

SIC Minutes November 2013

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 Wednesday 13 November 2013 at 5.30 p.m.

Present:

Governors Mrs Pippa Prior (Chair) Mr Andrew King (Headteacher)
 Ms Una Blair Mrs Eleanor Wright

Associate Members Mrs Zoë Griffiths (Deputy Headteacher)
 Ms Katrina Haberfield (FoCB representative)

Also attended: Ms Pippa Felsing (School Business Manager)
 Miss Beryl Hawkins (Clerk to the Governors)

- 1. Chair** In the absence of Will Arnold, Pippa Prior took the chair.
- 2. Apologies** Apologies were accepted from Will Arnold, Raj Basra and Lloyd Hatch. John Justice also gave apologies.
- 3. Declarations of Interest** There were no declarations of interest.
- 4. Confidentiality** The Committee agreed that no items of business on the agenda were confidential.
- 5. Future Meetings** The Committee confirmed future meeting dates:

	Reports to Clerk	Agenda Despatch
Tuesday 25 February 2014 at 5.30 p.m.	10/2/14	11/2/14
Tuesday 6 May 2014 at 5.30 p.m.	21/4/14	22/4/14

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

- Progress against priorities and targets in curriculum faculty action plans
- An analysis of end-of-Key-Stage test results
- Interpretation of unvalidated data from RaiseOnline and Fischer Family Trust and comparison with Chase Bridge data
- 'Closing the Gap', Pupil Premium and performance
- Sports Premium
- 2014 National Curriculum tests.

The Committee also received the 'FFT Governor Dashboard' for 2013. Arising from the report:

- 6.1 Data Dashboards** For the benefit of new governors, Andrew King explained the different data dashboards – that in his report and the key pupil performance data documents – FFT (Fischer Family Trust) and RoL (RaiseOnline). Andrew stated that, as the FFT data now covered much of

SIC Minutes November 2013

what was in his report, he would need to take a view, in consultation with the Committee, on how much data to include in his report in future. The FFT document provided useful and full data, but currently focussed on Key Stage 2.

Eleanor Wright arrived at this point and the meeting became quorate.

It was noted that the data showed a consistently stronger trend at Chase Bridge of helping higher attaining pupils, but whilst the rate of progress of lower-achieving pupils was improving the improvements were not as good as in Richmond and nationally as a whole.

Andrew King and Zoë Griffiths answered governors' questions about the performance data and analysis:

Question: What is meant by the term 'provision'?

Answer: Provision includes anything that is done in or out of the classroom to meet the needs of the children: the curriculum; staffing; resources; online activities that could be potentially accessed from home; extra-curricular activities and intervention programmes.

Question: What sort of support is given in class and does this include help for children who have English as an Additional Language (EAL)?

Answer: Support includes a wide range of interventions and has various layers, according to the needs of each child. The challenge for the school is to be conscious of what is being done well so that this can be replicated: the school needs to constantly review the effectiveness of interventions.

Question: Are lower-achieving pupils doing less well in a particular class or is this spread across the school?

Answer: The focus of the data is on Years 2 and 6. A lot of the data is based on teacher assessment and judgements and is not too scientific. However, there is sufficient data, including internal data by year group, to suggest that the pattern is not exclusive to the end of Key Stage.

Eleanor Wright and Pippa Prior had met with Erica Barber to look at how the school reports on performance for intervention groups. The school has identified that some setting arrangements are not effective: teachers are now pro-active and empowered to use a mix of setting and mixed ability groupings. Some children who are good at maths are not so good at explaining how they worked out the answer and this also needs to be addressed.

Question: How long does it take to decide whether a strategy is working?

Answer: This depends on the provision being evaluated. It might be through teachers responding on a daily or weekly basis to the way the children are learning; at the end of a sequence of work from a specific intervention after perhaps half a term; or at the end of the year when summative assessments are analysed. Rate of progress will be measured through the year group reviews.

Question: Do you talk to the children when making the assessment?

Answer: This depends on the nature of the assessment. Some more formal assessments in the juniors are in the format of traditional tests that are timed

SIC Minutes November 2013

and children respond to these individually giving written answers. For the younger children the majority of assessments are made through observation or by interacting with the child.

Question: How can you find out why the results for Chase Bridge are different to the borough results?

Answer: This is dependent on many variables so it is difficult to isolate one particular factor – most commonly, differences can be accounted for by the population we serve and the context within which we operate. Nevertheless as part of our CPD programme we encourage staff to visit schools and see other practice to be able to learn from this and enrich our own provision at Chase Bridge.

Do you have more pupils that need help than the borough and national averages?

Answer: The percentage of lower-achieving pupils at Chase Bridge is not lower than the national average; typically, it is between the national and borough averages.

The headteacher's report highlights the strengths in the Chase Bridge data and areas that the school needs to continue to develop. The areas for development were already in the priorities for 2012/13. The school needs to continue to monitor progress in these areas through year group reviews and pupil progress meetings.

Question: What did you do to bring about the improvements seen in maths?

Answer: The school reviewed the syllabus for the Level 6 test and the rate of progress by that group was better than Year 6 progress across the borough.

6.2 Strengths and Areas for Improvement The Committee noted the school's strengths and areas for improvement based on the evaluation of all available data:

Strengths:

- KS1 attainment
- Achievement of higher attaining children and improving trend over past four years
- Improving trend in mathematics with particularly strong achievement by high attaining children
- Achievement in reading with consistently high percentage making expected progress.

Aspects that may need improvement and require further analysis:

- Gender differences in achievement – girls stronger in writing, but weaker in mathematics compared to the boys
- Rate of progress across the juniors in writing and mathematics particularly the progress made by lower achieving children across the key stage
- Spelling, grammar and punctuation across Key Stage 2, particularly spelling.

SIC Minutes November 2013

With regard to spelling, it was noted that there was a much greater emphasis on spelling in the revised National Curriculum and new tests, giving a much clearer message about the importance of all aspects of spelling; a scheme of work would be needed; and there would be some analysis of certain misspellings.

- 6.3 Targets** The Committee received draft pupil performance targets for the end of Key Stage 2 for 2014 and revised targets for the end of Year 2 for 2013. With reference to the data for Key Stage 2 it was noted that 57 pupils was equivalent to 98% and that 54 pupils was equivalent to 88%. It was noted that the FFT and Chase Bridge data were not exactly comparable as the FFT data was based on the cohort in the school at the end of Key Stage 1. Andrew stated that 'two levels of progress' was the key target and that before the proposed targets could be confirmed he would be discussing them with teachers, with a view to setting challenging but realistic targets.

Asked by a governor whether the results for end-of-Year-2 maths were good, Andrew stated that there was less available data from which to make an analysis but the information available indicated that they were indeed good.

It was noted that the 3+ target of 21% for writing represented 18 children and that the test covered composition, spelling and grammar – this was a challenging target.

The Committee was pleased to note the improvements in results and that challenging targets were being set and asked to be kept informed about key data.

- 7. Election of Chair and Vice-chair** Will Arnold was elected chair and Pippa Prior was elected vice-chair for the year, until the first meeting of the Committee in the autumn term 2014.
- 8. Minutes and Matters Arising** The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 21 May 2013 were confirmed and signed. Arising from the minutes:

Interpretation of Performance Data (Ref: Minute 12) The Committee reviewed the proposal for in-house training on interpretation of performance data and noted that John Justice had offered to share the briefing he had attended run by FFT. Pippa Prior stated that she would be attending RaiseOnline training on Saturday 23 November 2013. Andrew agreed that in-house training could be arranged.

WA, AK, JJ, PP

- 9. Faculty Reports** The Committee received reports from faculty link governors:
- 9.1 Inclusion** Eleanor Wright and Pippa Prior presented a report on a visit to the school on 21 June 2013 to look at the Inclusion Faculty with Susan Newbigin and Erica Barber (copy in the minute book). It was noted that relevant data was not available for the visit, but it was expected that new Inclusion-specific data on pupil progress and intervention would be developed on Integris in time for the next Inclusion Faculty visit.

Arising from the report, it was noted that the school needed to promote the Pupil Premium and encourage eligible families to register for free school meals; Richmond schools were missing out on an estimated £2 million Pupil Premium through 33% of families not registering.

SIC Minutes November 2013

Andrew stated that he would like to talk to the FoCB about promoting the Pupil Premium. In answer to questions from governors, Andrew stated that parents were asked to complete an application for free school meals on home visits and that the school would be obtaining publicity in different languages from the local authority.

It was noted that Ofsted would need to see that funding was being effectively used.

Eleanor Wright left the meeting at this point and the meeting became inquorate.

9.2 Core Subjects Governors received a report from Will Arnold on a visit to the school on 11 September 2013 to review the Core Subjects faculty with Geoff Acton and Zoë Griffiths (copy in the minute book). It was noted that the subject of the visit had been covered earlier in the meeting.

9.3 Early Years Governors received a report from Janet Scott on a visit to the school on 10 June 2013 to review the Early Years faculty with Laura Jeffery.

The clerk was asked to send a reminder to governors who had not completed a recent faculty visit and it was agreed that faculty visits should be an item on the agenda for the next meeting of the governing body.

BMH

10. Sports Premium It was noted that as of September 2013 all maintained schools in England were being given additional government funding – a Sports Premium – to improve PE and sport and that Chase Bridge would receive £9,500 during the academic year. Governors received a report from the headteacher on how the additional funding was being spent (copy in the minute book). It was noted that the activities being funded were already taking place and that the Premium would be used to offset overspending on sport in the current financial year.

11. Clubs Governors received a report from the headteacher on clubs, including data on percentages of pupils involved in at least one club, in an active or sports club and in a school team (copy in the minute book). It was noted that:

- Uptake of clubs had improved due to the better offer for 2013/14.
- Brentford had increased their charges, but these costs had not been passed on to parents and the clubs were currently running at a loss.
- Due to the heavy demand for places on clubs 20 children had been not been able to join a club in the current term – these children would be given priority when the next opportunity arose.

Governors asked for their thanks to be conveyed to all the staff who were involved in running the clubs, both teaching and administrative staff.

Governors considered how the school might cope with increasing demand as numbers on roll increased. Katrina Haberfield agreed that parents could be asked through FoCB to help by running clubs and Katrina stated that FoCB had ideas for running educational clubs, such as board games and card games. Andrew stated that if there were more people to run clubs there would be capacity to expand provision to week-ends and holidays with the appointment of a dedicated lettings/clubs co-ordinator.

AK, PF, KH

It was noted that the school did not yet have use of the school house but that it was expected that it would be operational in the near future.

SIC Minutes November 2013

Katrina Haberfield offered to ask FoCB whether they would be willing to fund specific resources used by clubs if the school could provide her with a list of clubs and what resources might help.
AK, PF, KH

12. Training It was noted that Pippa Prior, Zoë Griffiths and Pippa Felsinger had attended Finance Management Part 1 and that Pippa Prior had booked to attend RaiseOnline and SEN training.

13. Self-evaluation and Preparation for February Meeting of the Governing Body Governors agreed that the election of chair to the governing body was the highest priority for the governing body. Andrew King agreed to discuss with John Justice, Nick Green and Will Arnold arrangements for the governing body self-evaluation.
AK

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

- Clubs – increase in number, broad range and thanks to staff
- Report on achievement – lower and higher attaining
- Pupil Premium – evaluation of progress, registering
- Targets – rigorous process for setting.

The meeting ended at 7.35 p.m.

Chase Bridge Primary School School Improvement Committee Minutes Action Sheet		
Minute reference	Action required	By whom and when
8 Interpretation of Performance Data	Arrange in-house training for governors	AK, WA, JJ, PP Immediate
9 Faculty Reports	Write to governors who have not completed a recent faculty visit	BMH
10 Clubs	Approach FoCB for help with clubs as agreed	AK, KH, PF
13 Self-evaluation of the governing body	Discuss with John Justice, Will Arnold and Nick Green arrangements for the governing body self-evaluation	AK Immediate