbell (Headteacher), K Davies, A Fox, N Wiltshire, M Sands

In Attendance: M Lambert (Clerk)
C Nuttall (Assistant Headteacher)

Apologies were received from: R Neasom, N Gaulder, S Hillbeck – consent was given to their absence.

A warm welcome was expressed to Rob Campbell, newly appointed Headteacher.

		Action
16/24	<p><u>To Receive any Declarations of Interest</u> There were no declarations of business interests.</p>	
16/25	<p><u>To Agree the Minutes of the Previous Meetings and Discuss Any Matters Arising</u> The minutes of the meetings held on Tuesday 22 March 2016 had been circulated prior to the meeting.</p> <p>Resolved: That the minutes be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.</p> <p>➤ Governor Vacancy – A meeting had not been held with Mr Stewart. Christine agreed to get in touch with him as soon as possible.</p> <p>Resolved: To accept Mr Stewart as the new co-opted governor subject to the meeting with the Headteacher and Assistant Headteacher. Further work would be undertaken to identify someone from the High School should it be necessary to fill a future vacancy.</p> <p>➤ Performance Management – One member of staff was still to undertake their performance management.</p> <p>➤ Coffee Morning – A further coffee morning would be held this week. Some parents had expressed concern about the events taking place during the working day.</p> <p>➤ Parental Questionnaires – The responses had been collated. It was a positive picture with a return rate of 108. The welcome offered by staff had been positive. Quality of leadership and management and pupil care were positive. Transition of pupils was well received with no negative comments. Although there are children who exhibit challenging behaviour in most classrooms, parents felt that the school was doing everything in it's power to deal with this. The homework question was difficult to analyse. It was suggested that a set of questions with regard to homework should be circulated to parents with this being an item for a parents' forum. The question about Bullying had a significantly higher than average response from parents making the "did not know" box, which was felt to be a positive response.</p>	<p>CN</p> <p>RC</p> <p>RC</p>

	<p>Resolved: To send a summary of the responses to parents and to include this on the website. It would be shared with staff at the next meeting. The Headteacher would thank the staff for their hard work. Full details available in separate tabled report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Business Continuity Plan – This had been updated and had been discussed with the Headteacher. ➤ Oil Tank – The landlord does not feel that the tank is bad enough to replace but would be emptied free of charge. ➤ Visits/Trips – A rolling programme of visits and trips would be drawn up. The programme could be listed on the Headteacher’s report. Question: Adrian asked if visits/trips were budgeted for. This was confirmed. 	<p>RC</p> <p>CN</p> <p>RC</p>
16/26	<p><u>To Receive Any Correspondence</u> The Clerk had circulated items from the e-red bag for information.</p>	
16/27	<p><u>To Receive the Headteacher’s Report</u> The Headteacher outlined his positive first few days in school with business as usual. It has felt that things have continued to happen. Christine and Natalie are doing a fantastic job and looking at ways of formalising senior leadership time and prioritising work. A lot has been achieved in meetings and it is hoped that by prioritising work, the SLT would be able to have more presence in the classrooms. Preparing for the School Improvement Adviser visit has taken up time but had been useful.</p> <p>Challenge: The Chair asked whether time would be available to go into the classrooms. This was confirmed. Capacity had been increased for Natalie and Christine which had been welcomed. The model for Y5/Y6 would be considered in due course.</p> <p>Challenge: Adrian asked whether there was anything Adam Pritchard-Jenkins was working on. It was felt that Rob would need to become established in his post before taking TSA work forward.</p>	<p>RC</p> <p>RC/CN</p>
16/28	<p><u>To Consider School Improvement Items</u> Data analysis information was circulated at the meeting. The picture in terms of raw figures is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ This is not a very positive picture and will struggle in a lot of year groups due to the raised expectations of the curriculum and base levels of children recently received. ➤ Anything less than 66% is red as the government floor standard is 65%. ➤ It was noted that the new guidelines are not now a best fit model. Children with weaknesses in one particular area (e.g. spelling) now cannot be awarded the expected standard under a “secure fit” model are just not going to reach expected level. ➤ There is no comparison to previous years due to a change in the assessment process. <p>Challenge: Malcolm asked whether data according to the previous expectation would have looked better. Whilst duplication of assessment (against levels and against new standards) had not taken place, RC, CN and NW confirmed that this would have been the case (i.e., that a higher proportion of children would be at Age</p>	

Related Expectation).

Progress data was outlined:

- The percentage changes for children's age-related expectations showed evidence of good progress in the majority of areas.
- Y2 is universally down on the previous term as a result of recently released information from the DfE (e.g. secure fit rather than best fit) but this is felt to do with the secure fit rather than best fit.
- With increasing SEN in a number of year groups and raised expectations the real success story is in Y6 reflecting the booster provision.
- Mobility – two children leaving would have made expected progress in Y6.
- The data is a huge challenge but the staff are aware of this.
- The male/female split is boy heavy in most years. Y6 there are slightly more girls.
- The Raiseonline data may show that the results may be in line with national data with regard to boys.
- The school would need to be realistic about the children which did not attend the school the previous year and the children arriving mid-assessment.
- The assessment process would need to be refined when collecting data.
- By the second half of the summer term, the data should be as robust as possible in the confines of the information available.
- The school is mindful that the national picture on staff morale is low and that the school does need to ensure that any changes do have positive impact on the children's outcomes.
- Christine had drawn up case studies so that format could be used to track children who had and had not made progress. These indicate that a number of pupils who left in the weeks before SATs last year would have achieved age-related expectations.
- The early years is similar in terms of low on entry with ten new arrivals and seven out. Seven out of the ten new arrivals are below and emerging. All 7 leavers would have been "expected".

Challenge:

(a) Adrian asked about the IEP – This should be SEN.

(b) The Chair asked whether the data would trigger an Ofsted inspection. It was confirmed that this is very likely.

The data had been discussed with the School Improvement Adviser along with a learning walk. The learning walk had been positive with children showing good behaviour. High quality discussions between the children and adviser had taken place. All staff feel that learning behaviour would need to be focussed on which was felt to be inconsistent. Interactions with TAs and teachers were good. Early years was felt to be excellent with regard to independent learning indoors. Some areas to be focussed on were the improvement of the outdoor area in early years, the consistency in marking and feedback which had already been identified in a book scrutiny. Display in school would need to be considered which had been a focus the previous year. The broader discussion should be around the classroom environment. There were no surprises from the visit which was a testament to the leadership team. A further visit would take place during the summer term.

	<p>The draft Governor Action Plan had been drawn up and circulated. This was outlined at the meeting.</p> <p>Governance Healthcheck – Following the offer of a governance healthcheck it was agreed to look at this before the visit by NYCC. This would be discussed at the next meeting with a matrix being sent out by the Clerk.</p>	AWL
16/30	<p><u>To Receive feedback/updates from Governors' attendance at meetings or training sessions</u></p> <p>➤ Parents' Evening – Thanks were expressed to Governors for attending the parents' evening.</p> <p>Challenge: <i>Adrian asked whether there would be a difference response if the Governors had asked the questions rather than the school. It was felt that this would raise the Governors' profile. It was suggested having a governors' email address so that parents could use this should they wish to.</i></p>	
16/31	<p><u>To Consider Safeguarding/Child Protection/Health and Safety</u></p> <p>There had been an incident at swimming where a child had kicked a member of staff. The parents had been contacted and risk assessments would be reviewed. The incident had been recorded.</p> <p>Concern was expressed about the uneven playground.</p> <p>Agreed: <i>To contact Richard Neasom as a matter of urgency to see if there was any funding available.</i></p>	RC NW
16/32	<p><u>To Receive Any Other Business</u></p> <p>The School Fund The balance sheet for the school fund was circulated for consideration. Agreed: <i>That the balance sheet for the school fund be accepted.</i></p> <p>Building Project The Landlord officer had visited the school and had been happy with the proposal for taking out the old boiler. The estimates had been received with an allocation of £10k budgeted. Consideration be given to adding a telephone line to the new office.</p> <p>Chair of Governors Jayne talked about future progression which would need to be considered in due course.</p>	ALL
16/33	<p><u>To Confirm the Date of the Next Meeting</u></p> <p>Tuesday 10 May 2016 at 4.00 pm.</p>	ALL

There being no further business the meeting closed at 8.00 pm.

20 April 2016