

Southway Junior School

Full Governing Body/Teaching Learning and Staffing Meeting
6pm Wednesday 26th April 2017

Governors Present: Peter Newbold (PN) (Headteacher), Peter Izard (PI), Sharon Carter (SC), Cath Beckett (CB), Kieron Woodland (KW), Steven Adams (SA)

Associate Members: none

Apologies for Absence: Paul Cartin (PC)

In attendance: Katie Smith (Clerk), Helen Denison (HD (Deputy Head)

The agenda and all supporting papers for the meeting were placed on the Southway VLE site for all Governors and Associate Members to view prior to the meeting. Hard copies of papers will no longer be printed out for the inspection file, apart from the minutes of each meeting - these signed minutes will be kept in the school office.

Start 6pm

Agenda item		Action
FGB. 1 (welcome)	It was agreed by PI and CB that CB would chair the meeting, CB welcomed governors and explained that the meeting would be combined FGB and TLS due to attendance and in order for data to be more relevant.	
FGB. 2 (apologies for absence)	Apologies were received from PC; this was accepted by the GB.	
FGB. 3 (declaration of interests)	None stated.	
FGB.4 (Quality of Teaching report)	PN presented his Q of T report which he explained was based on Priority 3 of the School Development plan ('to further develop our broad and balanced curriculum'): a) He noted that there are no judgments made other than green or purple (good or outstanding). b) PN explained he was involved in all drop-ins and whilst he listened to senior staff the overall judgements made were his own. He also made the GB aware that he does not use the term 'outstanding' liberally, and that it is to be interpreted in a broader sense; outstanding over a sustained period of time, and he reminded the GB that the target is 100% good teaching which they are achieving well. c) PN explained he had accepted a request from John Gadd (Head at a Worthing Junior School) to visit the school with senior leaders from their school. JG knew the school's journey and praised the school highly, which further validates the judgement of the Q of T. d) He noted there had also been a visit from a West Sussex advisor which he will come back to later. e) PN asked for any questions; PI noted positively that the trajectory of formal lesson observations continues to rise and maintains the upward trend and that there seems to be more dark green (good with outstanding elements) than ever before. f) PI clarified whether drop-ins were carried out by teachers or the HT; PN explained all were completed by himself /HD/senior leader and they then validate and discuss afterwards. HD added if anything PN can be a bit harsh. g) PN added that John Gadd and the West Sussex advisor have commented that the school has a learning environment that is unparalleled in many other primary schools. HD added that WS often use science books to judge standards of writing amongst other things and they added they have rarely seen such a high standard at schools before. h) SA added it is impressive that West Sussex say that behaviour is exemplary in and around lessons.	
FGB.5 (Whole school data review)	Moving onto data, CB explained that the challenge is to ensure the teaching is leading to good data; i. <u>Raiseonline data 2016</u> a) HD explained she would not go through in detail but just to show	

Signed.....

Date.....

Southway Junior School

	<p>the GB as they have not seen it previously.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">b) HD explained she had had training on it last year as the format had changed (due to life without levels) (and will change again probably). She explained every group is able to be plotted (average, above, below...) in order for the school to see which groups to work on or are working well.c) HD noted the top attainment was in the bottom progress which is based on KS2 results.d) The PA was low in KS1 (which equates to 1 child from last year). This year we have 2.e) High attainers continue to be achieve wellf) SEN are highlightedg) HD noted that there are no surprises in the data. The aim is to move everyone up a box.h) EAL (2 children) did well, and Disadvantaged are lowi) PN added attainment continues to improve, the KS2/Junior issue is beyond the school's control and therefore it is difficult to demonstrate well yet. PN added they were disappointed with Raiseonline results as there were a lot of 0s; PN added the person running the course explained that the norm is 0 and so they are making more progress to get to 0 which is showing accelerated progress. <p><u>Year 3 baseline data</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) HD noted it has been agreed that the data is fairly accurate and there some children that they are keeping their eye on.b) HD noted that for a year group of 90, 7 underperforming in maths is good.c) HD noted a slight change in the baseline in accordance with a course recently attended in which they suggested using the KS2 test to show progress;<ul style="list-style-type: none">i. HD explained they would take a KS2 test at the beginning of term (in the hope to show that there are things they are unable to do), which they then re-take at the end of the year to show they can now do those things. PN added this is a robust argument, showing their exact progress based on the school's curriculum. HD added they have bought in NFER tests for this purpose. CB challenged how this would impact the children in the first term at a new school. HD explained it would be sometime in the Autumn term in which they do usually carry out tests currently anyway and that the test is designed to be an Autumn test and so is slightly easier. HD also added it is the manner in which the teachers do the tests and are currently very good at, for the pupils to understand what they need to work on.ii. HD added that it also gives a standardised and scaled score which will allow the scores to be plotted on a spreadsheet of each pupils test scores. PN added it can therefore show their genuine progress throughout the school and across the KS. HD added markers for PP and SEN for example can be added too.d) PI noted year 3 baseline scores for September were the closest yet which is positive, but challenged as to why one class was less disproportionate. HD explained there were a few Special Needs children in this class that have been moved off. PN reminded the GB that each class has its own story, and that possibly the teacher was not assessing as accurately as others for example. HD added the scores are moderated again and PN explained offers had been made for their staff to visit the Infant School for SATS and for them to visit the Junior school for SATS but this isn't to happen and he noted that they want to work together for the children's best interests. HD added in the same applies to KS3 teachers from one local High school will be invited to join the school for the KS2 SATS. <p><u>Year group data</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) HD explained teachers had been asked to look at groups;b) The results were comprehensive on Reading Writing and Maths over the Spring term. Reading 68%, Writing 51%, Maths 57% are pretty good data for year 3.	
--	--	--

Signed.....

Date.....

Southway Junior School

	<p>c) HD noted it is difficult as year 3 is a phase (years 3 & 4 combined), and is not set in stone but generally agree attainment is where they should be.</p> <p>d) PI queried why the year 6 data had been included on the bottom of each year group, HD explained to re-enforce for all year groups, the school's target aims for pupils to be 10% above where they were last year. PN noted the writing scores aren't accurate compared to others across the country and it might be better to compare to West Sussex data, HD added standardised training is taking place for assessors this year.</p> <p><u>Year 4 NFER</u></p> <p>a) HD explained in February year 4 took the NFER test; GPS 69%, Maths 64%, Reading 73% which is very good.</p> <p>b) HD explained test data is different to teacher data as tests only cover certain areas and teachers historically are very accurate in their own assessments. HD suggested that if around 70% met targets in year 4, looking ahead to year 6 they will be where they are expected to be. PI added this is encouraging and good to know they are test ready. HD explained that NFER tests do look like SATS papers and phrased similarly and are quite challenging.</p> <p>c) KW questioned if other schools do the same tests, HD explained lots do use NFER, PN added other tests vary whereas these are very clear and strict.</p> <p><u>Year 5</u></p> <p>a) PN explained Teachers were asked to predict test scores for years 4, 5 and 6 (it was agreed it was not fair for year 3).</p> <p>b) Years 5's were on met or greater depth.</p> <p>c) The test was in December which was the SATS paper from the year before Easter (old curriculum). They used this information to judge who needs a booster and for teacher assessments. PI questioned if this was a whole curriculum test or just up to December; HD explained it contains year 5 curriculum for the whole year and until they receive other test papers it will be difficult to know what the difference will be. It can be used to show where they need to improve however.</p> <p>d) PN added year 5 is a good cohort and test results are predicted at nearly 80% which is impressive.</p> <p>e) HD explained the 'booster' plan (for year 6 originally) has been moved down into year 5; consisting of 3 reading groups, 2 GPS groups and 3 maths groups for next term and the aim is to make an impact early and target the borderline pupils.</p> <p>f) PN explained the idea of 'booster' has also been taken into year 3, 4, and 5 so at year 6 there will not be the need for a 'catch up'. He added in year 6 there are a few pupils they are focusing on.</p> <p>g) HD added that there is a difference between 'boosters' and interventions'; that boosters are short sessions to fill in gaps in knowledge. Whereas interventions are very targeted, focusing on SEN children or to develop key skills for example.</p> <p>h) PN made the GB aware that the combined score(reading, writing and maths combined) is predicted at 66%, PN reminded the GB that the current national average is 52% which is potentially a significant improvement.</p> <p>i) HD added PP in year 5 are very good</p> <p>j) CB questioned what happens to the data submitted to West Sussex, if they follow it up at all?</p> <p>k) PN explained that West Sussex were, according to Ofsted, an improving local authority, and some schools didn't submit data (around 75% did). The local authority wants to know what the overall data picture will be in the future.</p> <p>l) PN also noted there is possibly an issue with infant and junior schools predictions vs. primary schools predictions submitted to WS.</p> <p>a)</p>	
<p>FGB. 6 (National Assessment picture)</p>	<p><u>Year 6</u></p> <p>b) HD provided the GB with an update in which she explained that teacher assessments are solid (with the exception of writing which will be talked about later).</p> <p>c) PN was impressed with the maths and reading scores and reminded the GB that the term 'met' is not taken lightly. He also explained the borderline pupils are being worked with.</p>	

Signed.....

Date.....

Southway Junior School

	<p>d) HD reminded the GB that the data needs to be sent back by 30th June.</p> <p>e) PN mentioned the SATS from last year were 69%, maths 68%, and that the current year is at 68% already. Last year 67%, this year their results were 65% on the same paper (2 months before), and borderline may only be the matter of a few marks.</p> <p>f) 15% GD (greater depth) in GPS which is an improvement. CB added that last year's test was a bit of a blip, HD added it was a very hard test, PN added that they underperformed and that wasn't good enough.</p> <p>g) HD added 79% would be in line with expectations already. PN reminded the GB that teacher assessments are historically accurate.</p> <p>h) CB noted the challenge is that there are a number of different figures; it is helpful to triangulate them and understand the difference. CB suggested that although it is easier to track now, there is a bit too much data for the GB to look through and suggested the possibility of condensing it a bit for the governors.</p> <p>i) HD explained she had created 2 VEN diagrams showing 15% get RWM combined (by Easter), maths 46% secure, 20% in writing and 50% in reading. PN also noted he doesn't give the term 'secure' very easily and that the children are those who they believe will get there with continued high class teaching not boosters. It is predicted at 57.7% (the national average is 52%) and so is fully achievable and anything more is a bonus.</p> <p>j) HD reminded the GB that pass marks will go up by a few this year.</p> <p>k) HD explained that different children who aren't achieving in writing are different to those in maths, and these will be looked at to see what they can do.</p> <p>l) PI agreed data is improving, and thanked HD and PN but agreed that maybe there is too much data. PN suggested a form of headlines for the GB, and suggested getting the year groups leaders to produce reports to show governors what is expected of teachers which may be good to see. CB noted concern, not wanting to give year group leaders more to do just for the governors.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">i. PI suggested something similar to the Quality of Teaching report structure for data. HD added next term this won't be needed but can be made available for governors to look at.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">ii. CB challenged that the submission to county should look at what the school is being held account to.</p> <p>m) Boosters, HD explained, were a 6 week program with Carey, Caroline, Alison, Andrea and Pete; the autumn data showed that 100% were working below and the same children now have 46% on track, with 43 borderline and only 36% left. CB praised that it shows what impact interventions/boosters have made after just 6 weeks.</p> <p><u>Writing</u></p> <p>n) HD added 2 children are 'secure' but the way in which the school is doing assessments has changed; ARE showing expanded writing is difficult to get evidence of during a 20 minute session and was not a good use of a booster, therefore Andrea now does 2 sessions, spread across 4 groups or approx. 10 children, to work with for more quality teaching.</p> <p><u>GPS</u></p> <p>o) HD explained to begin with no children scored 30 or more, and now (in spring term 1, they are yet to complete spring 2) 84% scored 30 or more and working towards greater depth. Boosters are in place to get them to 'met' or to 'greater depths' and are working on the same in year 5 now. PN added this can be now tracked on tables.</p> <p>p) PN explained they were visited by Steve Streeter who provided training on KS2 writing. He spent time with the year 6 team using examples of working and talking about them in depth. He provided clarity on interim objectives and has suggested writing be re-vamped allowing longer time to achieve 'in depth'. He added that the children know their expectations well and are using vocabulary well. PN explained this was very interesting and helpful. HD added there will be a 'twilight' to look at marking. HD added writing has moved on a lot and that they are not concerned about it but there is still a lot of work to do.</p> <p>PI questioned if there was a possibility that they were falling into just teaching the children to take a test, PN disagreed it is much more political than that. HD explained that they refuse to take the fun out of writing. PI clarified that they aim to</p>	
--	--	--

Signed.....

Date.....

Southway Junior School

	keep the flare but slip bits in. HD explained that the changes made so far to get them to there ARE, have gone down well and a lot have taken to it well and it is just about recognising bits they can add in.	
F&P.7 (staffing update)	<p>First part Confidential</p> <p>a) On explained the premises manager will be starting Tuesday 2nd May, and that he was delighted with his appointment.</p> <p>b) As PN explained he lives opposite the school, CB questioned what would happen to the bungalow onsite, SC confirmed it has subsidence and the council are leaving it, blocking it off and just making it safe. PN noted he has requested they knock it down to make a garden but nothing has come of that. Updates will be given in the next F & P meeting.</p>	
FGB .8 (school uniform policy)	<p>SC requested governors approve the new policy that has been created.</p> <p>a) SC added there will be an additional mention of hair styles and shoes. 'Black shoes', to be changed to 'leather look black shoes' to stop trainer style shoes being worn. SA questioned if it mentioned burkas for example for Muslims. HD explained it does note about religious dress and it isn't discriminatory.</p> <p>b) SC added also there will be a mention of non-school uniform for birthdays, and will remove the requirement of ties for men.</p> <p>c) HD added medical bracelets can be worn needs to be added.</p> <p>d) PN added it is very comprehensive and is needed as the school needs to be more rigorous and would appreciate governor backing to stop certain inconsistencies spiralling.</p> <p>e) Governors agreed to the implementation of the policy (along with the various re-wording, adding alterations mentioned)</p> <p>f) CB questioned the timing of the policy and suggested it should be at the start of a new year, HD agreed and explained the year 2 welcome packs will be send out soon, and to get existing parents to sign at the same time.</p> <p>g) PN added he aimed to send out the policy stating 'governors had instructed the school to implement the policy rigorously' to avoid any conflict, and for complaints to be made to the governing body. After discussion it was agreed that it would be mentioned in the newsletter and on the school website with a brief letter out to parents outlining key parts and to refer to the website for the full policy, and it was agreed there wouldn't be a reply slip.</p>	
FGB. 9 (proforma update)	<p>a) KW explained he and AG met on the 16th March but they didn't have a proforma form to fill in, PN to send a copy to KW.</p> <p>b) SC suggested, and it was agreed, having a blank copy of all of them to put on the VLE for governors to access. KS to load onto VLE.</p> <p>c) It was noted PC's proforma is still to come.</p>	<p>PN to send a of the proforma copy to KW</p> <p>KS to load proforma forms onto the VLE</p>
FGB. 10 (further matters)	<p>a) PN noted junior schools in West Sussex met with the heads and chair of governors (PI and PN attended) and he found it very productive. PN explained another meeting at Southway Junior is to happen with chairs of governors with Deborah Myers (the director of education in West Sussex) to articulate their concerns. PN is to be the head representative for schools at the meeting. Sean Harford (regional Ofsted inspector) will also be invited to try and help Governors understand their difficulties. PN added it aims to target both the LA and Ofsted together, and it looks like it will be a very good meeting with lots to say and he will keep the GB informed and updated.</p> <p>b) PN also added that coming up there is a third visit by West Sussex about governors and self-evaluation and would welcome some governor input but will keep the GB informed.</p> <p>c) PN added that on the 26th June there will be an offsite meeting and PI will be representing the GB.</p>	
FGB 11. (future business)	F & P is 24 th May, and it was requested full attendance in order to sign off the budget for next year.	
FGB 12. (meeting review to be judged against ofsted framework)	<p>It was agreed that the following points of the meeting in particular showed good governance as detailed below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval of the uniform policy (A,F,G) • Interrogation of data , good to know pinch points (A,B,D) • Seeing a direct correlation between school initiatives and their impact 	

Signed.....

Date.....

Southway Junior School

	(B,C,D)	A. Demonstrate an ambitious vision; B. Improve teaching and learning; C. Provide a broad and balanced curriculum; D. Evaluate strengths and weaknesses; E. Develop leadership capacity; F. Engage with parents and carers; G. Ensure all pupils are safe.	
--	---------	---	--

End 8.05pm

Signed.....

Date.....