



**West Oxford Community Primary School**  
Ferry Hinksey Road  
OXFORD  
OX2 0BY  
Tel: 01865 248862  
Fax: 01865 203555  
E-mail: office.2533@west-oxford.oxon.sch.uk  
www.westoxfordschool.co.uk

**CARE - THINK - INSPIRE - ACHIEVE**

Headteacher: Clare Bladen BA (Hons) PGCE, NPQH

**MINUTES OF THE 3<sup>rd</sup> EFFECTIVENESS, STANDARDS AND WELFARE  
COMMITTEE MEETING IN 2015/16 HELD AT SCHOOL ON  
THURSDAY 7 JULY 2016 AT 6.00pm**

**Present:** Clare Bladen (headteacher) **CB**, Jenny Crewe **JC**, Kelly Faye (joined at item 3, 6.12 pm) **KF**, Rebecca Huxley **RH**, Susanna Pressel (left towards the end of item 4.0, 6.45 pm) **SP**, Pete Smith **PS**

**In attendance:** Claudi Thomas (chair, associate member) **CT**, Joey Potgieter (non-ESW governor) **JP**, Helen Kaufman (non-ESW governor from September) **HK**, Cathy Mulhall (clerk) **CM**

**1.0 Apologies for absence - approved:** none

**Recommendations for the next full governing body meeting**

- JP to arrange a meeting of head and chairs (and usually also deputy head and clerks) at the start of each academic year to plan for the year and to discuss the details of the school development plan before it gets presented to full governors
- Governors to follow up whether there should be a dedicated member of staff for Pupil Premium
- Measurables in the SDIP to be numbered and referred to by number in the evaluation to show clear links (action CB)
- FGB1 to agree SDIP draft objectives and measurables for 2016/17
- Exclusions to be mentioned explicitly alongside racial and other incidents on FGB agendas (action FGB clerk)

**Summary of actions – to be carried out by the next ESW meeting, unless stated otherwise**

- ESW1 to follow up the replacement of PIRA and PUMA tests and moderation of maths, reading and writing
- ESW1 to follow up on the monitoring of writing and on plans to improve writing across the school
- ESW1 to follow up progress on the use of vulnerability indicators
- CB to consider whether a measure of progress could be included in the assessment information that goes to the data group for pre-ARE SEN and PP children
- The school to consider for next year whether further information about progress could be included at the top of pupil reports (action CB, by Term 5/6 ESW meeting)

**2.0 Procedural items**

**2.1 Quorum** The meeting was quorate.

**2.2 Declaration of Interests relevant to agenda** None

Signed .....

Date.....

ESW minutes, page 1 of 5

### 3.0 Matters arising from the minutes of 28 April 2016

#### 3.1 Review actions

- Ursula Irvine is looking into curriculum-awareness training for governors.
- The assessment information was received seven days previously and allowed the data group to meet prior to this meeting.

CB suggested that an improved timeline would be to discuss only the key priorities at the end of the academic year and to move the detailed data analysis to September. Also, the detailed school development plan would be written in September. CB suggested that she should meet with the deputy head and the chairs at the start of each academic year to discuss the school priorities in more detail and to plan for the year ahead. CT noted that this had historically taken place at the end of the summer holidays and had included clerks, but that no convenient date had been found last year. It was agreed that these meetings should continue (**action JP**). CT also commented that it should be possible to move the ESW3 meeting to September.

SP raised a few questions linked to the minutes: she suggested that Liz Newman should be invited to a governors' meeting to talk about art; she asked for clarifications whether there are any plans for forest school – the TA who had been trained was leaving. Governors discussed whether someone else could be trained, such as a parent, or whether we could tap into someone who has had training. CB thought that the costs were too high. CT suggested that the Friends might be willing to help with funding. SP also asked whether there was an action plan resulting from the pupil questionnaire. CB confirmed that there was and that this was feeding into the school evaluation form (SEF).

**3.2** The minutes were approved and signed by the chair as an accurate record of the meeting.

#### 4.0 Internal assessment information

Governors discussed the questions raised by the data group as follows.

##### (1) Assessment

Could you give us a brief summary of the assessment process – how is assessment recorded, how are PIRA/PUMA tests/formative teacher assessment used, how are OPT and Integris used?

Has it worked/does anything need changing?

CB thought that this had been sufficiently covered in previous meetings and at a parent meeting, but governors wanted more details about the actual process of using tests and recording scores. CB confirmed that Oxfordshire Pupil Tracker was used on Integris to generate reports using the available data on age, gender, ethnicity. PS explained how the scores for emerging, developing, expected and mastery for each child were added up to produce overall percentages. It was reported that staff tended to keep a paper or Excel record of the assessment information before uploading it on to Integris. This data formed part of the information in the hand-over folder for each child, to be passed to the next teacher.

PS also explained that the school was looking into replacing PIRA and PUMA tests with another diagnostic tool, as these did not provide enough depth and were not close enough to the SATs papers. Writing had been moderated, and the school felt more confident about this; reading was tricky as it needed so much evidence, including listening to the children talking about what they had read; maths moderation would maybe be the next step and would be looked at within the partnership. Governors would follow up the PIRA and PUMA replacement and the use of moderation (**action ESW1**).

##### (2) Year 1 boys (literacy)

Y1 Boys are clearly lagging behind girls in reading and writing. At ESW2, you were fairly confident that, taking SEN out of the equation, the boys would naturally catch up with the girls as they mature. Is this still the case?

CB clarified that she had not said 'naturally' at the last meeting, and explained that the Y1 girls were outstanding and that Mrs Whiting would focus on the boys' interests to improve their attainment. PS commented that writing was an issue across the board. KF noted that we had a very similar conversation last year about writing and whether writing should have been in the last School Development and Improvement Plan (SDIP), as suggested by governors at the time. CB explained that writing had not been a whole-school issue last year and that it had been in the literacy coordinator's action plan. The school previously had focused on 'Talk for Writing' and reciprocal reading, and now on Spelling, Punctuation and Grammar (SPaG), but when you focused on one area, another area tended to go down. CB suggested that the school would need to do more monitoring of the writing in books to make sure that all teachers were doing enough writing.

### **(3) Year 3 (writing)**

Y3 writing has been a focus point for the last two ESW meetings and the Term 6 results unfortunately still show a big split in achievement:

1/3 of class mostly below ARE with 1 on Emerging, 2/3 of class on expected/mastering – big split, and progress at lower end not good: one child seemed to stay on emerging all year, one seemed to drop from emerging to below ARE, all below ARE seemed to stay there.

If you had the chance to go back and change something during the last year to try to improve Y3 results, would you do so and, if so, what would it be?

How will you ensure good progress next year?

CB commented that the poor Y3 results were down to the teaching, with little evidence in the books. CT asked again what CB would change if she had to work with the same teachers. PS noted that it would have helped if writing had (by chance) not been left to the end of term for monitoring, as evidence of the issue would then have emerged sooner.

Plans for next year were discussed: subject leaders would need to be made more accountable, and could look at the plans for their subject early on and more rigorously. The subject leaders could get training for this. PS added that working within the cluster/in other schools really helped. The school would take part in training for raising the attainment of underachievers.

Governors will follow up on the monitoring of writing and on plans to improve writing (**action ESW1**).

### **(4) Year 6 (writing)**

Term 6: 31% pre ARE, 21% developing, only 48% expected/mastering

From governor visits, we are aware that a lot of interventions were deployed in Y6 and continually reviewed and adjusted. However, if you had the chance to go back and change something during the last year to try to improve Y6 results, would you do so and, if so, what would it be?

PS reflected that the issue was balancing writing with the need to concentrate on Spelling, Punctuation and Grammar (SPaG), which was tested separately and had been very poor. Writing had come on but had started from a low base. The interim framework had been a frustrating tick-box exercise that hadn't helped.

KF asked how this class had been supported along the way, as KS1 results had already been low. CB noted that KS2 results were based on Age Related Expectation (ARE), but that it would be interesting to see what the progress data would be. Y6 had the school's highest proportions of Special Educational Needs (SEN) and English as an Additional Language (EAL). KF followed up to ask what interventions had been given to help this cohort. This year group had both individual and group interventions; they had an extra teacher for two terms and had a full-time TA. PS confirmed that the school was evaluating what had worked and what hadn't. PS working with the more able had provided a nudge in the right direction. The extra teacher had previously worked as a TA and there were behaviour issues that meant that PS had to come back in to class to help sort out behaviour. Also, some children had been reluctant to leave the class to work with PS in the afternoon; they could manage the work with PS, but not independently. Extra time for high-quality writing would have been advantageous.

It was noted that this year group had had a number of teacher changes.

### **(5) Special Educational Needs (SEN) – attainment and progress**

#### **maths**

Term 6: 9/22=41% on pre ARE, 2=9% on emerging, 5=23% on developing, 5=23% on expected and 1=5% on mastering  
Cannot tell from this data how much progress pre ARE children have made, but can see that:

Seven made 2+ jumps, six made 1 jump and nine 'remain' (all on pre ARE, 3 in Y3, 2 in Y5 and 4 in Y6)

#### **reading**

Term 6: 6/22=27% on pre ARE, 6/22 on emerging, 6/22 on developing and 4/22=18% on expected

Five children made 2 jumps, nine made 1 jump and eight 'remain' (2 in Y3 on pre ARE, 1 in Y4 on emerging, 1 in Y5 on pre ARE, and in Y6 3 on pre ARE and 1 on emerging).

#### **writing**

Term 6: 13/21=62% on pre ARE, 4=19% on emerging, 3=14% on developing, 1=5% on expected

One made two jumps (Y4), rest (four) in Y4 dropped down one, seven made one jump (in Y1,2,5) and nine 'remain' (all on pre ARE, 3 in Y3, 1 in Y5 and 5 in Y6)

The SEN maths results seem stronger than for reading, which in turn are stronger than for writing. Also, SEN children in KS1 have all made 1+ jump in progress, whereas there are a group of eight or nine KS2 children (in each of maths, writing and reading), who have stayed within pre-ARE.

It is clear from the July KS2 governor visit that a lot of paperwork and tracking is in place for SEN, with excellent handover plans over the summer, and that most of the pre-ARE children have made progress.

The progress made in KS1 (judging from the data available to governors) seems stronger than that in KS2. If so, what are the reasons? Is there a difference in the severity of SEN in KS1 compared to KS2?

PS noted that it was easier for KS1 to make visible progress, as the children in KS2 might be starting from quite a low starting point, whereas in KS1 they are much more likely to be close to or indeed on emerging at the start of the year. It was also noted that there were higher SEN numbers in KS2 (especially in Y6) than in KS1.

Governors asked whether the pre-ARE SEN group in KS2 had made enough progress, or whether more could be done. It was explained that teachers can see the Term 2 to Term 6 progress, but cannot currently see the KS1 to KS2 progress, because different measures are now being used.

In response to a question, SB confirmed that regular progress review meetings take place and that diagnostic tests (PIRA, PUMA, Sandwell and Salford) are used for gap analysis. Teachers sit down with the SENCO and also do handover meetings with the new teacher to discuss the available information.

It was noted that Botley School was using a list of vulnerability indicators and that West Oxford was looking to adopt this. ESW would follow up progress on this (**action** ESW1).

CT asked whether there was enough resource to support SEN. SB said that there was a SEN budget and that she could also approach CB and PS in case of specific other needs.

#### **(6) Pupil Premium (PP)**

Can you give us a summary of your assessment of PP writing/reading/maths achievements?

CB replied that she had not yet had time to analyse the data, but that the school could be doing better on Pupil Premium (PP). PS elaborated that the non-SEN PP children were making much better progress than the SEN ones.

The data group's analysis of PP assessment information (which was restricted to those on emerging+) shows that PP lags behind non-PP not just on attainment but also on progress. Given the government/Ofsted focus on disadvantaged pupils, what do we need to put in place for next year? How will the funding impact be reviewed next year? Should we have a dedicated member of staff looking after PP?

It was suggested that the SENCO might be able to take this on but would need extra training. Alternatively, CB would also be in a position to take on responsibility for PP. Governors will follow up whether there should be a dedicated member of staff for PP (**action** FGB1).

Governors discussed how impact of PP funding was evaluated. For example, some money has gone on equine therapy to address a behaviour issue, but that it required professional judgement to assess the impact. It was also noted that 1-to-1 work with a PP child could benefit the whole class, but that it was tricky to measure impact.

KF noted that Ofsted will focus on PP children and asked whether teachers were addressing PP in a special way, such as marking their work first or going round class to check especially on PP children, to show that PP was on their mind. It was explained that the numbers were very low in each class and that teachers focused on all children equally but that there were some inconsistencies.

For both SEN and PP, the question was raised whether governors could see some progress data as part of the termly assessment information, especially for children at pre-ARE (**action** CB).

#### **5.0 Review of 2015/16 School Development and Improvement Plan (SDIP)**

The SDIP review was received on the day of the meeting and governors had not had much time to look at this. JC commented that it was not easy to find the information that governors needed from the review document.

CT suggested that measurables should be numbered, so that the evaluation could refer back to each measurable and state whether and when it had been met. It was agreed that such labelling should be used (**action** CB). Governors further clarified that the review document did not need to be in the form of a PowerPoint document, and could contain traffic-light indicators or similar.

It was noted that the school had met their pupil objectives on the tests that had stayed the same (early years, phonics). The other targets had been aspirational ones, based on former SATs data, which could not be

compared to the new SATs tests. The SATs data would be analysed in more detail when RAISEonline becomes available in the autumn, which will also provide a potentially more informative measure of progress. JP asked CB to go through the measurable milestones and state which ones had been met, which was then briefly discussed at the meeting. It was highlighted that the Maths Club in Year 6 had been particularly effective and it was reported that the school was considering introducing Maths Club to lower year groups. KF queried whether this was best use of resources and whether a kind of sentence club to improve writing should not be higher priority. There was a short discussion in which governors agreed that it was worthwhile extending Maths Club to lower year groups, as this had been seen to be effective.

## 6.0 Draft objectives for 2016/17 School Development Plan

No paper had been received and it was agreed to delay this item until the autumn term (**action** FGB1).

## 7.0 Governor visits

The KS1 visit had been arranged to take place the following Monday.

CT thanked PS and SB for a very informative KS2 visit. The visit raised one question for this meeting that had not yet been covered elsewhere.

*Should end-of-year reports provide more of an indication of progress (placed at the top of the form), especially for children who have remained either above or below age-related expectation?*

It was explained that the school had been advised to present the attainment on the reports in that format, linked only to age related expectations (ARE), but that other schools were experimenting with reporting on the categories such as emerging, developing etc. It was agreed that it could be more helpful for parents to know whether their child is only just below ARE and whether they've made expected progress. The school should consider for next year whether further information about progress could be included at the top of the reports (**action** CB).

## 8.0 PE and Sport funding

### 8.1 Review outcomes for 2015/16

The paper (funding statement for last year) was noted. CT highlighted the fact that this statement did not show baseline data or many success criteria. The format had been taken from the partnership, but needed improvement. It was difficult to find measurables because of the limited nature in which funds could be spent. Use of soft surveys were discussed and it was noted that Mrs Whiting was collating data for the Sports Mark.

### 8.2 Discuss success criteria and baseline data for 2016/17

It was reported that funding was going up and that a better report format would be adopted. It was noted that Cumnor School might have a format that could be made to work for West Oxford. Professional Development was being planned for teachers, as the school would like to move on from using Ignite for PE.

## 9.0 Any other business

CT noted that during her KS2 visit, she may or may not have witnessed an exclusion taking place, and asked whether exclusions should be explicitly mentioned on the agenda of full governors' meetings, which used to be the case. This was agreed (**action** FGB clerk).

Two recent exclusions were briefly discussed and RH noted the importance of collecting all the evidence as this would be required to ask for additional support and for any Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCP). The chair thanked everyone for attending the meeting. JP thanked CT for her role as chair of ESW and all the support she has given. Rachel Goode will chair ESW meetings next year and CT will be vice chair and clerk.

The meeting closed at 7.45pm.

**Date of next meeting:** tbc, 6.00pm at WOCPS