



The Federation of Bedenham & Holbrook Primary Schools

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING OF THE FEDERATION
OF BEDENHAM AND HOLBROOK PRIMARY SCHOOLS
HELD ON MONDAY 25TH JANUARY 2016 AT 6PM**
Held at Holbrook Primary School

Present:

Z Dudley (ZD)	HoS Holbrook Associate Member s
T Potter (EHT)	Executive Headteacher s
S Reed (SR)	Co-opted Governor s
G Cull (GC)	Authority Governor
J Heath (JH)	Co-opted Governor (Chair)
L Newman (LN)	Co-opted Governor
C Landon (CL)	Co-opted Governor s
L Dovell (LD)	Co-opted Governor

In attendance:

J Dunn (Clerk)	Local Authority Clerk
----------------	-----------------------

Apologies: C Wood (CW) HoS Bedenham Associate Member **s**

Absent: C Storey (CS) Parent Governor

Quorum Present (3 required)

AGENDA NUMBER		ACTION POINTS
1.	<p>Welcome and Apologies for Absence: The chair welcomed everyone and started the meeting at 6pm and confirmed that apologies had been received and accepted from C Wood. It was noted that C Storey was absent.</p> <p>The clerk confirmed that a quorum was present.</p>	
2.	<p>Declarations of Pecuniary Interests: No additional declarations were declared.</p>	
3.	<p>Agree Any Urgent Business: No items were requested.</p>	
4.	<p>School Improvement Plan (SIP) Subjects and Progress (Data): The EHT tabled written data reports for each school showing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • December 2015 data comparisons – September 2015 Baseline data against November 2015 Phase 1 Hampshire Assessment Model (HAM) data, in Reading, Writing and Maths. • SIM package high level summary reports in Reading, Writing and Maths for each Year group. • Achievement against relevant milestones for “not on track”, “close to on track”, “securely on track”, “beyond” and “close to on track or above”. • Key group data as above. 	

Approved in committee and signed by the Acting Chair: G Cull

Date: 29th February 2016

Page 1 of 8



The Federation of Bedenham & Holbrook Primary Schools

	<p>The EHT gave the governors time to read through the reports and explained that the baseline was set at the beginning of the year and although a crude measure allowed them to assess if the children were felt to be on track for age related expectations (ARE) under the new system, in order to do this some assumptions had been made; a 1a at the end of Year 1 equated to being on track at the start of Year 2 and a good level of development (GLD) at the end of Year R equated to being on track etc.</p> <p>The EHT explained that in phase 1, county had advised them to show the children as “on track” even if they needed some support in certain domains. The question is around how much support this should or could be, as there are several domains. This can result in children showing as “on track” with some domains missing – such as decoding which is essential to reading and a key requirement to completing ARE.</p> <p>The governors spent some time reviewing and discussing the baseline and phase 1 data and the EHT asked for questions.</p> <p><u>Holbrook School:</u></p> <p>Governor questions to the EHT:</p> <p>How many domains are there? It varies from subject to subject. I can provide this information if anyone wants it, please ask.</p> <p>Given the anomalies you have pointed out with this tracking package, is there anything preventing you from ignoring parts and tailoring it to your requirements? We can make it what we want it to be. The tracking package is the Hampshire model and we need to be aware of the anomalies within it. In the long term we could make adjustments to the SIMS package to fit our needs but at this time we are just using it as is..</p> <p>Are you saying that it could show children are on track right up to the end but then are not able to achieve ARE and it looks like a fail, although you were aware all along they would not get there for one reason or another? Yes. The staff are fully aware of which children are not hitting specific domains and interventions are in place to address this. I do expect the phase 2 data to go down as a result. If you take Reading - Year 1 is quite positive and Year 2 is very positive but that includes children who are “close to” with support, but will not be able to achieve the decoding domain in time for phase 2. I think that in Year 3 (having had a look at the data) there may be an issue. Baseline was taken from a mixture of end of Year 2 teacher assessment and some testing data, whereas this is all teacher assessment.</p> <p>Do you feel teachers are being over cautious? There is an element of that, plus an understanding of what each assessment statement</p>	
--	---	--

Approved in committee and signed by the Acting Chair: G Cull

Date: 29th February 2016

Page 2 of 8



The Federation of Bedenham & Holbrook Primary Schools

	<p>means. This is also true with Year 4 data.</p> <p>How is this being addressed? We have ongoing support in place for the quality of teaching and learning and C Landon and J Stedman are undertaking some checks on accuracy in order to provide a clear standard to work from.</p> <p>If it is the same issues for Years 3 and Year 4, why does Year 4 show a much better picture? There are anomalies all round and this is also due to Year 3 data being based on Year 2 results which incorporate tests and teacher assessment whilst Year 4 is based on Year 3 where teacher assessment alone used.</p> <p>How much from the 81% in Reading do you expect Year 6 to drop, considering their issues with de-coding? To around 70%.</p> <p>The governors spent some time reviewing and discussing the SIMs data package. ZD explained that Holbrook has received an update to SIMS since the baseline data was prepared and some figures may not match up exactly, although they will mirror the data tracker roughly. The EHT explained that as the year progresses more boxes will be completed. The Bedenham SIMS package has not been updated as yet due to the absence of the SIMS administrator.</p> <p>The EHT referred the governors to the group data showing data for pupil premium and non-pupil premium, looked after children and non-looked after children etc. The EHT said that there is nothing they felt to be of major concern with regards to the groups other than potentially Year 3 and Year 4, where the whole cohort is an issue.</p> <p>Are the concerns over anomalies being fed back to county? Yes.</p> <p><u>Bedenham School:</u></p> <p>The EHT explained that there is some commentary added to the baseline data page from the HoS and they are broken down into classes rather than year groups. The EHT asked for questions.</p> <p>Why have Year 3 Dolphins class taken a dip in Reading at phase 1? There are only seven children in that class and potentially the children in there at the time of the baseline are not the same children as in there when the phase 1 data was collected i.e. turbulence. The tracking system does not take account of a change in the children within the class. We have three new children in Year 3 with no baseline data available and if they are also low attainers this has a significant effect.</p> <p>The reading data shows Year 3 as 29% not on track and in Year 6 42% not on track, is this accurate? The data originally showed children on track with support in Year 6 as being much higher (98%) and it has been changed to show those predicted to achieve ARE at the end with no support. There are also three children in there who are</p>	
--	---	--

Approved in committee and signed by the Acting Chair: G Cull

Date: 29th February 2016

Page 3 of 8



The Federation of Bedenham & Holbrook Primary Schools

	<p>in the BESD provision.</p> <p>Is there a way of taking out the children in the provision? It will be possible but we are still learning the new system. The front page shows the data for Victory class without children from Sharks. Our biggest concern is in Year 6 Reading as there are a significant number of children struggling with de-coding.</p> <p>Why do they struggle? The reasons vary, some never read at home, some have specific speech and language difficulties and some children were behind with phonics from earlier years.</p> <p>Is Reading in Bedenham worse than at Holbrook? In theory yes, however Holbrook's data will drop.</p> <p>The governors noted that it is difficult to get a clear picture during this period of transition. The EHT explained that they have tracked children back at Holbrook from Early Years (EY) to the current Year 6. Of 31 children who joined the school 7 years ago there are now only 16 who have been with the school since Year R, so it is hard to compare cohort data. The office manager is trying to create an internal tracking system, similar to that already held at Bedenham, for tracking individual children still in school from Year R to Year 6.</p> <p>Are there any indications that those children who came into Year R under the age expectations, will still be under the age expectations at the end of Year 4? No, there is no generality. Summer born children for instance tend to have caught up and negated this by Year 2. The Year R baseline data is assessed at "well below typical", "below typical", "typical" and "above". If they are below they are expected to catch up.</p> <p>The EHT said that as a whole they feel that progress is being made and the new system has raised the bar, although there are a number of flaws associated with the new system. The expectation is that the figures for phase 2 in February will go down, but that it will be a truer picture. The EHT said that she has discussed with each HoS as to whether they will continue with the HAM next year and what they can do about the "with support" judgements.</p> <p>Are other schools having the same issues? ZD said that she and CW attend an assessment group of Headteachers and they feel it shows highly inflated levels due to the "with support" category and it is this element that may be removed next year. The EHT said it needs to be about "are they on track to reach ARE at the end of the year and do you think you can close that gap?" based on the teacher's professional knowledge and consequently what needs to be done to close that gap.</p> <p>The EHT said that the February data will give a more realistic and reliable picture.</p>	
--	--	--

Approved in committee and signed by the Acting Chair: G Cull

Date: 29th February 2016

Page 4 of 8



	<p>The chair thanked the EHT for her reports.</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p>Review Annual Special Educational Needs (SEN) Provision Reports: Review Annual Special Educational Needs (SEN) Provision Reports: The EHT confirmed that the Special Educational Needs Co-ordinators (SENCOs), had previously sent reports to governors together with an anonymous intervention analysis for Bedenham school.</p> <p>The EHT said that the county advisor for SEN Kim James had been in to work with both SENCOs and had noted the need to tighten up on tracking progress and the interventions by staff. This has already been addressed and observed by the SENCOs.</p> <p>The EHT said that the LA adviser had suggested under county guidance, only children with issues around their reading and spelling ages should be put on the SEN register and consequently have IEPs, but she strongly feels that some children have a significant issue only with Maths. The EHT said she has asked for more Sandwell Tests to pick these children up as she feels that it is wrong to exclude them from the SEN register.</p> <p>The EHT asked for any questions.</p> <p>Governor questions to the EHT:</p> <p>What would you consider a good ratio gain? A level 2 gain indicates that six months progress has been made in three months. (Sent in advance) Was there anything you feel needs to be done as a result of this data? Because we are monitoring interventions more closely now, we will stop any intervention that are not having the desired effect and try something else. Do you also see it working the other way around and see how you can use successful interventions elsewhere? Yes. What does precision teaching look like, it appears to be very successful? It is very tightly focussed one to one work with children, only 10 minutes every day. Could you give more information on spelling ages please? Spelling tests such as they are do not go low enough as children are commonly below spelling age of 5 for some time. They have to get 15 correct before they even score and spelling tends to come later. What about colour coded grammar? This is a one to one intervention for children and it is interesting that it did not help Year 2 but had a significant impact in Year 3. It is about getting the right intervention for the right child at the right moment. When does the SENCO at Bedenham go on maternity leave and do we have plans to cover her role? Around Easter time. Ms Tomkins will have finished at Alverstoke by then and Mr Lloyd should be back</p>	

Approved in committee and signed by the Acting Chair: G Cull



	<p>and with the support of an experienced higher level teaching assistant they will be able to cover the SENCo role. We will need to make sure they are given quality time to keep track of the SEN provision.</p> <p>The EHT explained how Kim James had reviewed the records for 2-3 children at each school and it had been picked up that recording of interventions had been sporadic in some cases where staff are not being given sufficient time to record everything. The SENCos had spoken to the phase leaders about this to ensure all interventions are recorded along with attendance and to look for any trends. They had monitored this last week and things have improved as a result. Going forward they will be monitoring 3-4 of each other's children's records rather than working together, to allow fresh eyes.</p> <p>Has the moderation of the intervention records been shared with the class teachers and SENCos? Yes, it has been fed back.</p> <p>The chair thanked the EHT and asked her to send the governors thanks to the SENCos for their reports.</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p>Staff Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Review: The EHT said that CPD at Holbrook is individualised and will be discussed at FGB in more detail. Holbrook is still accessing county CPD such as a number of Maths courses, but most is internal and to support the quality of teaching and learning. The EHT said that they are waiting to hear if Holbrook has a grant for the teaching school to access more CPD but as ZD is still officially a Specialist Leader in Education (SLE) they could use the funding flexibly to give more time in school for staff to work together. The grant would give them more flexibility. Ms Tomkins is coming over to Holbrook one day per week to model teaching and coaching with Year 1, which has been really valued, the impact already being seen in class.</p> <p>The chair thanked the EHT for her update.</p>	
<p>7.</p>	<p>Governor Monitoring of the School Improvement Plan: Visit report forms had been previously circulated for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data working party JH 07/12/2015 • Early Years Maths Workshop for Parents (Holbrook) – JH and LN 25/11/2015 • Early Years (Bedenham) – JH 24/11/2015. • Early Years (Holbrook) – JH and LN 25/11/2015. <p>The updated governor termly monitoring plan had been previously circulated.</p> <p>The governors spent some time discussing monitoring activity and agreed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. English monitoring – JH to complete a learning walk at Holbrook with Mrs Stedman around spelling. 	

Approved in committee and signed by the Acting Chair: G Cull



The Federation of Bedenham & Holbrook Primary Schools

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. English monitoring – JH to contact A Foice for a focussed visit on Guided Reading and the changes in delivery / planning following the INSET. 3. Next committee meeting to focus on Maths work and what “Mastery” looks like. The HoS and Maths leader to provide a maths problem in advance of the meeting for governors to work through. 4. EHT to provide Maths books for work scrutiny at next meeting. 5. EHT to ask some selected teachers if they would be willing to have a lesson observed so that governors could observe and gain a better understanding of what makes a lesson strongly good. No more than 1-2 governors, suggestions from EHT to be sent to the clerk for circulating for Spring 2. 6. GC meeting the site manager at Holbrook w/c 1/2/16 to review Health and Safety and premises. 7. Governor volunteer(s) required to attend a “Book Snuggle” at Holbrook (for parental engagement) 12/02/2016 2.20pm. 8. Parent Evenings – governor volunteers required. Bedenham – 24/02/16. Holbrook – 24/02/2016 and 25/02/2016 (Year 3 and Year 4) 3.30pm to 6.30pm. 9. JH and LD to attend Year 6 mentoring meetings at Holbrook w/c 24/02/2016 – availability to be agreed at FGB. 10. Governor volunteer requested for Holbrook residential Hooke Court (Years 3 and 4 w/c 22/02/2016). 11. Governor volunteer requested for a 1 day visit to the Stubbington Centre Bedenham Year 4 residential w/c 07/03/2016. Please inform the EHT asap. <p>The chair confirmed that she will update the monitoring plan with these plans and circulate to governors through the clerk.</p>	<p>Update and circulate governor monitoring plan (JH & clerk)</p>
<p>8.</p> <p>8.a</p> <p>8.b</p>	<p>Minutes of the Previous Meeting 16th November 2015: Previously circulated. The confidential minutes were tabled</p> <p>Approval: Both sets of minutes were unanimously approved as a true record and signed by the chair.</p> <p>Matters Arising:</p> <p>Action 12, agenda item 5: The chair confirmed that the SEN reports had been sent to this meeting as requested.</p> <p>Action 13, agenda item 10.b: The chair confirmed that the curriculum and Key Performance Indicator (KPI) links had been circulated to governors as requested. The clerk confirmed that she had discussed the Office 360 distribution lists with the finance managers in each school. The EHT explained that she had requested administration rights from county for the distribution lists as they are still incorrect.</p> <p>Action 14, agenda item 10.b: Committee members confirmed they</p>	<p>Prevent duty e learning FGB</p>

Approved in committee and signed by the Acting Chair: G Cull



The Federation of Bedenham & Holbrook Primary Schools

	<p>have completed the Prevent Duty e learning, however it was requested that this is confirmed for all governors at the next FGB.</p> <p>Action 15, agenda item 11: GC confirmed that he had sent back the school year consultation 2017/18 feedback to county, as requested.</p> <p>There were no further matters arising from the minutes.</p>	agenda item (clerk)
9.	<p>Any Other Agreed Urgent Business:</p> <p>The clerk raised the requirement for an annual Looked After Children (LAC) report to governors. The EHT said that she will send the county review of LAC for Bedenham for circulating and will request a review for Holbrook. In addition the Inclusion leaders will be asked to write a report.</p> <p>The SEND local offer for both schools is accessible from the websites and the EHT is to confirm that these have been updated and ensure they get sent to governors</p>	<p>Send LAC review to clerk for distribution (EHT)</p> <p>Request county review of LAC for Holbrook (EHT)</p>
10.	<p>Confirm Date of Next Meeting:</p> <p>The chair confirmed that the next meeting will be held at Bedenham School on the 29th February 2016 at 6pm.</p>	
11.	<p>Items for Next Meeting:</p> <p>The committee agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maths Mastery task and review of Year 6 workbooks. • Phase 2 data • SEN Information Report (SEND offer annual review). <p>The chair thanked the governors for their attendance and input and closed the meeting at 7.20pm.</p>	

Agreed action points from the meeting

Action Number	Agenda item	Action Required	Responsibility	Completed
16	7	Update and circulate governor monitoring plan	JH and clerk	completed
17	8.b	Prevent duty e learning FGB agenda item	clerk	On agendas
18	9	Send LAC review to clerk for distribution	EHT	
19	9	Request county review of LAC for Holbrook	EHT	

Approved in committee and signed by the Acting Chair: G Cull

Date: 29th February 2016

Page 8 of 8