Chesterton Primary School

*Learning, Growing, Achieving Together*

**LOCAL GOVERNING BODY**

**MINUTES OF MEETING**

**28th November 2017 AT 6pm**

**PRESENT:**

 Kate Heywood

 Jo Guillod-Rees

Marion Lloyd

 Jenny Nelder

 Ian Murray

 Maxine Cole

 Bryony Surtees

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Camilla King (Minute taker in absence of JS)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Agenda Item** | **Action** |
| 1 | **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**No apologies were received.  |  |
| 2 | **DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY AND NOT PECUNIARY INTEREST** It was noted that TM had sent out a new form at the beginning of the year, all governors to check they have completed and returned it..  | **Governors** |
| 3 | **CHAIRS ACTION** There were no Chair’s actions to report at this time. |  |
| 4 | **MINUTES** The minutes of the 19th September 2017 were **Approved.** **Matters arising from the minutes.** Governors raised concern that no clerk had been appointed. The Head confirmed that she would re advertise the post. **Action**It was noted that Marion Lloyd would be the champion of ‘safe recruitment’.Trust governors are due for ‘renewal’, however the ALT are in discussions with the DFE about changes and it is therefore proposed that current Trust Governors remain in post until the situation is clearer, or resolved. | **Head****Head / Clerk** |
| 5 | **SCHEME OF DELEGATION**To be deferred to the beginning of the next meeting.  | **Clerk** |
| 6 | **ACADEMY IMPROVEMENT** This item was introduced by the Headteacher. **Question (ML): Could further analysis related to the impact to be conducted by the school for the next meeting?** Head. Yes**Question (IM): Exclusions are high? Is it a particular class?** Head: 5 children are escalating their behaviour, mostly three to five days and these children have been violent and extreme behaviour and this has been used as a last resort. The Head confirmed that violence is not tolerated at school.**C What is the process?** Head: Meeting with EH or HoS about exclusion and then work sent home and then come back for reintegration meeting with us and start fresh. This does not affect anyone else’s learning across the school. **Question (JGR): Is this is why Dandelion has been set up?** Head: his was set up for nurturing those children who have a need and it is not the same children, some children need the extra support. It was noted that a behaviour review has been requested to evaluate the wide range of strategies and the level of funding being allocated.**Standards and Progress** This item was introduced by the Headteacher. Governors were requested to examine ASP(Analyse School Performance), FFT Aspire (Fischer Family Trust) and Ofsted Dashboards. It was noted that this is a replacement from Raise on LineIt was noted that the school data lacks detail due to no KS2 whilst the remainder of the data is historic from KS1 2017.It shows that the school is 64% in reading LA 73% N76% so we are belowMore able School 8%, LA 25% N25%. This data is not a true reflection, there and does not show our new intakes. If we just looked at our own children we would have got 75% combined. Maths is more in line with national.KS1 data has improved and the school have introduced big reading this year. The 2nd page provides key context, high % of girls, average for FSM, top 20% of schools for EAL and high for SEN and deprivation factor is high. 20% of our children do not have EYFS data as they have joined from overseas. The SATs results are from 2017 and compares them to where the children were at EYFS. **None** of our emerging children did not get expected, we did not convert any to expected level. 100% of our children who got expected at end of EYFS got expected but **none** got exceeding. 100% of exceeded at EYFS got expected and 67% got exceeding, all of this is read. Writing is similarMaths indicates that we achieved better for children who exceeded. **Question (IM): How often will govs see this?** Head:It will be annual as this is when the data is released. The FFT programme also be shared with Govs annually. The Head informed the governors that the Fisher Family Trust Aspire, reviews data. This will be used in all SIM meetings, we will use it to target and develop interventions. RWM % is in line with national data. it is not significantly below even though both are slightly below.Higher attainment concern and white pupils. With red minusPink line explains how our results have improved from 2016 to 2017. We had sig minus for 2016.The school is are showing our lower attainers are not making as much progress as the rest of the children. **Question (ML): If the children come in with low in reception and we do not move them as fast as other schools. Why do we not achieve?** Head:Not sure as this is confidential to the school. **Comment (IM): Each child is worth a huge percentage as a small school.** **Pupil premium****Question**: **Year 3 PP what interventions have they had.** Head: 1 expected or exceeding, 1 EHCP and 1 has made good progress and EALEAL those who speak English at home make quicker progress than those who do not speak it at home.Higher % of PP and SEN in current year 4 than year 3. **SEF** It was noted that this has recently been updated and that it is still rated as good. It was noted that the SEF was due to be reviewed on Thursday **Governor Visits** Governors to email the Head with their availability. **Action**  | **Head****Governors** |
| 7 | **BUDGET MONITORING REPORT** No items for discussion. This has been deferred.  |  |
| 8 | **SAFEGUARDING UPDATE** It was noted that volunteers require references and must complete and sign a short contract. **Action**  | **Head** |
| 9 | **HEALTH AND SAFETY REVIEW**It was confirmed that the group was meeting regularly and minutes will be distributed. It was noted that JGR would join the next meeting.  |  |
| 10 | **EDUCATIONAL VISITS** No visits are scheduled.  |  |
| 11 | **DfE INFORMATION** The following policy information was noted. <http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/toolsandinitiatives/cuttingburdens/b00216133/need-to-know-schools>  |  |
| 12  | **GOVERNOR TRAINING** **It was noted that the last training session was cancelled.** ML to discuss this at the next meeting. **Action** | ML |
|  | **ANY OTHER BUSINESS****Question: Place to be, what is the decision?** Head: It has an impact for those lower level children who might escalate has worked really well and has stopped them escalating. It does not have an impact on those children who have really violent high need behaviour. It was noted that the CCTV policy would be sent round for approval.  |  |
|  | **DATE OF NEXT MEETING****Next meeting Tuesday 9th January 2018** |  |

The meeting closed at:

Signed:……………………………………… Date:………………………………………….