



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 2nd EFFECTIVENESS, STANDARDS AND WELFARE
COMMITTEE MEETING IN 2016/17 HELD AT SCHOOL ON
THURSDAY 26 JANUARY 2017 AT 6.00pm**

Present: Clare Bladen (headteacher) **CB**, Rachel Goode (ESW chair, co-opted governor), **RG**, Susanna Pressel (co-opted governor, until 6.40 pm) **SP**, Johnny James (staff governor) **JJ**

In attendance: Claudi Thomas (clerk, associate member) **CT**, Joey Potgieter (FGB chair, co-opted governor, non-ESW member) **JP**, Helen Kaufmann (parent governor, non-ESW member) **HK**, Suzi Batterton (SENCO) **SB**

1.0 Apologies for absence - approved: Rebecca Huxley (LA governor) **RH**

Other absences: Kelly Faye (parent governor) **KF**

Recommendations for the next full governing body meeting

- CB to table the Supporting pupils with medical conditions policy for FGB3

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

- CB to update on replacement of PIRA and PUMA assessment tests
- RG to fix date of next data group meeting and CB to prepare some progress data for children (especially for SEND and PP) who fall within the pre-ARE category
- CB and other staff to look for opportunities for whole days/overnight stays at Hill End
- CB to include assessment targets for Y1,3,4 and 5 in the assessment information for the data group
- Governors to continue to work with JP, RG and Ben Selby when organising governor visits
- CB to send a copy of the Positive relationships and behaviour policy to HK after this has gone to a staff meeting
- SP to update the Equal Opportunities policy
- RG to review with governors whether anonymised pupil progress review actions should be released to governors
- CB to report to ESW3 on the impact of PP spending in more detail than done for the website
- CB to send RG the maths action plan
- SP to suggest dates to RG for SP's behaviour visit
- RG to add the review of the governor visit protocol to the ESW3 agenda and change the name to governor learning walk

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 ESW1 (28 September 2016)

The action points were reviewed as follows.

- Alternatives to PIRA and PUMA are being discussed and trialled. Teachers are still using the diagnostics, especially the PUMA ones. An update on replacements should be reported to ESW3 (**action CB**).
- The DfE hasn't yet released a progress measure, but CB will attend some Oxfordshire Pupil Tracker training, which should include information on the OPT progress measure. CB has been looking at data going back to EY learning goals and KS1 results for year groups higher up in the school, but this can only give us trends because of changes in the cohorts. CB is aiming to collate some progress data for pre-ARE children before the next meeting, which should be in time for the data group meeting, for which RG will fix a date soon (**action RG, CB**)
- Teachers are enthusiastic about whole days/overnight stays at Hill End. Separately, Laura Cheeseman is in contact with a local-authority trained Forest School Leader, who offers 10-week courses at £4/week per child. Governors asked where this Forest School would take place and were concerned whether all families could afford this. A discussion followed about whether the 10-week course would be a good way of offering Forest School. The following points were raised: it would be best to take children out of the school environment, but Hill End takes a lot of time; Hogacre is quite a long walk for younger children; there are risks associated with using the school field. Most schools use part of their school grounds for Forest School. It was agreed that CB and other staff would try to make days/overnight stays at Hill End happen (**action CB**).
- The governor newsletter went out with information for parents about how to help with writing, linked to the school development plan. Governors discussed where this information could be published in future. It doesn't naturally sit with what governors are doing, and ideally should be year-group specific. So individual teachers should get involved. JJ reported that he had tried this with mixed feedback. There were also concerns about the impact on workload.
- CB is working on including internal assessment targets for non-SATs year groups in the assessment information for governors together with the progress measure for pre-ARE children mentioned above (**action CB**).
- Governors have been working with JP, RG and Ben Selby (chair of HPR) when organising governor visits and should continue to do so (**action all**)

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

4.0 Policy review

It was clarified that the Early Years Behaviour policy was tabled at the last full governors' meeting, and that the whole-school policy is in the process of being updated. The staff use this policy a lot and update it constantly. CB will send a copy to HK when the updated version has been shared at a staff meeting (**action CB**).

Governors noted the updated Sex and Relationships policy (approved by the headteacher) and thanked JJ for his work on this.

SP will update the Equal Opportunities policy; and the policy for Supporting pupils with medical conditions will go to FGB3 (**action RG, CB**).

5.0 Progress data – review of RAISEonline data and internal Term 1 data

RG thanked CB for providing answers to the data group's questions in advance of the meeting. The questions and answers (tabled paper) were fairly comprehensive and governors worked through these at the meeting to seek additional clarification.

RG said that some of the questions were quite granular but this helped governors feel reassured by plans going forward. [RG asked again for confirmation of when governors would get a report on progress tracking across all year groups \(not just SATs\), linking to the action points from the last meeting.](#) CB explained that this data is evolving and that she is doing what she can by reviewing EY goals and progress across the last three years by looking at general pupil groups. [RG asked whether the missing Y3 data was now available.](#) CB confirmed that the reading and maths data were in and that the writing assessment was imminent. It was decided that this data should go to the data group as soon as possible to see whether there were any questions.

RG and JP expressed the view that the anonymised action list arising from the pupil progress review meetings was very useful for governors to see and asked whether we could continue to receive this information. CB however thought that individual children could be identified from this. JP then suggested that governors should see an action list for just two anonymised children per year group purely from an educational point of view. CB replied that governors had already seen this and did not agree to release this information in future. HK wondered whether we could move to the bigger picture, so that governors could for example hear how the school is dealing with writing across year groups, to find out what is going well and what needs improving. The minutiae would not be relevant but the “big picture” actions should be reported to governors. JP explained that her suggestion was about gathering evidence that things are happening. CB replied that it felt as though governors did not trust her. JP explained that it was nothing to do with trust, but that at a meeting with other chairs she had heard how governors receive samples of actions, to get a sense of what is going on. It would help governors to explain any lack of progress and what the school was doing about it. It was noted that lack of progress was often linked to multiple vulnerability indicators. JP again made the point that other schools’ curriculum committees got samples, so that they had seen the evidence, not just the data. JP noted that CB was really pushing back on this idea. CB explained that she was weary of being micromanaged. JP responded that this was not what was proposed; it was a measure that would give governors confidence that they had not only seen the data, but also its implications within the school. CB said that at an upcoming heads’ meeting she would check whether other schools shared pupil progress data. JP said that St Swithun’s did. RG said that we would need to pick this up again another time and that it was really useful for governors to be aware of what was happening per pupil group (**action RG**).

Governors next asked about progress for Pupil Premium pupils and noted that if a child was on pre-ARE, one could not tell from the data whether there had been any progress. CB and SB explained that there tended to be multiple vulnerability indicators and that, within the pre-ARE category, children did make progress. CB said she regularly challenged SB on the amount of progress made and in particular on whether these children were making the same progress as their peers.

Governors then asked why the assessment information for Y4 looked quite different from the other year groups. It was noted that the teacher had been working with the same year group since the Y3 summer term and that she had embedded interventions with very positive results. CB felt that the strategic change in the senior leadership team had proved really effective.

Governors next discussed how CB and Tessa Palfreyman shared responsibilities for the writing action plan and that CB was taking the strategic overview on this. CB said that she had 100% confidence in Tessa doing the right thing for writing.

RG asked when the next assessment meetings would take place and whether teachers could add a note on the effectiveness of the PP spending. CB explained that the teachers did not deal with the finance and that it was on her to-do list. RG asked whether this information would then come to ESW. CB explained that it would go on the website. RG asked whether governors could get more in-depth information than that for the website. CB explained that the effectiveness of PP spending was difficult to measure as, for example, a lot of PP money was spent on a one-to-one TA for one child, which would help the whole class and avoid disruption, but would not necessarily push up the data for that one child. Governors asked for a more detailed report on the impact of PP spending than the one on the website to come to ESW3 (**action CB**).

HK asked whether disadvantaged children were seen by an educational psychologist. This was confirmed. HK asked how difficult cases were handled. SB and CB explained that the school buys in a home-school link worker pro-rata from the partnership and that the home-school link worker would be sent to talk to the parents to provide support. HK asked what the school would do if the situation was such that the child would be unable to make any progress. CB explained that, if there is a need, the school would put in place a ‘team around the family’ and get external help.

Teachers were good at spotting when a child was feeling unhappy, in which case Fran Melvin would offer a few weeks of nurture work. JP asked whether parents were aware of this work. SB explained that this was ongoing for SEN but that otherwise it tended to be discussed at parent-teacher meetings.

JP asked why maths club for Year 5 was starting only in May when there seemed to be a need for this sooner. JJ explained that maths club couldn’t start any earlier because of a lack of available TAs, but he had already put in a 10-minute maths intervention, as he agreed that something needed to be done sooner.

RG highlighted that a lot of the Y6 high attainers were not in line with expectations and asked whether actions were specifically targeted at these. CB said that this was not exclusively targeted at these children, but that the

additional support teacher, Miss Oliver, worked together with the teacher and TA to discuss which groups to work with next.

HK asked whether the school had a positive feeling about the current Y6's KS2 SATs. CB replied that it was more positive than last year, but that there were some children who had got very high KS1 SATs results who were unlikely to get KS2 SATs results that were as high. The school had employed Miss Oliver to target these children. JP challenged CB to explain why these children had fallen behind. CB replied that she did not know. It was noted that this year group's KS1 results had been moderated and should therefore be accurate. One could pin the drop on to the changes in curriculum, but it was noted that this shouldn't be done. CB said that the issue concerned under-confident girls, who were "opt-outers". RG commented on the work that was now being done by school to affect a culture change on the issue of opting out. CB explained that during the January inset day the teachers had looked at the key lines of inquiry and articulated which children they would be looking at from the data, which provided good stories for what the school is doing.

The governors challenged CB to explain why the writing results had been so bad, even in comparison to the partnership schools. CB said that she had already spoken about this a lot. It was very much an issue with that particular cohort. RG asked whether this sufficiently answered the question. CB confirmed this and highlighted issues such as multiple vulnerabilities, a child who had child protection, a looked-after child, high SEND, high EAL and low attendance.

RG asked what would happen if we had the same class and used the new interventions being embedded by Tessa Palfreyman. CB said that the result would be better. RG concluded that it was not just a cohort issue then, but also the way in which this was handled. CB pointed out that this cohort's EY learning goals had been dire. RG agreed that this was raking over coals but that governors needed to be able to better answer this question.

RG noted that she had seen the reading action plan and would like to see the maths one. CB will send this to RG (**action CB**). The governors were interested to hear that teachers had looked at the key lines of inquiry at the last inset day and written notes on what to focus on next. Governors were interested to receive a summary of these notes, but CB pointed out that most of the notes concerned plans for individual children. The data group would like to map their questions on to the key lines of inquiry, but CB noted that the answers could then be too personalised to share.

RG thanked CB for this in-depth discussion, which had been quite difficult at times, and noted that things looked quite positive going forwards, which should be reflected in the data.

6.0 Governor visits

RH had done her Early Years visit and RG had done the KS1 visit, which she reported to have been enjoyable. RG will share her visit report with the relevant staff to make sure that they are happy with it. RG will do a KS2 visit soon. SP is due to do a behaviour visit and should suggest dates to RG (**action SP**).

JP noted that governors should aim to do two visits per year and that she and CB would sit down together to see what governors were saying after each visit.

CB thought that a revised title would be of benefit to some governors, and governors agreed to change the title to governor learning walks. It was noted that the protocol for visits needed reviewing at ESW3 (**action RG**).

7.0 Staff wellbeing

RG explained that the intention would be to look at staff wellbeing from an ESW angle, i.e. to concentrate on the effect of all the curriculum/teaching and learning changes on staff wellbeing. CB said that she had an answer to how to ensure the wellbeing of staff, and it was the Vision meeting. In September, staff had become quite upset that parents didn't understand what was going on in school. CB felt that the previous Vision meeting had been 'disastrous', with a 'single-minded agenda'. There had been two very different perspectives in the room and it was not possible to formulate strategies with just three people involved. Governors checked that teaching assistants had also been invited to the upcoming Vision meeting and this was confirmed. It was agreed that the wider engagement was very positive, with representatives from each group.

CB reported that Tessa Palfreyman had done a session on mindfulness with TAs and that this had been extremely positively received. She noted that teachers and TAs were working in a joined up way, whereas she felt that teachers and TAs had not been speaking to each other when she joined the school in 2012.

8.0 Any other business

HK asked about the planned meeting between governors and staff. This now clashed with a leaving do and would need to be rearranged. Governors said that they didn't want to impose anything, but that they were very keen for the meeting to go ahead soon. Maybe it could be combined with another meeting or with an inset day, or maybe it could take the form of pizza before a governors' meeting.

RG thanked everyone for coming and was thanked by all for chairing the meeting.

The meeting closed at 7.30pm.

Date of next meeting: 11 May 2017, 6.00pm at WOCPS