Isle of Ely Primary School Local Governing Board Minutes of the Meeting

held on Tuesday 17th March 2016

Present:

Mr S. Dove

Mrs S. Hogger

Dr D. Knox

Ms M. Lloyd

Mr D. Marriott

Mrs K. Marriott

Mr A. Perry

Mr A. Sanderson

Mrs B. Surtees (Head)

In Attendance:

Mrs K. Jarvis (Clerk)

Item	Notes Notes	Action	
1.	Welcome & Apologies for Absence Ms Lloyd welcomed all present. There were no apologies for absence		
2.	Declarations of Pecuniary & Non-Pecuniary Interest No new interests were declared.		
3.	Chair's Action Ms Lloyd reported that she had carried out a Chair's Action to change the Professional Development Days as recommended by Ms Surtees.		
4.	Minutes of the Last Meeting and Matters Arising 2. There is one declaration form outstanding. The governor concerned will complete the form and return to Mrs Surtess. 4. Ms Lloyd reported to the full governing body that Mr Clive Paskell, ALT's Director of Finance, had attended the Finance committee meeting that took place just prior to this meeting. He would be available to attend a full governors meeting at a future date. 7. Mrs Surtees reported that all governor visit forms had been received and circulated. 9. Mr Sanderson asked how much detail governors are expected to go into with the online DfE information. Mrs Surtees replied that the website is available should governors wish to search for information, and it is not necessary to study everything. 6. Ms Lloyd asked if parents should be given more information about the newer testing arrangements. Following discussion, Mrs Surtees summarised that she would prefer not to over-involve parents to support school so that it retained its ethos of having well-rounded, happy children. Ms Lloyd asked whether school felt the EYFS children had the level of maturity to understand the test language. Mrs Marriott and Mrs Surtees replied that they were not concerned about this. Mrs Surtees concluded the discussion by stating that the children at Ely enter school with age related expectations.	DM	
5.	Academy Improvement Mrs Surtess referred governors to her report, that had been circulated prior to the meeting to allow for questions to be forwarded. Questions and answers included:		

On the Levelle Report, re Recommendation 1 – is it correct that PP money is spent on Place2Be at the moment? Will this continue? What are the systems for checking whether Place2Be is having an appropriate impact?

We haven't received any pupil premium money to date but once we do, it will be earmarked for Place2Be – all children have the opportunity to use Place2Talk and priority is given to any children who receive PP funding. All other children will be tracked carefully and discussed at half termly pupil progress meetings.

On the data - Reception Progress — There are a small portion of children who made negative progress. Is this something you would expect at this point in the year? Or has something gone wrong? What are your strategies for helping them to improve?

Our baseline assessments, which were done through Early Excellence, were dropped into Classroom monitor and converted – some may have been inaccurate which is why it looks like the children have made negative progress. For all the children that we feel need extra support, we put interventions in place, e.g. socially speaking, time to talk, phase 1 phonics groups and using our objective led really target those children.

Year 1 Boys/Girls Attainment – Are the boys now marginally out-achieving the girls? Is this a consequence of the focussed strategies to help boys to improve? Is there a similar system for helping girls?

Continually reviewing our provision to ensure all of the children are engaged and making good progress. I think when you look at the averages of boys and girls, they are very similar

not many gaps.

	Average (Girls – 22)	
English %	1 Dev+ (23.73)	Average (Boys – 21)
English - Reading %	1 Sec (23.84)	1 Dev+ (23.69)
English - Writing %	1 Dev+ (23.50)	
Mathematics %	1 Sec (23.80)	1 Sec (23.88)
7.72 N		1 Dev+ (23.40)
		1 Dev+ (23.67)

On Michael Lavelle's report: In your experience how likely is it that the Ofsted inspectors will reach a similar judgement of outstanding in all areas just as the ALT reviewer did? Ofsted is often dependent on the inspector that visits the school but Michael Lavelle has verified my outstanding judgements, our data is above average and the parents think well of the school. I obviously cannot guaranteed the outcome would be the same but I will produce the evidence as I did for our review. I think we are better than good which is outstanding.

With reference to recommendation two in the report: what do you see as the "further opportunity" for LGB and leaders that might be put in place? More visits to the school? As we are a new governing body, I believe it is to continue how we have started. With further challenge and visits to the school and further training.

Aside from the recommendations, are there any areas of the school that you feel could be judged less favourably by Ofsted and if so, what are your plans to address them? That's a difficult question to answer – I have evaluated the school to be outstanding in all areas. The one that worries me the most is safeguarding as we are a new school ensuring all of our procedures are in place. Also we do things slightly differently and an Ofsted inspector may not understand or like what we do so it is very difficult to say and know.

With reference to point five from the May 2015 inspection report, summarised in the "evidence evaluated" section on page two of the report which says "Develop systems for the governing body to communicate with parents so that they understand governors roles and responsibilities" would it be worth considering expanding on the governor content on the school website a little - perhaps adding a sentence of two for each governor saying what their background is, why volunteered to be a governor? We trialled a slot for the governing body in the weekly school e-newsletter before Christmas but I am not sure whether it has happened again since then. I wondered whether we could consider formalising this to ensure there's a short note after each FGB, agreeing at the meeting who will draft it and perhaps agree key messages for inclusion at the end of FGB? I had a go at the first one and I'd be happy to do it each time but equally appreciate other governors may want to do it on rotation basis. Personally, I think it would be good if there is something for parents after every FGB. I think that would be a great idea — I also think we probably need to add a bit to the website.

It's great that so many Reception children are meeting the expected level (40 - 60 Developing at half way through the year). There appears to be a number of children who are not quite achieving the expected level in reading and writing, in particular. The data appears to show this applies to boys and girls. Could you give your view on why some of the children aren't at the level you would expect (I assume some of this is due to the large number of summer born children?) and what steps are being taken to get them up to the expected level in reading and writing, in particular? Reading and writing are usually the Early Learning Goals that are most difficult for the children to achieve. Writing is often linked to fine motor skills and control which can take longer to develop — boys are not always keen to write and as you correctly state there are many summer born children in the cohort. Similarly with reading, not all phonics have been taught yet and this often links to writing. Support is put in place for any child we consider is at risk of not achieving the ELG- extra phonics, recapping, interventions, pre-teaching etc...

On Year 1 stats it looks as though the children are achieving great things (expect a Year 1 to be attaining beginning +) in nearly all areas. I wondered whether you could give your view on whether you would expect the current Reception children to achieve similar levels of attainment based on progress trajectories so far? Does the current Year 1 set a particularly high standard due to unusually small classes, particularly bright cohort, fewer summer born or EAL children? Our target for a Good Level of Development for the current Reception cohort is 90% and we are looking to achieve approx 83% - this is well above national averages and the children have made outstanding progress. Therefore, I expect that trajectory to continue into Year 1. Last year's reception achieved 79% GLD. The whole school sets particularly high standards and expectations, the curriculum in Reception in Year 1 and Reception allow the children to thrive as they are engaged, motivated and

independent learners, outstanding teachers and children are assessed and tracked very closely throughout the year.

Budget

On the 2016-17 hydget the annual admin salary expenditure appears to be almost 50%

On the 2016-17 budget the annual admin salary expenditure appears to be almost 50% lower than the current year. Could you clarify why that is?

Where does PTA income go in the 2016-17 budget? There would be no PTA income as the PTA have their own bank account.

What is sponsor income and who might the school's sponsors be? Sponsors are Active Learning Trust (ALT)

Why is there no budget allocated to music services costs in the next year? Currently it is not something that is happening

There is no mention of the nursery in the projected 16/17 document. Will this be essentially independent financially or will it impact on these figures

The nursery comes from a separate funding pot which we are applying to at the moment – it won't come from the school's usual funding streams.

How many teachers/TAs are accounted for in the salaries section? Does this cover all the possible new-hire positions discussed in the Personnel meeting?

Two Reception Teachers, One Year 1 Teacher, Two Year 2 teachers, Head of School, Inclusion Lead to job share – as discussed at personnel committee meeting.

Will catering continue to be bussed-in next year or will it be conducted in-house? If the latter, what are the budgetary implications of this?

CCS will continue to provide the catering but it will be from our kitchens rather than brought in. The cost is in the budget and the school will still receiving funding as part of universal free school meals. It was agreed to investigate whether the contract could be renewed annually to allow some flexibility on future plans.

Mrs Surtees explained how funding for nursery places works, that 15 hours are currently funded per pupil, and how staffing would be allocated.

Ms Lloyd explained that some figures within the budget were distorted due to incorrect codings in the past. She expects the next report to be clearer, but reported that an underspend of £20,000 can be expected. Mrs Surtees informed governors that she would like to appoint a temporary admin assistant from April. This would be a part-time position. This was approved.

7. Committee Meetings

6.

It was noted that a change of date is needed for the next Personnel meeting.

8. **Educational Visits**Mrs Surtees asked that governors approve a Year 1 trip to Wicken Fen and a Reception Class walking trip into Ely. Both were approved.

9.	DfE Information Mrs Surtees reminded governors that the DfE website was available to assist governors in their role.		
10.	 Any Other Business Mrs Surtees reported that an Artist in Residence had been hired to work on an ongoing project. Parents were involved in the appointment. Mrs Jarvis informed governors of some areas that the Active Learning Trust had asked be reported. These included a change to the Health & Safety Policy, an update to the school's Admission Arrangements, the need for all governors to complete a DBS check and a reminder of the next ALT governors event on 14th April. Dr Knox volunteered to be part of an interview panel for appointing a Year 2 teacher. 		
LO.	Puture meetings were agreed as follows: Local Governing Body: Tuesday 3 rd May – 6pm Finance Committee: Thursday 12 th May – 4.30pm Personnel Committee: Thursday 9 th June – 5.30pm Local Governing Body: Thursday 7 th July – 6pm		