



MEETING OF THE LOCAL GOVERNING BODY OF STOTTESDON CE PRIMARY
SCHOOL HELD IN SCHOOL ON TUESDAY 24TH MAY 2022 AT 4.30PM

MINUTES

Present	Mark Daborn	MD	Chair of LGB
	Rachel Datlen	RD	Vice-chair of LGB
	James Auden	JA	
	Jane Jones	JJ	
	Katie Jones	KJ	Headteacher
	Dan Middleton (joined remotely)	DM	
	Sarah Price	SP	
In attendance	Hannah Coleman	HC	Governance Professional
Apologies	Apologies were received from Richard Lewis (RL) retrospectively.		

Ref.	Minute
1.	Welcome
a)	MD welcomed all to the meeting.
2.	Apologies
a)	There were no apologies for absence received.
3.	Declarations of AOB
a)	Note the proposed Ofsted training in September.
4.	Declarations of Interest (not previously declared)
a)	There were no declarations of interest received.
5.	Minutes
a)	The minutes of the meeting held on 23rd March 2022 were agreed. It was further agreed that the minutes would be signed and filed electronically going forward, and that all meeting papers would be shared via SharePoint. KJ would request access for governors.
6.	Matters arising (not otherwise on the agenda)
a)	The Diocese had been contacted regarding the carbon zero grant, however the response was limited. There were further options that could be explored.
b)	The English link visit would be carried out after half term.
c)	Governor recruitment would be discussed later in the meeting. It was noted that Richard Lewis' term of office was due to end in July and parent nominations would be sought after half term.
d)	An update was given on the NGA Ofsted training. This would be held in September, starting with a face-to-face general overview and input session with up to 5 governors. The second element would provide bespoke support for each school setting.
7.	School performance
a)	The spring Pupil Progress Report was received: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) It provided an overview from the end of the spring term. ii) Overall strengths and areas for focus were covered. Areas of focus tended to be for individuals or small groups but interventions were in place, especially Year 1. iii) Year 6 had done the SATs. There was a feeling amongst teachers that this form of assessment had been too soon however the cohort were focused and maintained calm even in areas where the children were not fully confident. Staff had handled the preparation and week well. The results would not be published this year. iv) Teachers were looking at the potential 25% greater depth following the SATs. Q1. Would they be published next year? It was expected they would be. The full system ie phonics, EYFS, was otherwise being rolled out. v) Year 5 also looked strong. The gaps were closing and children were making accelerated progress. vi) Year 4 showed very strong reading, and writing, however Maths was weaker. The Maths booster clubs had shown positive impact in their books already.



	<p>vii) The PP and school-led tutoring was having impact across the board, and assisted transition to upper KS2.</p> <p>Q2. Was the school-led tutoring held after school? It was. There was more work than funding but it was showing positive impact.</p> <p>viii) Year 3 progress was down from their Year 2. Reading progress had been good, and Maths was progressing. The writing was lower, but progress was secure.</p> <p>ix) The White Paper had been published. One aspect was that 95% of pupils would have to achieve the expected standard in reading, writing and Maths. This was felt to be ambitious.</p> <p>Q3. Did this include SEN and EHCP children? It did. Ofsted focused on the quality of the curriculum, however this aspirational standard would be counted.</p> <p>x) Year 2 assessments had been rolled out over May. Progress was above in reading, writing and Maths. Although attainment remained low, there was evidence that learning was progressing. This was their first full year of education. The needs of the high ability children were also being met.</p> <p>xi) The Little Wandle phonics programme had been well received, and staff were completing their training and implementing it. Phonics screening would be carried out after half term, but it was already observed that it had had an impact on the children. The repetition to support fluency and retention of words was thought to be beneficial.</p> <p>xii) Four KS1 children accessed the school-led tutoring and were meeting their targets. The EWO was helping to address attendance issues.</p> <p>xiii) Governors should be aware that there were less social services/early help support on the ground now eg family matters. There were still support links but much was now done virtually. Where there were gaps, staff required further training and this added more pressure due to an already stretched capacity. The threshold for safeguarding appeared to be going up and early intervention down.</p> <p>xiv) Year 1 bottom 20% received tutor-led tuition and catch-up sessions.</p> <p>Q4. Did the Little Wandle repetition work help? It did target their needs. The evaluation was every 6 weeks. Attainment was secure.</p> <p>xv) EYFS had also seen good progress and was predominantly on track, based on where they should be at a particular time of year.</p> <p>xvi) The school nurse service was stronger and considered a real support for the children who needed it.</p> <p>xvii) There were 13 children due to start in September. The existing 17 in Reception would give a class of 30 with Year 1. There were two new older children due to start, however one younger sibling had been refused a place and were appealing.</p> <p>xviii) A Ukrainian family had moved to the village. This would continue to take numbers over PAN in Year 2 but there was one space in the class (now at 30, but in KS2 it would take numbers to 31 however there were no class size restrictions). They were due to be met over half term and welcomed to the community.</p> <p>Q5. How was Numberbots working? Where children were engaging in the programme, they had picked up their own approach to learning. It was felt that not all parents were engaging with it. It was sometimes challenging to find time at home at the end of the day, especially if the children were tired. Ten minutes a week was recommended ie a couple of minutes a day. It was suggested to investigate looking at providing additional IT at school.</p> <p>b) It was noted that the SDP update had been issued at the last meeting.</p>
<p>8. a)</p>	<p>Staffing and personnel</p> <p>It was noted that a TA was retiring and the post had been advertised, however the post depended on the EHCP requirements next year. Any requirements could also be potentially provided for via the SEN hubs within the Trust.</p>
<p>9. a) b)</p>	<p>Governance</p> <p>The election of a new Chair for 2022-23 was discussed. The current Chair had decided to step down as Chair from September due to other commitments in the Deanery. All were asked to consider the role, and the chair had offered to support the new chair if wished. There were also guidance resources and information on the role available.</p> <p>The Governor roles 2022-23 would be reviewed at the next meeting.</p>



c)	There was a brief introduction to using SharePoint and where to find the meeting papers and other documents.
10.	Governor activity and monitoring school performance
a)	Link visits would be considered at the next meeting.
b)	The Governor Skills Audit matrix was noted.
c)	JA reported that he had attended workshops on small MATs and the efficiency of MATs in light of the White Paper. It had been an interesting but not very inciteful event, and very Birmingham based but had proved a good networking opportunity.
11.	Feedback from Director
a)	An update following the last Director's meeting was given: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) There had been initial discussion on the White Paper, and there would be further at next meeting ii) A Trust-wide staff wellbeing questionnaire was going out in June. iii) Noah Turner had been appointed as the new headteacher at Lacon, and (since the meeting) Sarah Desborough at Cleobury Mortimer.
12.	Policies
a)	It was agreed to adopt the following policies and documents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The Collective Worship Policy – this was a live policy and reflected actual practice. ii) LAC Policy iii) Monitoring & Evaluation Policy <p>Q6. Was there reference to the SENCo within the policy? It was referenced, however all staff were involved. It would however be made more explicit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv) Governors Code of Conduct – this was used across the Trust for Members, Directors and Governors.
13.	AOB
a)	There was no AOB.
14.	Next meeting
a)	The date of the next meeting to be held on Tuesday 12th July 2022 at 4.00pm in school was noted.

The meeting closed at 6.21pm.

Minute		Action	By	Due
Minutes	5.a	Request access for governors to SharePoint	KJ	27.05.22
Matters arising	6.c	Seek nominations for a new parent governor	HC	17.06.22

Signed:



Date: 5th September 2022