



The Federation of Bedenham & Holbrook Primary Schools

**MINUTES OF THE FULL GOVERNING BODY MEETING OF THE FEDERATION OF  
BEDENHAM AND HOLBROOK PRIMARY SCHOOLS  
HELD ON MONDAY 5TH DECEMBER 2016 AT 6PM**  
Held at Bedenham Primary School

**Present:**

J Heath (JH)	Co-opted Governor CHAIR
T Potter (EHT)	Executive Headteacher
L Newman (LN)	Co-opted Governor
L Dovell (LD)	Co-opted Governor
K Lethbridge (KL)	Local Authority Governor arrived 6.04pm
C Landon (CL)	Co-opted Governor
A Foice (AF)	Staff Governor
S Reed (SR)	Co-opted Governor

**In attendance:**

Z Dudley (ZD)	HOS Holbrook Associate Member
C Wood (CW)	HOS Bedenham Associate Member
J Dunn (Clerk)	Local Authority Clerk

**Apologies:** G Cull (GC) Co-opted Governor

**Absent:** I Wood (IW) Parent Governor  
M Wise (MW) Co-opted Governor

**Quorum:** Present: 6 required

Agenda		ACTION POINTS
1.	<p><b>Welcome and Apologies for Absence:</b> The chair welcomed everyone and started the meeting at 6pm. The chair confirmed that apologies had been received and accepted from GC, but that IW and MW were not present. A quorum was declared by the clerk.</p> <p>KL arrived at 6.04pm.</p> <p>The chair confirmed that G Cull who could unfortunately not attend tonight, had kindly volunteered to return to the Governing Board (GB) as a Co-opted Governor whilst they are recruiting, but that he would not be able to commit as much time as previously. The governors discussed and agreed that Mr Cull's experience and knowledge of the schools would be most appreciated and unanimously approved his appointment for a 4 year term.</p>	
2.	<p><b>Declarations of Pecuniary Interests:</b> No additional pecuniary interests were declared.</p>	
3.	<p><b>Agree Any Urgent Business:</b> The EHT asked to cover premises and CW asked to cover the voting rules around Associate Members.</p> <p>CW explained that herself and ZD as Associate Members are not given voting rights and asked if this could be amended as she had been informed at a recent</p>	

Approved at FGB and signed by Chair of Governors: J Heath



	<p>National College for Teaching and Leadership (NCTL) meeting that they should be able to vote. They give a lot of time to the GB and felt that this was due recognition. The clerk explained that under statute Associate Members cannot vote at FGB and can only vote in committees if given the power by the GB and currently the GB is not running with committees. There is also under statute a maximum of one third allowed of governors working at the school. Within the current Instrument of Governance (IOG) this would be 4 governors, the EHT has a position by right of office, the staff governor has another and currently two other co-opted governors also work within the school. The clerk advised that the GB when considering its membership needs to be mindful of statute and the need to be able to form panels and committees from non-staff members, to ensure all proceedings can be seen as open and transparent and the GB is able to challenge as well as support the schools. The chair said that things may change in the future but in the meantime CW and ZD should be assured of the GB's respect and gratitude for their contributions to GB meetings.</p>	
<p>4.</p>	<p><b>Executive Head teacher Written Report:</b> Previously circulated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>End of phase data review including vulnerable groups.</b> Previously circulated.</li> <li>• <b>Impact of pupil premium and sports premium funding.</b> Within EHT report.</li> <li>• <b>Published admission numbers (PAN) arrangements.</b> Within EHT report.</li> <li>• <b>Attendance.</b> Within EHT report.</li> <li>• <b>Exclusions.</b> Within EHT report.</li> </ul> <p>The chair confirmed that the inspection data dashboards, school self-evaluation forms (SEF), school improvement plans (SIP)/Strategic Plans had been previously circulated.</p> <p>The EHT confirmed that she had received some questions from governor earlier, thank you.</p> <p><b>Governor questions to the EHT:</b></p> <p><b>Advance question - End of phase 1 data – are you saying that there should be a different criteria for setting milestones, as this does not seem to have worked?</b> No, we should be looking at “close to’s” and the Hampshire Assessment Model (HAM) does not allow us to do that. We have made a note of those children who are secure and “close to” and the milestones now reflect actual numbers. The EHT took governors through an example within the strategic plan (Year 2 Holbrook) to explain how they are tracking individual numbers of children and showing that the milestones have not been hit but they have significantly increased the number of children who are secure. The EHT said that they want to keep the milestones but governors need to be aware that they have not closed the gaps as much as they wanted to. CW said that they are looking at taking data later next year and the EHT said they are considering if data capture four times a year is the best way or to reduce it to three on a termly basis. Phase 4 in April/May onwards is supposed to be about consolidation of learning, but many children are still working on core learning at that time.</p>	

Approved at FGB and signed by Chair of Governors: J Heath



**If children continually are “not met”, is this reflected in teachers’ performance management?** Yes.

**How confident are you that you can meet the milestones?** I believe the end of year ones are realistic and I do not want to alter the figures. I will keep track of the cohort sizes as well. Three children have, for example, just come into Holbrook Year 2 who are significantly below age related expectations (ARE), so the numbers are better than the percentages.

**Are these children that have just come in, in the same class?** One is in one and two are in the other.

**Advance question - End of phase 1 data – When you say that at Holbrook in Year 1 “these numbers will increase significantly by the end of the next data capture”, are you referring to the whole of Year 1 or just those not on track?** The whole of Year 1.

**Advance question - End of phase 1 data – you said that at Bedenham “many” children have struggled with the mixed Year 1/2 classes, can you be more specific?** It is the vast majority, exacerbated by the transition from Year R to a more traditional classroom setting with some Year 2 in there. We started the year trying to split Year 1 and Year 2, but had some interesting characters in there working well below ARE. The team have struggled with the mixture in Year 1.

**Would it be possible to have single age classes?** No, we do not have the space – we would need an additional classroom and teacher.

**Advance question - End of phase 1 data – Can you give some examples of the type of support given and what is the impact for those children in Year 1 Bedenham i.e. are you seeing progress? Has there been any significant negative impact for Year 2 children?** The HoS is modelling teaching, there is joint planning with teachers and I have held extended discussions at pupil progress meetings. The last round of observations was much stronger than at the beginning of the year. I have seen the impact of this.

**Advance question – Quality of teaching – you have noted there are concerns with specific teachers. How many teachers are we talking about and presumably it is just the consistency of performance of these particular teachers?** In Holbrook I would say 4/17 and at Bedenham 3/15. Those who have been with us for the past couple of years are doing better.

**Advance question – LLP reviews – regarding the LLP visit to Bedenham, the role of additional adults was identified as an aspect to be focussed on, please could you explain who these adults are, what “split inputs” are and what staff can do to improve the situation?** They were the teaching assistants (TAs) and volunteers. Split inputs are where a TA may take a group of children and give them separate input. The LLP did not see enough of that, but this is something that regularly happens, which was frustrating.

**How many classes did the LLP observe?** All of them. CW said that it had been very frustrating as it happens on a regular basis and the evidence can be seen in their observation reports.

**How many books did the LLP look at when she commented on concerns in writing?** Just 5 books, which is not really in depth.

**Is your view that it is quite secure?** No, but 5 is too small a sample. CW said that Bedenham is on a journey with writing. The EHT explained that during additional planning, preparation and assessment time (PPA), AF is meeting teachers and challenging their spelling practice. She is looking at books to look for



trends and consistency and is challenging what she sees. The LLP based her judgement on a very small number.

**Advance question – LLP reviews – The LLP has said that at both schools improvements since September are not deemed to be rapid enough. I think it is better to make sure that staff are getting it right rather than rushing on and then finding we fall short of where we want to be later on. Would you agree?** I wholeheartedly agree, staff are under a great deal of stress and we need to have a balance.

**Advance question – impact of pupil premium – You have said the data for pupil premium children will continue to be closely monitored – and then what?** Staff will be challenged through pupil progress meetings and our on-going monitoring

**Advance question – impact of pupil premium – the emotional literacy and support assistant (ELSA) support for vulnerable children, is it possible to identify how well these children are doing?** It is, but I have not yet had time to do that. I will try and report on this in my next HT report for you.

**Advance question – impact of pupil premium – How many children are there at breakfast club and how many of these are pupil premium?** At Holbrook 3/20 and at Bedenham 25/56 on average.

**Do we pay for pupil premium children?** Yes, the offer is there.

**Would you like more pupil premium children to attend?** ZD said that at Holbrook traditionally pupil premium children do not use the breakfast club much.

**Does attendance bring any benefits to learning?** Yes and it may be worth promoting it more.

**Advance question – impact of sports premium – you have said that enjoyment and engagement in PE lessons is high, does this have a knock on effect to academic achievement?** Not always, it can be a welcome break for those children who are not academic. There could be some more data analysis to do on that.

**Advance question – PAN – at Holbrook in Year R, how is the unqualified teacher (UQT) working out? Are they having a positive effect?** Yes so far they are making a difference, but it has only been a couple of weeks and their active role in planning and organisation is being recognised.

**Advance question – attendance – you have said you will continue to challenge and support regular attendance, should this read challenge absence and support regular attendance?** Yes, thank you I will change the wording.

**Advance question – exclusions – the child at risk of permanent exclusion, is the support from the local authority (LA) and a range of agencies, for the school or the child?** Both and we have involved the early help hub for both children. The clerk asked that she be copied in to any exclusion notifications to the LA, so she can track them. This was agreed.

**Advance question – baseline Year R data – how do these percentages of children judged to be good or better compare with previous years? Is it getting worse each year and if so what are the implications for the future? Presumably the figures are similar for other schools in our catchment area and in other deprived areas nationally?** This is only the second year of this data so it is hard to make comparisons. At Holbrook in 2015 67% were below or worse, this year it is 73%. At Bedenham in 2015 55% were below or worse and



this year it is 55%. If you compare this to the national figure, that was 47.6% in 2016. We do not have access to other schools' data but we could discuss in our clusters.

**Advance question – LLP annual reviews – It seems that some of the LLP's conclusions should be challenged. How confident are you that this will be a fair debate?** Our challenge is via internal monitoring and evidence. I am not sure it will be fair at this point as the LA are also under pressure to make sure we improve our data.

**Advance question – PAN – you clearly would have no choice in having to reconsider the arrangements for Year R and Key Stage 1 (KS1) classes should more new children arrive, but bearing in mind that changes are often disruptive, however hard one tries and take time to have a good impact, do you think you would get any appreciation/acknowledgement of this from the LLP/Ofsted etc.?** I would say it is unlikely.

**Advance question – Bedenham attendance – I understand there are three looked after children (LAC), but they are not reflected in the figures?** At the time of writing my report the administration had not been set up sorry, their attendance is 97.83% with 2.17 authorised absences and 0% other.

**Advance question – phase data - I have asked in the past for the HT reports to include the % of expectations (expected and currently) for combined RWM to be included in a table so we can see them every term. Is this something we can have for Monday's meeting please?** The data shows the current cohort size including the number of children in the provision, those with education health and care plans (EHCPs), the number secure and the target number for the end of the year. There are some concerns and I have talked about this with the HoS. All staff are targeted for which children they need to bring into the combined and we are not far off last year's national figure of 53%. The data was taken from SIMS and that can change almost daily so it is quite tricky.

**Why has Year 1 gone down so much compared to Year R?** Early learning goals (ELG) and HAM are very different measures.

The EHT said that she feels it is useful to think in terms of the number of children and cohort size is recorded on everything. This also reflects the high turbulence. The EHT talked the governors through the data regarding cohort size. The governors thanked the EHT for giving them a better understanding of how the data is structured. It makes more sense now.

The EHT said that some Year 6 special educational needs (SEN) children will not be following the Year 6 curriculum but they cannot be disapplied. Both schools have 25% of the children in Year 6 with SEN. That means 25% were going through the school and this has had an impact on data throughout. The school has to meet their needs and there is limited finance to support but the schools are doing everything they can for every child, whether or not they are sitting the SATs. The governors spent some time discussing the definition of SEN and disability and when children can now go on the register. The EHT said that even if a child is not following a year appropriate curriculum, the fact that they are on the curriculum, means they will be counted in the school data. The EHT said that governors need to be able to talk about it and how it affects the statistics, but it is a point of frustration.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Review inspection dashboard and Raiseonline (ROL).</b> Previously circulated. The EHT explained that she has not been able to complete a full analysis as yet and will annotate a copy for circulating to governors.</li> <li>• <b>Learning and Leadership Partner (LLP) report.</b> Previously circulated for Holbrook school. The EHT confirmed that they are still waiting for the Bedenham report. Holbrook's still has some inaccuracies, but had been previously circulated.</li> <li>• <b>Review school improvement plan (SIP) priorities and progress.</b> Previously circulated within HoS written reports.</li> </ul> <p><b>Bedenham - What is "A" time?</b> AF explained that this is part of the PPA session. It is 20-25 minutes used for assessment and its used to go in and challenge teachers about spelling. The EHT said that A time is used at Holbrook as well, but not for the challenging of spelling.</p> <p>There were no more questions from the governors and the chair thanked the EHT and Heads of School for their in depth reports and data analysis.</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p><b>Safeguarding:</b> LD confirmed that she has now checked the single central register in both schools and previously circulated her findings. There had been a question over the safeguarding spreadsheet and the data covered. ZD explained that on recent safeguarding training all the things that had come up about the spreadsheet had been non statutory and were in fact Ofsted foibles. The tutor was going back to reflect on what Ofsted are wanting to see and consider if it is worth doing. For instance it is not a requirement to have references but Ofsted will want to see them. The EHT said that as a result of the governor audit and safeguarding training the school business managers are adding two columns to the spreadsheet to record completion of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Guilt by association forms completed by all staff</li> <li>2. Two references being obtained</li> </ol> <p>LD confirmed that she will be setting a date with each HoS for a safeguarding meeting in the spring term 2017. CW said that following her safeguarding training she will be discussing a couple of minor points with LD at this meeting.</p> <p>LD said that she would like to raise recent newspaper articles around Google searches and concerns about right wing infiltration and biased results, to ensure that all staff are aware. The implications are huge and they need to protect children. The governors discussed this at length.</p> <p><b>Governor question to the EHT:</b></p> <p><b>We have previously questioned access to the system and filters, is anyone doing a check of these?</b> County do it at the moment and I fully expect Agile to be giving us regular reports. We ask them to filter items out as we see them.</p>	

Approved at FGB and signed by Chair of Governors: J Heath



The Federation of Bedenham & Holbrook Primary Schools

	<p>The chair thanked LD for her update.</p>	
<p><b>6</b></p> <p><b>6.a</b></p>	<p><b>Governing Body Matters:</b></p> <p><b>Governor Monitoring Visits:</b></p> <p>The chair thanked governors for previously circulated monitoring reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 31/10/16, Holbrook, meeting with the English lead to monitor spelling.</li> <li>• 4/11/16, Holbrook, meeting with the Maths lead to look at learning walls.</li> <li>• 21/11/16, Holbrook, single central register check.</li> </ul> <p>The chair asked if there were any questions on the visit reports, none were asked.</p> <p>The chair said that following whole governing body training on Holding Leaders to Account on the 30<sup>th</sup> November 2016, she had sent the governors the four actions that had been agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decide on a vision for the Federation</li> <li>• Revisit our priorities – plus statutory items - for monitoring purposes</li> <li>• Complete the monitoring plan based on our priorities</li> <li>• Agree a framework for the EHT/HOS reports and aim to receive more specific feedback</li> </ul> <p>The chair said that she had discussed these with the vice chair and it was felt that governors should concentrate on the core subjects of Maths, Reading and Writing to build up expertise. This is already demonstrated by the in-depth knowledge of the Safeguarding Governor. The allocated governors would be responsible for their element within the strategic plans and follow through on monitoring. The governors spent some time discussing the benefits of this approach. Points noted included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would allow governors to focus on a specific area</li> <li>• Progress can be followed throughout the year</li> <li>• Fewer governors would mean less duplication and a real in depth knowledge</li> <li>• The EHT could provide key questions from the strategic plans that the governors would ensure are answered</li> <li>• Termly visits with phase leaders would suffice</li> </ul> <p>It was agreed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reading – LN</li> <li>2. Writing – GC</li> <li>3. Maths – KL</li> <li>4. Safeguarding – LD</li> </ol> <p>Actions agreed –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. EHT to draw up six key questions to be answered by the end of the academic year around reading, writing and maths.</li> <li>2. The EHT will send governors improvement team meeting dates for both schools</li> <li>3. JH to send LN notes on previous visits completed around guided reading</li> <li>4. The chair, vice chair and EHT will meet 16<sup>th</sup> January 2017 at 4pm</li> </ol>	<p>Send six key questions to be answered by the end of the academic year (EHT)</p> <p>Send governors improvement team meeting dates for both schools (EHT)</p> <p>Send LN notes on previous visits completed around guided reading (JH)</p> <p>JH, KL, EHT meet 16<sup>th</sup> January 2017 at 4pm (Holbrook), to review the strategic role and look at a framework for the EHT and HoS reports</p>

Approved at FGB and signed by Chair of Governors: J Heath





The Federation of Bedenham & Holbrook Primary Schools

	<p>through. There were no further matters arising not already covered on the agenda.</p>	
8.	<p><b>Correspondence:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raiseonline Newsletter (previously circulated)</li> <li>• Primary School Accountability in 2016 (previously circulated)</li> <li>• Bi-weekly Governor Services Newsletter (previously circulated)</li> </ul>	
9.	<p><b>Any Other Agreed Urgent Business:</b> The EHT confirmed that following interviews six appointments had been made today. One internal appointment had resulted in another post needing to be filled.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Permanent teaching assistant (TA) at Bedenham</li> <li>• Two fixed term TAs, one for Year 6 and one for Year 3/4 at Bedenham</li> <li>• Two fixed term TAs at Holbrook for Year R/1 and Year 3</li> </ul> <p>The part time roles are for mornings only and for specific children. The interview process had been very successful with 22 applicants, shortlisted to 12. The EHT said that she will be interviewing with the Bedenham HoS for maternity leave cover at Bedenham and if any governors were available, please contact her.</p> <p><b>The following conversation was confidential and is recorded on a separate document.</b></p> <p>The EHT said that there had been no applicants for the parent governor position in the last round and a further request will be sent out after Christmas. New parents will also be leafleted at the Christmas performances.</p>	
10.	<p><b>Items for the Next FGB Meeting 16<sup>th</sup> January 2017 at Holbrook School 6pm:</b></p> <p><b>Focus: SEN and Governance.</b></p> <p><b>HT Verbal report</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SIP priorities and progress update</li> </ul> <p><b>Special Educational Needs (SEN):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inclusion Leaders Annual Report including an analysis of SEN funding</li> <li>• SEN Annual Information Report</li> </ul> <p><b>Governance:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training and Receive DTG report on value for money</li> <li>• Staff survey feedback on performance management questionnaire (KL)</li> <li>• Governor monitoring</li> <li>• GB SEF review</li> <li>• GB vacancies, recruitment and term dates</li> <li>• Safeguarding</li> </ul> <p>The chair thanked the everyone for their attendance and inputs, wished everyone a Merry Christmas and closed the meeting at 8pm.</p>	

Approved at FGB and signed by Chair of Governors: J Heath



The Federation of Bedenham & Holbrook Primary Schools

### Agreed action points from the meeting

Action Number	Agenda reference	Action Required	Who By
1	11 (Dec 15)	IW to provide skills form to clerk by 31/12/16	IW
2	22(4.b Resources)	Bring comparison of cleaning supplies to spring term meeting March 2017	SP/SK
4	25 (4.a Resources)	Report to the March 2017 meeting on cross federation shared spending	SK/SP
7	11	Complete pupil discipline committee e learning by 16/1/17	JH, KL
11	16	Send offsite visit schedule to March meeting	EHT
23	5.c	Return financial skills forms to SP/SK by 5/12/16	All
26	8	Complete governor safeguarding checklist and return to clerk by 31/12/16	IW, SR, CL, ZD, MW
28	6	Send six key questions to be answered by the end of the academic year by 16/1/17	EHT
29	6	Send governors improvement team meeting dates for both schools by 16/1/17	EHT
30	6	Send LN notes on previous visits completed around guided reading by 16/1/17	JH
31	6	JH, KL, EHT meet 16 <sup>th</sup> January 2017 at 4pm (Holbrook), to review the strategic role and look at a framework for the EHT and HoS reports	JH, KL, EHT
32	11.b	Send notes on confidential visits to clerk by 31/12/16	JH, CW, SR/completed 6/12/16
33	11.b	Confirm pay roll checks in order for both schools by 16/1/17	KL

Approved at FGB and signed by Chair of Governors: J Heath

Date: 16<sup>th</sup> January 2017

Page 10 of 10