



Taw Valley Federation



A meeting of the Full Governing body was held on Wednesday 13th July 2016 at 7.30pm at Witheridge Primary School.

Present: Peter Lake, Sue Wells, Helen Carn, Sarah Fast, Adrian Wells, Heather Dunn, Phil Asson, Mike Clark, Rob Norton (head), Sally Anoyrkatis (chair), Jane Adams, Verity Lunn (clerk).

Meeting started: 19.38.

MINUTES

- 1. Opening Prayer & Welcome.** (AW/SA)
AW led the opening prayer. SA welcomed all to the meeting and introduced PA to the governors.
- 2. To receive, and if appropriate, approve apologies for absence.**
Apologies received and approved from Colin Parsons.
Apologies received and approved from Amy Suchacki.
- 3. To declare any business interests arising from the agenda and remind governors of meeting confidentiality.**
None declared.
- 4. To approve minutes of previous meeting** (20th June 2016 – previously circulated and attached)
Part I minutes of 20th June were approved.
Part II minutes of 20th June were circulated to those who were present. These were read and approved.
- 5. Matters arising from the minutes**
None not already as separate agenda items.
- 6. Finance: Approve capital spend Witheridge**
All had received the quotes obtained by BP for the outside area at Witheridge.
SW – noted that some items within the quotes were different – not completely quoting like for like.
PL proposed to accept BP's proposal – to accept the quote from Edscape and have a spend level agreed of no more than £14,500 to complete the job (to include spending a maximum of £3000 from school budget share). SA seconded, all agreed.
- 7. Data: Achievement and Standards, SEND, Pupil Premium and overall/Feedback from monitoring committee.**

AND

8. SATs Results (Discussed as one item)

RN went through the data with governors. He reported that the class four teacher at Witheridge had been moderated and there were no problem with his results – this helped RN to know that what this teacher was reporting was correct. RN reported on how many of the 'not at age expected' results were 'borderline cases'

SA – wouldn't they need more than just the 'borderline' cases to improve to have got above the threshold required?

RN – corrected the percentages – was a close number of borderline cases.

HD – looking at numbers – can say that not far off in results that can be improved quickly for test scores, but writing which takes longer to embed has not got there yet. Shows are improving as the quicker ones have improved already.

RN talked about the immersive curriculum – still work to do on cross curricular work to ensure that writing is used across all subjects.

SA – it is important to make sure that the new literacy co-ordinators for next year are fully prepared for this.

HD reported on meetings that had been had with Liz Kennard at HB.

HC – felt there had been some evidence of improvement at Y6 – eg boys’ writing. Girls’ maths percentage had gone down a lot.

RN – explained difference in how the children were assessed at Easter and in July – what they were judged towards. Children have not ‘gone backwards’ – but not made the progress to reach what was needed in July.

SA – is there anything we need to learn from this particularly with the girls – the SIAMS inspection had picked up it was girls not contributing so much in class, also SW and SA had picked up on this on a visit they had made. Do governors need to think about what confidence the girls have towards contributing in class, and how much this would affect confidence when it came to a test environment?

RN – is a possibility that it is their confidence getting in the way.

SA – felt possible about general confidence – something to watch out for going in to next year – to look out of lack of confidence in certain groups.

SA – Y6 at HB had done very well to make the progress needed, so congratulations to those in that team. Witheridge Y6 were not what had been hoped for. They needed to look at children further down the school as they come up to Y6 – looking at the work needed in Y4/5, does he feel staffing needs to change at all?

RN – was confident with class 4 staff in W. Had been to visit class swap day – looked to be good Y3/4 class next year that were going to work well as a group. That class and the reception class were very small classes, which would also benefit the children. KS1 was going to be a bigger class, which had some issues with their data that needed to be improved, but was very confident that the teacher coming in to that class was capable of moving that forward. Class four was going to have the higher level of SEND children.

SA – would that be where AS could be used better for support MT?

RN – would use her knowledge for that

SA – needed explanation of Y3 figures at HB

RN – numbers in brackets were TI++ - very small distance away from achieving.

MC – felt there was an error in the Y3 girls maths results in how they were added up (*a corrected version was later circulated*)

SA – another note of congratulations should go to the class one team at HB – reception results were excellent.

Governors discussed the difficulties of looking at trends in PPG data when numbers were so small.

SA – how confident was RN in the teacher assessment results?

RN – very confident – on borderline test results he had got teachers to go back to really make sure that the evidence in the books was all that was needed. Did have time to do this as tests were in May, so there had been time after that to make sure that all that was needed was there.

Governors discussed the area of concern with Y2 boys – RN was confident with the Y3 teacher, and HLTA one to one support will improve next year.

SA – PPG/SEND gap – anything to highlight for next year?

RN – a very small number of PPG children, tend to be SEND as well. It is important to have quality first teaching, and then to fill in gaps where needed with interventions.

AW – so is that in the SIP, and can be monitored and evidenced?

HD – they have got a document that shows what they have been doing for individuals, what has changed depending on ongoing needs and the impact that this has had.

SA – SEND – has had feedback that the way AS does this as SEND co-ordinator has been positively received. Is she doing this across both schools?

RN – yes. As she has a smaller class of nine for next year, this will free up more time for her SEND role across both schools.

HC – looking at the results it is at Witheridge where they need more support to get to age related.

AW – important to have the evidence to show how they are closing the gap.

9. Report from Witheridge inspection

And

10. Update on MATs from working party (Discussed as one item)

SA – had last ‘mock Ofsted’ visit of the academic year yesterday. Result was that they were judged red – not entirely a surprise, but disappointing. The feedback had stressed handwriting, presentation, ensuring that children are confident and have high enough expectations that they want to stretch and challenge themselves. Also consistency – making sure teachers comments were such that it became meaningful for the child to respond. Tough message to get, but is what need to move on from.

There was a meeting next week with David Blower to discuss these results and how to move forward. From what had been said on the day, they thought that they would get a pre-formal letter of warning. If they get a formal letter of warning it will immediately trigger an Ofsted inspection. Have been warned that they do not want to get that.

SW – noted that they did acknowledge the strengths, and more freedom in what needed sorting, which felt a bit more like progress.

SA – they were now desperately running out of time, if don’t get it right before the next inspection then it will be out of their hands. Felt it a positive was that what they were being told needed to happen was things that they can get right, things that RN was very passionate about and can change. Also they did stress that needed to get the relationship right with TEAM, and seeing evidence that that is working in practice. Need a robust plan in place to be moving forward some way or other after Christmas.

HD – was there any feedback on the impact of Jo Dymond?

SA – did not feel like they had reported a positive impact, felt like some negative questioning in what written evidence did they have for her impact.

SW – they did report back on change within teaching areas, which was as a result of JD input,

SA – with all that though there was that it was not enough yet.

HC – so were they saying that they shouldn’t have had her?

SA – they would not say that they shouldn’t have brought her in, but there was no praise for bringing her in.

HC – bottom line question – had it been worth it to have her?

RN – felt that although they didn’t comment on her directly, he thought that some of the improvements they had been impressed by were as a result of her work.

SA – do feel like there were a lot of ‘buts’ – positivity about KS1 environment, but not seen followed through in books/data. They were giving the benefit of the doubt as they could see good practice when in there, and that children were obviously used to the good practice.

RN – JD had not been at W long enough to do all the improvements that were the final aim.

PL – how much time has she been spending in school?

RN – it has been roughly two mornings a week.

PL – will that continue?

RN – she is happy to continue, but has said that she’s done what she can.

PL – did RN think there would be a benefit to her continuing to come in?

RN – she has been doing what needed, but may be that September is a point where they embrace the TEAM option and working with them to achieve the improvements needed.

SA – thinks it would be easier to work with TEAM without JD’s involvement.

HD – so are they going to decide not to have her back in September?

AW – felt that governors’ viewpoint was that it was looking like having JD in was going to get in the way of the working with TEAM, and not benefit from that as much as they could.

JA – in last meeting with PM his viewpoint was that he felt she was compatible as long as it was affordable.

SA – felt that it might be better to build the relationships with TEAM up rather than her – as would give more idea for due diligence, both from TVF and TEAM’s perspective.

AW – would need full report from JD to governors as end of term.

11. High Bickington: new school building

RN had had a meeting last Monday with LA representatives, plans had been put to RN for the new school site. They were going to go away and draw up more based on RN's feedback. They were feeling quite hopeful and positive towards that, which did throw up worries that if TVF were about to academise then they would not get the funding for the new school building if no longer a maintained school. SA had phoned the diocese to ask their advice about this – had reported that they've done plans but no money earmarked for new school, and no sign of money appearing for it. Had been giving advice that possibly more likely to get as part of an academy – if government opened up streams of revenue, more likely to go to academies than the LA as the government were wanting more schools to go that route now.

MC – why are they coming up with plans if there is no money for it at the moment?

SA – not a sudden change – have been coming up with plans ready for if they money suddenly becomes available. The LA were very happy to work with academies and pass on plans to academies where this happens.

PL – where would this be?

SA – explained location. Outline planning in place from when the community centre was built. It was frustrating as if accounted for sale of current school building then it was not a huge amount of money they were looking for. They needed to think of how this was going to work going forward in terms of class size/structure without a new building.

SF – saw this as more and more that RN had to do – was there anything that he could pass on?

Discussion of middle management and passing on responsibility.

SF – is there no way they could bid for any funding?

RN – not as a maintained school – only free schools and academies are able to do this.

12. Review and reset vision

The current vision had been circulated in advance of the meeting. Governors agreed to keep the same for the next year.

RN left the meeting 21.16.

13. Governing body organisation 2016/2017.

Agree portfolio structure. Governors agreed to carry on with the portfolio structure as last year. Individuals assigned to each portfolio to be agreed in September.

Agree Christian Ethos Portfolio Terms of Reference and Safeguarding Governor Terms of Reference. Safeguarding ToR agreed by governors. Christian Ethos ToR: agreed with deletion of first item (duplicated at end of document), and assignation of delegated/recommendation to individual policies as statutory requirements. **ACTION: VL to change these.** Portfolios currently without Terms of Reference to be agreed in September. **ACTION: VL to resend out model ToR to the portfolio holders concerned.**

SA questioned how the Christian Ethos portfolio fitted in with the ethos group. Governors agreed that this would be something to discuss with RN at the next meeting. SW felt that the ethos group would need to be over both schools. **ACTION: VL to place on agenda for next time.**

Agree process for appointing chair/vice chair next year, including term of office. Governors agreed the process.

SW and AW left 21.53.

14. Governor terms of office/vacancies

No terms of office coming to an end. Vacancies – had received a notice of resignation from Colin Parsons. SF was moving out of the area at the end of the term. HD also resigning at end of term. This would give vacancies for a parent governor, a staff governor and a local authority governor.

15. Governor visit/training updates (governor feedback from any training undertaken – including online. Please bring copies of any certificates/feedback forms)

PA had booked on to new governor training with Babcock for September.

Governance review originally booked for July, now being delayed to September.

16. Safeguarding update.

Nothing brought to governors.

17. Policies:

Assessment – not presented at this meeting.

Remote Attendance – agreed by governors.

18. Matters brought forward by the chair.

Child starting next year at HB with statement for 20hr support – governors had to agree that they felt suitable to accept child. Governors agreed.

Meeting ended 22.11.

Proposed dates of future meetings

Monday 19th September (HB)

Monday 17th October (W)

Monday 14th November (HB)

Monday 12th December (W)

Monday 16th January (HB)

Monday 27th February (W)

Monday 27th March (HB)

Wednesday 26th April (W)

Monday 22nd May (HB)

Monday 19th June (W)

Monday 17th July (HB)

DRAFT