

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE LEARNING AND TEACHING COMMITTEE OF
MANOR PARK NURSERY AND PRIMARY SCHOOL
HELD AT THE SCHOOL ON 6TH DECEMBER 2017**

Governors Present: **Mr. P Jones** **PJ** **Chair**
 Mr. S Cotterill **SC** **Headteacher**
 Mrs. C Walley **CW**
 Miss. E Holden **EH**
 Mr. G Mason **GM**

Also in attendance: **Ms C Creager** **Clerk to the Governors**
 Mrs. S Jeffery **SJ - Deputy Headteacher**

PART ONE – NON-CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS

1	<p>APOLOGIES & ADDITIONAL AOB ITEMS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apologies from CW for lateness were received and accepted. • There were no items tabled for AOB. 	
2	<p>CONFLICT OF INTEREST</p> <p>Governors were asked to declare any potential pecuniary interest or conflict of interests with the business to be discussed during the meeting.</p> <p>No potential conflict was declared.</p>	
3	<p>MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING</p> <p>The part one minutes of the meeting held on 6th July 2017 were confirmed as a correct record, and signed by the chair.</p> <p>Governors reviewed the Summer term actions and confirmed all actions had been completed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School data amends have been done • Amends to policies have been made 	
4	<p>IMPACT STATEMENT</p> <p>How has the Board of Governors helped move the school forward in this meeting, particularly in relation to core function 2 (holding the headteacher to account for the educational performance of the school).</p> <p>This committee has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looked at whole school and internal school data; SC stated that the questions raised for him to investigate have been very helpful and in particular have brought about the changes in how data is produced. • EH & GM carried out a learning walk to look at Curriculum changes. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governors have carried out monitoring visits (reports to come to FGB). • Governors have attended relevant training (e.g. on numbers and ASP) ensuring better understanding to improve the quality of questioning. • Governors through visits get to know the school and in asking meaningful questions secure a greater understanding of how the school operates which enables them to operate effectively as critical friends, offering challenge in the right places. 	
5	<p>2017 OUTCOMES AND ANALYSIS</p> <p>Governors were provided with the following document prior to the meeting: Analysing School Performance (ASP)/ Inspection Data Summary Report (IDSR) (unvalidated) published in October and SC advised governors that last years Raise data had been converted to ASP to provide a comparison.</p> <p>SC explained that his document combines ASP and IDSR; the documents all have the same information in different formats. In the IDSR, groups of 10 children or less are deemed not to be significant; he has not done this in his document.</p> <p>Behind each area in this document is narrative e.g. pupil gap analysis; it is about looking at the detail and how individual children may skew the results e.g. those with poor attendance etc.</p> <p>SC reviewed with governors the inspection dashboard 2015 and 2016. Historically, in 2015 the school had 6 weaknesses out of a possible 8 and 2 small strengths. A year later, there were no strengths identified and 8 weaknesses. That is school's starting point.</p> <p>SC had identified the schools current strengths and weaknesses.</p> <p>The following areas were identified as for improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The % of disadvantaged children achieving the Y1 phonics score was significantly below non disadvantaged both in school and when compared to national. 2. Transition and attainment of disadvantaged children from EYFS to KS1 in writing and maths is below the national figure. 3. Transition and attainment of disadvantaged children from KS1 to KS2 in all areas. 4. The gender Gap between boys and girls at KS1 at Reading and Writing. There is a gap nationally but MP's is bigger. 5. The gender gap between boys and girls at KS2 at Reading, (progress of boys in KS2 reading). 6. Spelling at LPAG and MPAG is below national. <p>Strengths were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Standards of writing have increased from significantly below in 2016 to being close to top 40 schools nationally, reflecting the impact of change in school leadership and being made a priority in the SSDP. 	

2. In school data evidences outstanding progress in year 6 and Year 2.
3. At KS1, transition from EYFS was strong, a significant improvement on the previous three years. Attainment in 2015 was SIG- in Reading, Writing and Maths. When comparing with 2016, attainment this year has increased in each subject at both EXS and GD with significant improvements in reading GD, writing EXS and maths GD
4. Whilst the proportion of children meeting the standard in phonics was below national standards, there was a significant improvement from 2016 in their starting points with 32% at typical or above for reading on entry to the school and by the time they took the phonics were at 73%.

The document will be updated and will inform the SEF and be linked with the SDP. The priorities are accurate; gender will be included - that is about boys and a more engaging targeted curriculum for them.

Q: *What we think boys are excited and engaged by – I can see how using that knowledge improves their engagement. How specific can we be in making the curriculum more engaging in maths and grammar?*

A: The text links to the topic e.g. how to train a dragon is linked to the Vikings and the same with grammar etc so that this follows through all subjects.

Q: *What specific actions are we taking to improve numeracy results?*

A: We review the impact of what we have done and we have shown with adherence to our values and with clear expectations that it is already working in engaging the boys. Writing is generally where there is the gender gap, it's the profile of writing in school and we have boys who are extremely proud of their writing – the text it is based on is engaging

Q: *It strikes me that the document is quite comprehensive; there are several documents with this information. Which will Ofsted ask to see?*

A: They will be given this document which will tell them about our school; all of the will meet at the beginning of Spring term to review the progression on the SSDP and review the priorities in light of the assessment analysis.. Some documents inform others, some compete – this document takes it all under its umbrella and I want to include the journey the school has been on as it is still quite pertinent.

Q: *One of the points you've not said is what impact has the past 12 months had on these children? The children in KS2 are likely to have felt the prior issues more keenly than those in KS1.*

A: This is about snapshots. A strength of the school is that last year Y6 made accelerated progress – this shows accelerated progress last year. The starting data for Y6 is evidence of that progress.

	<p>Q: The point about behaviours and it being strength of the school are not mentioned in this document?</p> <p>A: No, this document is about data; behaviour is included in the SEF.</p>	
6	<p>2018 PREDICTIONS</p> <p>The predictions for KS2 were in the document referred to above.</p> <p>Included within CW and GM's monitoring visit was discussion about the targets. GM suggested they are rag rated in terms of how confident the school is that they will be achieved. The targets are aspirational.</p> <p>CW informed governors that another specific issue that had been spoken about was on progress in KS1. SC referred to the document 'Whole School Data'.</p> <p>Whole School data</p> <p>Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The schools data shows outstanding progress. • This year what stands out is that progress in reading needs to be investigated. • Historically teachers are loathe to give too much progress in the autumn term. • There is an element of the transition from Reception to Y1 but we need to understand and investigate the reading data particularly as it is a priority. It is about individual children and the school has started those Pupil Progress meetings, (as per the annual monitoring schedule) to identify where interventions are needed. <p>Q: Has the subject lead been in to assess whether the teacher is being conservative in the way they are grading the children or that the teaching in the class is perhaps in need of some support? Do we know; could it be one of these issues or a combination?</p> <p>A: SC responded that t's a combination of both. He and the KS leader have monitored and also the SIP. In terms of assessment, we sat down with the class teacher and after, reviewing children's learning and moderating the assessments, ameliorated some children's assessments; Support is also being provided to the class teacher from the KS leader to ensure that the standard of learning and teaching is at least good. Support is starting to make a difference. There is moderation of writing judgements every half term and also there is book scrutiny and support is put in place. Things do paint a picture. The transition from early years to Y1 is challenging and needs to be managed well.</p> <p>Q: My gut feeling is that this group had a higher number of exceeding children in it and the greater depth figure is low?</p> <p>A: We agree we looked at that today and questions have been asked; that data will be changed. It's possibly 3 children, and there has been no regression, (monitoring evidences this)– no children have regressed in Y1</p>	

	<p>at greater depth but none have converted yet.</p> <p>We talk about low starting points and we have had to search for this data. We found the baseline assessment for all our children and this has enabled us to start to feed this into our evaluations and we can tell what value we have added. We are producing a 'Whole School Journey' document for each cohort which will map their progress year on year.</p>	
7	<p>CURRICULUM PLANS – Mrs Jeffery (SJ)</p> <p>Governors were provided with the following document prior to the meeting: Whole School Curriculum Overview Cycle A.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The document includes the current curriculum excluding Maths and English. • Cycle B is in preparation. • There are links between some subjects and other subjects that are stand alone, including for instance French and music <p>Q: How much French? A: Children are taught for half an hour to an hour every week from Y3.</p> <p>Over the 2 years the plan covers all the required areas. Behind this overview document are objectives and we go into more depth. On the website we have put the expectations for each year group.</p> <p>Q: There is nothing on earth, space etc? A: Not until Y5. There is no longer any physics in KS1 at all; it was removed in the 2014 curriculum. There is a heavy overload on plants. A governor said he had looked into this and this is true in Germany, for instance, as well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The computer suite is now up and running; Laura has developed a new scheme of work which includes targets for children that they can use to self-assess their progress and the working walls in the suite are also being developed in the computer. • In terms of Music provision, there is Charanga; there are singing projects, also brass in Y5 and a choir which is supported by Governor Patrick Jones. Staff have been released staff in their teams for training. • Residential visits are planned within Cycles A and B, in Cycle A, to Menai in March at the outdoor adventure centre. <p>Governors thanked SJ for her presentation.</p>	
8	<p>SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (SIP) PROGRESS</p> <p>Governors were provided with the document "Attainment and progress data, Autumn" prior to the meeting.</p>	

	<p>SC had rag rated the document and governors discussed the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school is making good progress against most objectives. • Priority 1 needs to be revisited as it is not progressing as quickly as the others. • We know who our disadvantaged children are and we know what intervention they are getting and can track the progress of this group and individuals. • We have children who need intervention who are not disadvantaged; we need to evidence though that we are prioritising money on children who are disadvantaged. • All children must make progress irrespective. 	
<p>9</p>	<p>SUBJECT LEAD UPDATE – Janet Hazeldine SENDCO (taken prior to Item 4)</p> <p>The report was taken as read and key points were discussed and questions asked as follows:</p> <p>9.1 There are 32 pupils on register, 5 of which have health care plans.</p> <p>9.2 Cheshire East is offering outreach from Ivy Bank who offer support (referred to as the IBIS service)</p> <p><i>Q: What is the Ivy Bank service?</i> A: It is led by Emma Mahon; she works in their resourced provision. They had to do something because these children didn't have appropriate provision.</p> <p><i>Q: Is she coming in to offer additional support or as part of existing support?</i> A: It is additional to the hours the child already receives. Emma's visit starts with a review; she plans from what she sees when she gets in and she sets targets for us to follow. She is very good at identifying needs and has already identified a child here who needs specialist provision, which is really not in line with what her job role entails. We are going to gather evidence for this child and there is a review on the 14th. It has become progressively more difficult to get the correct provision for children and access agency support.</p> <p><i>Q: Is it the case that provision is available in CE and oversubscribed or is it only available out of area?</i> A: It is oversubscribed in CE and they will not send children out of area.</p> <p>9.3 SC informed governors that a Plan is a legal doc and it is then the LA's responsibility to ensure provision for a child requiring special provision and at the LA's cost. SC will be clarifying with the SEND team visiting the school on 7th December the statement that had been discussed in the Pastoral committee that there were shortcomings in the SEND paperwork; it is not clear what these shortcomings are.</p>	

<p>9.4</p>	<p>CW arrived at 17.20.</p> <p>School Focus Plan (SFP) children SFP's were shared with parents in October; 3 meetings a year need to take place with them. JM is meeting with staff next week to look at pupil tracking and progress.</p> <p>Q: How is the school able to release teachers to do that? Are the arrangements working? A: The SEND meetings have been dovetailed into the pupil progress meetings. We use support from TA's and we try to diarise the meetings at times of the day when it's easier to release them from class. The meetings are very concise.</p> <p>Q: The S&L (Speech and Language) provision; is that because English is not the children's first language? A: Mainly no, it isn't. The vast majority of children receiving S&L is because they are considerably behind ARE , (Age related expectations)on entry to school, not because of EAL</p> <p>Q: How many are FSM (Free School Meals) children or cared for children? A: None are cared for children.</p> <p>Q: is there a correlation that more FSM children fall into the SEND category? A: We know some are multi-trigger i.e. FSM and SEND and some also having low attendance. Action: SLT to ensure that it is has the relevant information on the percentage of SEND children who are disadvantaged.</p> <p>Impact is being discussed in the review meetings with the teachers. Interventions cover all areas – maths, literacy skills. They are put in place for all children, not just those with SEND.</p> <p>Q: What is the difference between those children and those with SFPs? A: These are children that just need a boost in one area. SFP children will also have interventions.</p> <p>Q: The levels of intervention in the infant school are high, 2/3rd of the class; is that common for the younger years? A: It's common in the younger years; many come in with lower language skills for instance and there is speech and language support. We put support in place as early as possible in nursery and reception and correct the problem as best we can as it gets more difficult to do as they move higher up the school.</p> <p>Q: Do you notice if the child has been through our nursery that they</p>	
------------	--	--

	<p>perform better than those who don't?</p> <p>A: I would think better, because they do have a lot done in the nursery. Our current Reception class is the first that did the 2 year old provision. When they come into the 2 year old provision I do an assessment and get quite an accurate assessment and that means we can put in a programme which can be used with any children slightly below where they should be. That moves through into nursery and we retest them every term to check where they are.</p> <p>Q: So in theory the child who comes into our Y2 provision who progresses though our school should be making better progress than those who haven't, but we haven't got the evidence?</p> <p>A: Not at this point, but we should be able to evidence that identifying the need early improves outcomes as they progress through the school.</p> <p>Action: SC to evaluate the progress that children make from 2 year old to 4 years and then through the school. SC has arranged for a colleague to focus on early years data with him.</p>	
9.5	<p>JM advised governors that a lot of outside agencies are involved in offering support to the school. CAMHS referrals can be made by other agencies.</p>	
9.6	<p>Q: If someone is referred to CAMHS by another agency or person e.g. GP, they don't have to tell you about it?</p> <p>A: No; it is about confidentiality. I get a report if for instance they have diagnosed a child with autism. Usually we know through parents; sometimes we recommend they take a child to the doctor as that can be a quicker route than referral through school. If there were a safeguarding issue, we would be told.</p>	
9.7	<p>The SEND service is stretched; we access the Educational Psychologist and autism team. There is only one 3 hr meeting a half term and often 6 schools there with cases to discuss; there is insufficient time for everyone's cases to be discussed and often you have to take them along next time. Now CAMHS meetings are going to follow the same pattern.</p> <p>Q: What sort of problems are we seeing? How do children present if you need to go to CAMHS?</p> <p>A: We see behaviour issues, children who are anxious, depressed and/or with mental health issues. We have a lot of needy children in the school and we work very hard with them; there are quite a lot of mental health issues including attachment.</p> <p>SC explained that due to successful implementation of the schools policy on behaviour which has led to good behaviour throughout the school, it is possible to distinguish between children who choose not to follow the school rules and those whose behaviour is related to additional needs.</p>	
	<p>JM referred to the huge new development in identifying children with sensory difficulties; all senses are being affected e.g. some children cannot eat in the dining room because there are so many different smells.</p>	

9.8	There used to have a specialist in the autism team but there is no longer one and JM feels she struggles a bit with this issue now.	
9.9	<p>There are information pages for the website, signposting parents for more information for the different disabilities children in the school have.</p> <p>Action: SC to support SENDCO in uploading the documents to the website.</p>	
9.10	Lunch club has just started for SPLD children in Ys4/5.	
9.11	JM explained that another difficult area arises from not being allowed to diagnose children as dyslexic. If parents want a diagnosis, in the old days the school could ask an Educational Psychologist to do it but now parents have to go and get a diagnosis privately.	
9.12	JM has a TA trained to carry out her visual screening, as there are children who need to be assessed.	
9.13	Observations have taken place in Y5. JM has written up timetables for those who require intensive support.	
9.14	The SEND policy needs updating and will be updated before Xmas.	
9.15	<p>There is a new SEND tool kit recently launched by the LA. It is apparently very prescriptive and should help with early identification. There are 20 children on early alert – (now called ‘first concerns’)</p>	
9.16	<p>JM has done individual provision maps; the school is looking at doing a provision map for the disadvantaged children which will be of help to the SENDCO.</p> <p>There is a computer programme that children can use independently for reading and spelling; it is working well and the school is looking into getting the programme for Maths.</p> <p>Q: The volume of the work; is it manageable and sustainable? A: I do my best.</p> <p>SC advised governors that JM is supported by the pastoral team. JM supports the class teacher who is responsible for first intervention; her remit is to organise, support and train the class teacher and the class teacher delivers 90% of the intervention. The class teacher comes to meetings with JM with information for discussion.</p> <p>The school is more fortunate than many schools in that it has a SENDCo that isn't a class based teacher; but there are many children with special needs and with more available funding, more support could be provided for JM.</p> <p>Governors thanked JM for a very enlightening and informative report.</p>	

<p>10</p>	<p>GOVERNOR MONITORING REPORTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All monitoring reports are being received at the autumn term FGB. SC said that the monitoring schedule has been well supported by governors, all governors on the committee having visited the school. • There is good engagement between governors and school staff. 	
<p>11</p>	<p>SCHOOL POLICIES</p> <p>The SEND policy is being updated and will be approved at the FGB.</p>	
<p>12</p>	<p>SPRING TERM TRAINING FOR GOVERNORS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training will be discussed at the FGB. • GM and PJ have attended data training & CW coached on data. • GovernorHub is now live. GM has created the folder structure on the site and will organize Governorhub to send out an invite to all governors to sign onto the resource. 	
<p>13</p>	<p>DIRECTOR'S REPORT</p> <p>Governors received the Autumn Term 2017 Director's Report and precis in advance of the meeting and noted its contents. Of relevance to this committee were:</p> <p>Item 1.11: Changes to the Ofsted framework Item 3: CE Provisional results for Schools Item 4: Replacement of Raiseonline by ASP (Analyse School Performance) Item 5: LA's responsibility in terms of Primary School Monitoring of National Tests and Teacher Assessment. Mike Harris had moderated KS2 and for writing – it was all in line. Item 13: Strategic School improvement fund Items 14-17: Safeguarding related items Item 18: SEND Update Item 22: Cheshire East Information, Advice and Support service (CEIAS)</p> <p><i>SG left the meeting at 19.06.</i></p>	
<p>14</p>	<p>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</p> <p>There was no other business.</p>	
<p>15</p>	<p>DATE OF NEXT MEETINGS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18th March 2018, 5pm • 4th July 2018, 5pm 	

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting ended at 7.10pm.

.....Chair

.....Dated