

SIC Minutes November 2014

London Borough of Richmond upon Thames

Minutes of the meeting of the School Improvement Committee of Chase Bridge Primary School held at the school on Tuesday 11 November 2014 at 7.30 a.m.

Present:

Governors:	Ms Pippa Prior (Vice-chair in the Chair)	Mr Andrew King (Headteacher)
	Ms Una Blair	Miss Francesca Prior
	Ms Claire Debney	Mrs Eleanor Wright
	Ms Rebecca Hill	

Associate Members: Ms Caroline McCarthy, FoCB
Mr Brian Ostro, Deputy Headteacher

Also attended: Miss Beryl Hawkins (Clerk to the Governors)

- 1. Apologies** Apologies were received from Will Arnold.
- 2. Declarations of Interest** There were no declarations of interest.
- 3. Membership of the Committee** It was noted that there had been no changes in membership since the last meeting of the governing body.
- 4. Election of Chair and Vice-chair** The Committee noted that Will Arnold had been unwell and it was not known whether he wished to continue as chair. The Committee agreed that Will should be elected as chair, subject to his agreement. Pippa Prior was elected as vice-chair.
- 5. Minutes and Matters Arising** The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 6 May 2014 were confirmed and signed. The Committee reviewed the action agreed at the last meeting. There were no matters arising.

Eleanor Wright arrived at this point.

- 6. Confidentiality** See Minute 8.4.
- 7. Future Meetings** The Committee confirmed dates of future meetings:

Tuesday 10 February 2015 at 7.30 a.m.
Tuesday 12 May 2015 at 7.30 a.m.

Pippa Prior gave apologies for the meeting on 10 February and Claire Debney stated that she would not usually be able to attend meetings before 8 a.m.

- 8. Headteacher's Report** The report of the headteacher was received (copy in the minute book), including:

- Factual data relevant to the work of the Committee
- Progress against priorities and targets in curriculum faculty action plans
- An analysis of end-of-Key-Stage test results

SIC Minutes November 2014

- Interpretation of data from RaiseOnline (RoL) and Fischer Family Trust (FFT) and comparison with Chase Bridge data
- An evaluation by the Link Inspector of children's outcomes achieved during the summer term statutory assessments
- A final draft of the school's Pupil Premium Statement for publishing on the website
- A case study to show the impact of interventions

Arising from the report:

8.1 Key Performance Data The Committee considered the available data on pupil performance in 2014, including EYFS (Early Years Foundation Stage) outcomes; Year 1 Phonics Screening; end-of-Key-Stage-1 achievement and end-of-Key-Stage-2 achievement. Andrew King stated that:

- His report to the governing body on 1 October 2014, his written report to the Committee (previously circulated), the Link Inspector's analysis (included as an appendix to the headteacher's report) and Fischer Family Trust data (just received) all indicated broadly similar areas emerging as strengths and aspects that needed further investigation.
- In the FFT data each child represented 1.7% of the cohort.
- Targets had to be set in relation to previous performance and were based on individual children's end-of-Key-Stage-1 and Reception performance as well as other contextual data, for example: boy/girl, EAL and SEN.
- The school had set challenging targets, that is, based on a comparison of progress with the top 20% of similar schools nationally in 2014.

Andrew answered governors' questions:

Question: Why is the school's performance in phonics screening below the national average?

Answer: The school is investigating the process used to assess phonics and reviewing the teaching of phonics to establish why outcomes remain below the national average.

Question: Do all children have to make a certain level of progress in order for the school to meet the 20th percentile target.

Answer: Not all children need to meet the target measure of progress. Some children are working in extremely challenging circumstances; some of these will not meet the overall progress measure, but will be able to make progress over time.

Question: Do EYFS outcomes need to be moderated?

Answer: EYFS outcomes in Reception are based wholly on teacher assessment. All have to be moderated, but the data nationally is not robust. Richmond is out of kilter with the rest of the country.

Question: Should there be an upward trend in progress in writing?

Answer: Writing is not being properly assessed because of variations in the way that independent writing is taught and assessed across the country. Chase Bridge did not change its teaching and assessment methods for independent writing in 2014 as the absence of a statutory protocol had not

SIC Minutes November 2014

previously been a major issue. The school is now taking steps to improve writing. An external adviser has visited and staff will be meeting later in the day to 'level' independent writing with a view to achieving consistency across the school. Teachers will be reminded of the need to make accurate assessments. The school is aiming to improve results for writing by 10% points.

8.2 Improving Standards at Chase Bridge, including Standards in Writing

Brian Ostro gave a presentation on how the school is improving standards (copy in the minute book), including:

- diagnostic tools used – FFT, RoL, Ofsted data dashboard;
- comparison with national averages – Richmond is the top achieving borough in London;
- the criteria for assessing performance between Key Stages 1 and 2 –
 - attainment: the number of pupils attaining two levels of progress (Expected) and the number attaining three levels of progress (Exceeding); and
 - achievement;
- the action the school was taking to address areas for focus – in particular, writing (Expected and Exceeding).

Brian and Andrew answered governors' questions:

Question: Are sub-levels used in measuring performance?

Answer: Sub-levels do not count when using the statutory 'two levels of progress' measure; they have been devised by schools as a useful means of tracking progress.

Question: What is the school doing to improve standards in writing?

Answer: Staff have considered assessment, ideas for writing and target setting. The school needs to have higher expectations in the lower years of Key Stage 2 so that less catch-up is needed in Year 6.

Question: If results in phonics are below the national average, does that mean that the foundation is not there for progressing to Key Stage 2?

Answer: The school may have been too harsh in its assessments. The school does well in SPAG (Spelling, Punctuation and Grammar) when it is externally assessed, but writing needs to improve.

A target for all teachers is to achieve Outstanding progress across the class. Year Group Leaders are being appointed. Iris Klever has responsibility for Core Subjects and Rose Woodington has responsibility for Literacy. Middle Management will be reviewed to find out whether it is fit for purpose.

Question: What is Outstanding pupil progress?

Answer: Outstanding is defined as an average of 4 points across the class, that is, 2 sub-levels of progress.

Question: What is changing in teaching practice?

Answer: Teachers are attending external courses in phonics teaching; Year 1 teachers are visiting other schools; weekly CPD meetings are taking place; the TPSE (Teacher Profile and Self-Evaluation activities) monitoring system is being introduced during the autumn term; Lindsay Pickton, a local

SIC Minutes November 2014

external consultant, is helping with levelling different pieces of writing diagnosing and finding gaps in practice, deciding on next steps and identifying CPD (continuing professional development) needs. Lesson observations are being used to look at practice in differentiation, so that in a mixed ability class all pupils are learning whatever their ability.

There will be a different focus each term. The focus for the autumn term is number and the number system. The school is taking steps to ensure that teachers are using core texts effectively each term.

Question: Do teachers have a choice in the texts that they use?

Answer: Teachers must use quality texts. The school has revamped themes to meet the new statutory requirements of the National Curriculum. Staff have reviewed key texts and nearly all staff have visited a specialist bookshop during the spring or summer term to select texts.

Question: Why is there more maths homework than writing homework?

Answer: The school is in the process of reviewing homework,

Question: How soon will there be an impact from the changes in practice?

Answer: An impact is already being seen. Teachers are altering practice. It will not be possible to assess the impact on children's work until the end of the academic year.

Question: Are teachers getting the tools they need to improve standards?

Answer: Brian Ostro has been in post for just over half a term and has already introduced weekly CPD; writing is very high on teachers' radar; teachers know the school's position and what needs to be done.

Conclusion The Committee agreed that:

- Andrew should provide a progress report at the next meeting of the Committee on implementation of changes in teaching practice.
- There should be a report at the next meeting on other things that the external adviser worked on with staff.
- Examples of writing, including 'P' scales, should be built into the governors' day.
- Brian Ostro's presentation should be circulated to governors with the minutes of the meeting. **BO, AK, BMH**

Caroline McCarthy stated that FoCB could help financially if teachers needed additional resources to support the curriculum. **AK**

Brian Ostro offered to provide governors with further information about the independent writing programme.

8.3 Policies Linked to the School Improvement Committee Andrew stated that he would be meeting with John Justice and Janet Scott on 14 November 2014 and would look at how governors were linked to policies. **AK, JJ, JS**

SIC Minutes November 2014

- 8.4 Case Study** The Committee received a case study on a pupil with special educational needs. Pippa Prior stated that the case studies were useful in Inclusion Faculty meetings.

The Committee noted that the case study (in the appendices to the headteacher's report) included confidential information. Governors attending the meeting were asked to leave paper copies of the report in school.

All governors

- 8.5 End-of-Key-Stage-2 Targets 2015** The Committee agreed targets for the end of Key Stage 2 for 2015.

- 8.6 Summary of Recent Evaluative Reports – Little Chasers: Parent/Carer Toddler Group** Andrew stated that an evaluation of Little Chasers had been carried out in order to ensure that the provision was supporting the school's priorities. The Committee was pleased to note the overall positive response from parents and noted that some changes would need to be made in reporting arrangements in order to take into account new assessment arrangements and to minimise the administrative burden to staff.

9. Faculty Reports

- 9.1 Early Years** The Committee noted that Janet Scott had arranged to meet with Laura Jeffery on 25 November 2014 to review the Early Years Faculty.

- 9.2 Humanities** The Committee received a report from Claire Debney on an introductory visit with Tania Noble, Humanities Faculty Leader, on 26 June 2014. Claire reported that she had reviewed the Humanities Faculty with Tania on 6 November 2014 and would produce a written report. **CD**

- 9.3 Inclusion** The Committee received a report from Pippa Prior on her meeting with Erica Barber on 27 June 2014 to review the Inclusion Faculty. Pippa reported that the monitoring sheet, which showed interventions, was to be kept up to date by Erica to be shared at termly faculty meetings. Pippa was impressed with Erica's well-organised approach to her wide brief.

- 9.4 Governor Faculty Links** The Committee noted that some faculty visits had yet to take place. Andrew stated that he would be reviewing faculty links at his meeting with John and Janet and would need to contact Will Arnold.

AK, JJ, JS

- 10. Reports and Correspondence** There were no additional reports or correspondence.

11. Policy Review

- 11.1 Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS)** The Committee noted that the Early Years aspects of use of the outdoors and emergency evacuation would be covered in the Health & Safety Policy, due for review. Andrew stated that separate Ofsted judgements were to be introduced for the EYFS and that an overall review would therefore be needed.

- 11.2 Policy Review Dates** The Committee suggested that the review dates for non-statutory policies should not be published on the school website. **AK**

Rebecca Hill left the meeting at this point.

- 12. GovernorMark** The Committee reviewed the online GovernorMark assessment and agreed that selection, recruitment and induction of governors was a priority for

SIC Minutes November 2014

improvement and that more help was needed on interpreting data. Claire Debney and Caroline McCarthy reported on training they had attended (see Minute 14) and a document on recruitment and induction from the Richmond Teaching Primary Schools Alliance.

The Committee agreed that when recruiting and inducting governors the process should be transparent; there should be a clear induction programme; the skills and capabilities required should be clearly stated; and that there should be a statement about recruiting and inducting governors on the school website.

The Committee agreed that Francesca Prior, Claire Debney and Caroline McCarthy should draw up an action plan for presentation to the next meeting of the Committee and consult Angela Langford about establishing links with effective governing bodies.

FP, CD, CMcC

13. Self-evaluation and Preparation for February Meeting of the Governing Body

The Committee noted that self-evaluation of the governing body and preparation for the February meeting of the governing body would be an item on the agenda for the headteacher's meeting with the chair and vice-chair on 14 November. The Committee identified mentoring/buddying, induction and recruitment as emerging priorities.

AK, JJ, JS

14. Training Governors reported on training attended since the last meeting:

- Claire Debney – interpretation of pupil performance data through SGOSS.
- Claire Debney and Caroline McCarthy – Getting to Grips with Governance (Intensive).
- Pippa Prior – Performance Management of Headteachers.

Caroline McCarthy stated that she had a Masters' Degree in Corporate Governance with Ethics.

15. Governing Body News Items Governors identified key points for inclusion in the next newsletter to parents and publication on the school website:

- How the school plans to improve attainment and achievement in writing
- Governor induction
- Little Chasers recent evaluative report
- The work already done to improve writing

16. Impact Statement The Committee considered what they had done in the meeting that would have an impact on teaching and learning:

- Challenged the headteacher and asked for an update at the next meeting on the implementation of changes in teaching practice
- Looked at how pupil performance was monitored at different stages
- Agreed plans to improve the governing body through the development of an induction programme
- Familiarised themselves with what the school was doing in terms of pupil performance

Claire Debney stated that the induction day she had spent in school had been very helpful. Andrew stated that the more time governors could spend in school the better.

SIC Minutes November 2014

The meeting ended at 9 a.m.

Chase Bridge Primary School School Improvement Committee Minutes Action Sheet		
Minute reference	Action required	By whom and when
8.2 Improving Standards at Chase Bridge	Report progress on changes in teaching practice implementation. Report on 'other things' that the external adviser worked on with staff. Build examples of writing, including 'P' scales, into governors' day. Circulate presentation to governors with the minutes. Note offer of financial support from FoCB	AK For meeting on 10/2/15 AK For governors' day on 4/2/15 BO, BMH Immediate AK Immediate
8.3 Policies Linked to the School Improvement Committee	Review how governors are linked to policies	AK, JJ, JS At meeting on 14/11/14
8.4 Case Study	Note confidential aspect of headteacher's report	All governors Immediate
9.2 Humanities Faculty	Produce written report on Humanities Faculty visit	CD Immediate
9.4 Governor Faculty Links	Review how governors are linked to faculties	AK, JJ, JS At meeting on 14/11/14
11.2 Policy Review Dates	Consider whether notional review dates should be omitted from non-statutory policies published on the school website	AK Immediate
12 GovernorMark	Draw up action plan and consult Angela Langford about establishing links with effective governing bodies.	FP, CD, CMcC For meeting on 10/2/15
13 Self-evaluation and Preparation for February Meeting of the Governing Body	Consider self-evaluation of the GB and preparation for February meeting of GB Note emerging priorities identified by the Committee – mentoring/buddying, induction and recruitment	AK, JJ, JS At meeting on 14/11/14