



Learning, Growing, Achieving Together

#### LOCAL GOVERNING BODY MINUTES OF MEETING Tuesday 15<sup>th</sup> January 2019

**PRESENT:** Bryony Surtees

Kate Yeoman

Marion Lloyd (by phone)

Tim Gingell
Stephen Dove
Annabel Charles
David Monk
Stephanie Peachy
Allan Sanderson

#### **IN ATTENDANCE:**

Item	Agenda Item	Action		
1	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE			
	No apologies			
2	DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY AND NOT PECUNIARY INTEREST			
	None recorded			
3	CHAIRS ACTION			
	There were no Chair's actions to report at this time.			
4	MINUTES			
	All matters arising from the minutes had been actioned.			
	The minutes of the meeting held on 15 <sup>th</sup> January were approved			
5	RESTRUCTURED GOVERNING BODY			
	QUESTION (ML) As the Executive Head teacher has now resigned, will there be a need to have two governing bodies again?			
	declared this intention to resign within the year as he has questions			
	about the model of Chesterton being a stand-alone academy being			
	sustainable. IM explained that his interest is within the local community and believes you need to be invested in the local community to			
	understand the schools. ML explained that the reason for merging may			





Learning, Growing, Achieving Together

6	disappear but it is too soon to say whether the merged Governing Body is working and having impact. TG discussed how much the new SLTs will need from Governors and AC agreed. AC now feels committed to Ely and she thought that Governors ought to spend at least a year and then review it. AS agreed that the Governing Body was the stable part of the leadership within this time of change but perhaps should review it after a year. IM stated that the Trust should keep a close eye on the change.  ACADEMY IMPROVEMENT					
6.1	QUESTIONS ML:					
	EYFS					
	Chesterton:					
	On track to be working pre the expected expectations	38%	38%	24%		
	What is the makeup of	these childr	en – are the	ey the PP, S	end,	
	EAL?					
	White British, mixture of	girls and boy	s, EAL			
	Y1					
	Chesterton: interesting to note that large group of boys, but doing well. What are the characteristics of those pupils who are on track to be working pre the expected expectation?					
	Maths: On Track – boys – SEND, EAL	& girls, EAL	and Pupil P	remium, Not	on Track	
	Reading & Writing – boy EAL	s & girls, EAl	_, Not on Tra	ack – SEND,	PP &	
	Y2					
	On track to be working pre the expected expectations	22%	25.9%	18.51%		
	Anything 1D or below					





Learning, Growing, Achieving Together

# <u>These look like big numbers – what are we doing to ensure these pupils make better progress?</u>

HLTA running interventions (although currently off sick) JS is focusing on borderline children during group time

Y2: progress

# What are the characteristics of those pupils who are making good progress and those that are making less than expected progress?

No specific groups are making good progress as all are. Those not making expected progress fall under EAL, New to the School and SEND

**Y3** 

On track to be	16.7%	16.7%	13.3%
working pre the			
expected			
expectations			
•			

# <u>Quite a large group – what strategies are we using to improve</u> outcomes for these?

Vast majority of the class are making expected progress.

Quite a transition of children. We have lost 3 pupils who met the expected level at Year 2 and in their place, we have gained children who were either not in the country or got expected at Year 2.

Children with SEND work in Mulberry Class. HLTA was working with Year 3 with interventions, write away, inference, CLIC etc (however, HLTA now off sick)

**Y4** 

On track to be working	27%	19%	15%
towards expected			
expectations			

# I guess these are the pupils that we need to work even harder with – do we have a cunning plan?

Children who met the expected level at Year 2 are still on track or exceeding. Many of the children working towards have had a





Learning, Growing, Achieving Together

significant time out of school.

Those not on track have behavioural needs or EAL and joined later.

There is a tight intervention timetable for the children – this is happening regularly

Y5

## This remains our greatest challenge – do we have anything different we offer?

With Year 4/5 teachers, following on from SIM meetings we discussed expectations and teaching to specific needs and teaching the children separately if needed. In terms of maths, the priority was planning and teaching problem solving and building this into the wider environment.

Spoke about specific children whose progress has slipped and so teachers' are aware of any children who haven't made expected progress

Boys are a concern in Year 1 and Year 3 and the teachers are carrying out a lesson study approach to look at the specific barriers for this group – carried out a lessons study last term and learning walk this week showed that all of the PP pupils were engaged and learning.

EAL – pre teaching, first language assessments

Isle of Ely

# Y1 – data doesn't make sense, there appears to be only 1 SEN pupil in the cohort, so can't have 25%?

Reading (SEN)	Writing (SEN)	Maths (SEN)
25%	25%	25%

There is only 1 child listed by four whom the teachers would consider SEND

Y2: progress

What are the characteristics of those pupils who are making good progress and those that are making less than expected progress?

There is no difference in the characteristics of those making progress





Learning, Growing, Achieving Together

and those not making progress, it is a mixture of boys and girls. However, the children who are not on track are those children that did not achieve a good level of development at the end of their Reception Year.

**Y3** 

SEND	3%	3%	2%

#### Is this as a percentage of the whole cohort?

These children are working at 1beginning, 1beginning+ and 1developing which signifies they are two years behind so a referral to SEND may be necessary

% on track to at least meet their sufficient progress target			
Reading	Writing	Maths	
79%	61%	54%	

#### What are we doing to improve progress?

For all children, consistent first quality teaching is the key to making expected and better progress. All of the children in Year 3 now have this. The teachers within class will adapt their provision, precision teach, model introduce more problem solving activities. They will also use pre-teaching for certain children. Other children may need more targeted interventions and these will be ERT, being in The Garden, Inference, extra reading, APDRs are in place, number box and Place2Be.

#### Should the impact of Place2Be be a focus of an interim head?

They could probably cast an independent eye on it. Point for a review

**Y4** 

On track to be working towards expected expectations	13%	13%	29%
On track to be working pre the expected expectation	5%	16%	3%





Learning, Growing, Achieving Together

SEND	3%	3%	3%	

#### What are we doing differently with these pupils?

See previous answer

Progress					
% on track to at least meet their sufficient progress target					
Reading	Writing	Maths			
54%	43%	70%			
% on track to exceed their sufficient progress target					
Reading	Writing	Maths			
14%	22%	5%			

#### Progress looks quite poor?

I believe the children regressed over the summer vacation and then the children whom were in Grasshopper Class were a concern. I have also taken the progress from the summer term but when you look at just the Autumn term, most of the children make expected progress. Not overly concerned about the progress of the Year 4 children – they are enthusiastic and motivated children who are keen to achieve. Please remember that this stage of the year, much hasn't been taught yet and so the children will show greater progress.

#### **QUESTIONS FROM AS**

I note my absence at the last meeting wasn't noted in the minutes.

CPS KS2 Boys: Is it known why they score so low? How are they being supported? Is it anticipated they will improve? What does it mean for them in their future education journey?

They are identified as a key group and a key line of enquiry for the school. Many of our boys are pupil premium children but also SEND/EBD. We have an action plan to support them. Every identified boy needs to have a now and next board in class. This supports them staying on target during lesson time and making the most of challenge time. The now and next boards give them the challenge they should do and which star level to aim at. Then the next challenge they need to





Learning, Growing, Achieving Together

move onto. This ensures the children have a focus and are not aimlessly wondering. Also because the now and next boards are set by the teachers there is accountability, that the children know the adults are checking on the work they are doing and what they should be doing. That way they cannot hide under the radar. This has worked for some children, in making them more focused and increased the amount of challenge work being completed. In the review by the ALT it was commented how children were engaged and on task during independent learning time. During SIM meetings and data collection there is a focus on looking a boys progress as well as achievement. In Autumn 1 as a school there was a lesson study conducted to look at the learning of pupil premium children. The teachers got a lot from this and were able to adapt their teaching from lessons learnt. Therefore we are going to continue this approach and apply it to boys in the Spring term.

The boys to focus on will be those who have not made 1 point progress across the first term, regardless on their starting point. This is to try and identify what stopped them making the progress and fixing it for the Spring term.

Teachers need to be looking at the boys making 1 point progress across a whole academic term and 0.5 points progress in a half term. This must be made regardless of their starting point. This progress is continually to be discussed and be kept in mind

Are we doing all we can to aid these children's journey through? We've tried Place2Be, referred to CAMH and not been able to achieve, been rejected for EHCP, ML – why? If we don't have a diagnosis then won't get through. IM explained that this should be the conversation.

AC asked have we had the opportunity to visit other schools to see what they are doing? It's when they meet several characteristics. I think that is a good idea to visit other schools. KY has visited Red Oak to support disadvantage.

<u>SP asked is there practice from other settings?</u>, e.g. Highfields that could be borrowed that may help with managing behaviour. KY explained that we had worked with Highfields in the past

Why do we have "Disadvantaged" children falling short of National %?

It is always difficult to compare all disadvantaged children to the national average – you should be comparing the disadvantaged





Learning, Growing, Achieving Together

children to the national disadvantaged. Chesterton's data is lower than the national disadvantaged data. Many of our disadvantaged children fall into many categories, e.g. boys, SEND etc. However, all of our disadvantaged children have a one page profile and additional support and needs. The teachers' carried out a lesson study looking at the disadvantaged and what support their learning. Within our Year 3 cohort, we have two disadvantaged children with significant EBD needs and are working in Mulberry, 1 new child with significant needs and on a very part time timetable and 1 new child. One child is on track in all areas and the other is on track in a couple of areas. Those children without additional needs, make the progress like all of the children.

#### **QUESTIONS FROM SP**

In the school performance summaries I would welcome some clarity on where the national averages sit against Chesterton and IOE performance on the graphs - especially around disadvantages students. I don't fully understand how we compare.

So the data in front of you is not comparable to national data at this time as we are using an internal system to track attainment and progress. We can only compare against the national ages at the end of Key Stage 1, EYFS and Phonics – this data was presented to you at the end of the summer term.

If the trend continues it looks like again we should hit our targets for EYFS, phonics and Key Stage 1.

The national data for disadvantaged for EYFS was 57.3% and Chesterton's was 50% and for Key Stage 1, reading: National – 62.5%, Chesterton 33%, Ely 57.1% Writing, 55.4% Chesterton 16.7%, Ely 42.9% and maths 62.8%, Chesterton 33.3%, 42.9%

However this is a national figure with disadvantaged children and as long as we have a strategy and we can identify our barriers, which we do have, and the children have one page profiles, then we are trying to support these children.

I have also noted that there is difference between national average and our performance around supporting students to work at greater depth. I know this is something we have worked hard on at IoE - could you just update us on how both schools are approaching this?

The school has the more able strategy and we are continually reviewing our more able but the data shown cannot be compared to any national averages until the end of each key stage.





Learning, Growing, Achieving Together

	Learning, Growing, Achieving Together	
	Finally I am interested to know how staff teams across both	
	schools look at data and therefore how good teaching and	
	learning practices are shared across schools. I note that IOE	
	seems to do well in maths for example and would like to	
	understand more about how staff share what works.	
	At IOE we have a really strong Maths lead and at Chesterton the maths	
	lead is new to the role. However, the Chesterton's maths lead is doing	
	LAL project around maths and is using a lot of the documents from Ely	
	to look at maths provision at Chesterton.	
	'	
	Look at the data and integrate it but don't take it as gospel truth. What	
	really matters is where is the trend.	
	,,	
	As long as the projects are purposeful for both	
	3 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
7	SAFEGUARDING	
	AC QUESTION: Do we have enough DPs trained?	
	Yes there are four at Chesterton with one further member of staff being	
	trained and 3 at Ely. All staff are aware they can phone us if we	
	are off site or another school if they have a concern.	
8	HEALTH AND SAFETY REVIEW	
	The governors acknowledged that both reports seem quite positive.	
	AC QUESTION: Is this getting enough attention? Yes as it's	
	discussed at the monthly H & S Meetings	
	The actual reports will be presented at the next meeting	
9	EDUCATIONAL VISITS	
	Discussed taking the Year 4/5 children at Chesterton to Bushcraft and	
	how we could enable this to happen if not enough children	
	signed up for it. IM explained that child poverty is East	
	Chesterton is high so we need to encourage and do all we can	
	to ensure that trip goes ahead.	
10	GOVERNOR TRAINING	BS
	Governors would like focussed training on data from ALT, either James	
	Chester, David Hilton or Joy Parke.	
	Governors would also like training in talking to Ofsted.	
11	Any Other Business	
11.1	KY explained that there are a lot of late children at Chesterton who are	
	marked down as a U. KY would like to change the start time of	
11.2	Chesterton so that there was a rolling start from 0850 to 0900	
	instead of 0835 to 0845 as it is currently.	BS
	QUESTION TG: Will that later start mean any change in behaviour	
	or does it mean that they will then arrive even later? KY	
1	didn't think so. TG has suggested that KY documents evidence,	





Learning, Growing, Achieving Together

	investigates it further and brings it to the next Governing Body Meeting.	KY
	ALT are receiving a visit from HMI The governors would like any new members of SLT to be invited to the next meeting.	
12	<u>Dates of Future Meetings</u> – to confirm the date of the next meeting. Wednesday 6 <sup>th</sup> March Tuesday 30 <sup>th</sup> April Wednesday 9 <sup>th</sup> July	