

ST MARY & ST PANCRAS PRIMARY SCHOOL

Part 1 OF THE MEETING OF THE FULL GOVERNING BODY

Held on

Tuesday 17th January 2017 at 6pm

ATTENDEES

Governor Type	Name	Term of Office End	Present/Absent /Apologies
Incumbent (COM)	Rev Anne Stevens	Ex-officio	Apologies
	Father Paschal Worton	Ex-officio	Apologies
LDBS	Gregory Watson (GW)	March 2017	Present
	Tim Brown	Sept 2020	Apologies
Deanery (South Camden)	James Poole (JP)	Dec 2019	Present
	Marion Rushbrook (MR)	Sept 2017	Present
PCC	Mark Paul-Clark	Aug 2016	Apologies
	Caroline Rink (CR)	July 2019	Apologies
Parents	Marie LeMaitre	Sept 2017	Absent
	Lawrence Tampu-Eya (LT)	May 2019	Present from 4
Headteacher	Jules Belton (JB)	Ex-officio	Present
Staff	Nick Tidey	Jan 2018	Apologies
Co-opted	Debra Griffith (DG)	May 2019	Present
Also present			
Local Authority	Roshan Ahmed	Observer	Present
LBofCamden	Kellyanne Wray	N/A	Present
Clerk (LDBS)	Camilla Stefani	N/A	Present

Part One (Non-Confidential)

1. Opening Prayer

1.1 The meeting was opened at 6.10pm; the Chair led all present in prayer.

2. Welcome and Apologies for Absence

2.1 The Chair welcomed the governors to the meeting. He introduced Camilla Stefani (CS), who was deputized from LDBS to clerk the meeting, and Kellyanne Wray (KW), from London Borough of Camden, who would present a report about the school's data. The FGB was quorate.

2.2 Apologies had been received from Rev Anne Stevens, Father Paschal Worton, Tim Brown, Mark Paul-Clark, Nick Tidey, which were accepted. No apologies were received from Marie LeMaitre, Lawrence Tampu-Eya and Rochan Ahmed.

2.3 *Confidential: see Part 2 Minutes

3. Declaration of Interest

3.1 No new interests were declared.

4. Training – Kellyanne Wray (London Borough of Camden)

4.1 KW presented the Inspection Dashboard, a report by RAISEonline on behalf of Ofsted. The report was launched on September 2015; the report presented is about the last academic year, 2015/2016. It is a tool for the governors to understand the data and the results of the school; it is also part of the Ofsted inspections. The report is divided into KS1 and KS2: KS1 results are based on assessments made at the end of Y2 last year. KS2 results are based on tests taken last May in reading and maths; writing has been assessed by the teachers so it will not have an attainment score.

On the front page are the overall strengths and weaknesses of the school for the year. KW noted that at the bottom right of the page, the report stated “unvalidated”: this means that data are not yet confirmed. The school has the right to appeal in case there is something wrong, such as marking, fault on tests’ data or children being discounted; SMSP did not appeal as the HT was happy with the data.

4.2 Before starting to analyse the single subjects, KW explained the structure of each page on the report. There is a breakdown of the progress and attainment data for all pupils, disadvantaged and other pupils. The data are analysed by cohort and national average; pupils are split between low, middle or high expectation; the data shows the expectation for each pupil and if they were, below, at or above it.

Lawrence Tampu-Eya entered the meeting at 6.30pm.

4.3.1 **KS2**—Reading: overall, 77% of the pupils reached the expected standard, while 66% did so nationally. So the school had a score 11% higher than the national (around 3 pupils) , and the disadvantaged pupils were above the national score. On the middle band no-one reached the highest standard.

- 4.3.2 Writing: the school is on the top 10% of national results. The pupils with low prior attainment had positive results; disadvantaged pupils also had good progress. The attainment results were positive, in particular for pupils reaching the highest standard. The HT noted that the school often assesses the pupils and there is good practice in place to analyse the books.
- 4.3.3 Maths: the school has a positive score, which was 2.6% above the national. The disadvantaged pupils performed below the national average.
- 4.3.4 The following pages are a breakdown of data for boys and girls, where pupils are compared with peers of the same gender nationally; pupils with SEN performed well, particularly in Maths. Finally, in the attainment data for each group of pupils showing results in English grammar, punctuation, spelling and science, the school performed above the national average.
- 4.4.1 **KS1** – the outcome is the result of the teacher assessment rather than a test. The comparison is made between where the pupil was in reception and at the end of Y2. Following a **question**, the HT explained that teachers set standards for each pupil when they start school in Early Years, assessing them with practical tasks. The HT also commented that in case a pupil shows very good progress in a short period of time, his/her standards will be reset.
- 4.4.2 Reading: the cohort was 30 pupils. 80% of pupils reached the standard, compared to 74% nationally; 9 pupils were emerging, 18 were at expected level and 3 exceeded the standard. KW noted that looking at the disadvantaged pupils' results, it seems a bad situation; but breaking down the data there are only 4 pupils below standard, which is actually not bad.
- 4.4.3 Writing: overall the school reached the standard in this subject and it is in line with the national average. There is also one pupil exceeding expectations.
- 4.4.4 Maths: the school overall is in line with the national data, with a positive gap of +10%.
- 4.4.5 SEN: PW noted that last year there were 4 pupils with SEN. Overall, the pupils with SEN performed well and in line with the national results. There was a positive gap in science, where 93% of pupils reached the standard compared to 82% nationally.
- 4.4.6 Phonics: the results are split between Y1 and Y2 and the results show figures from 2014, 2015 and 2016. Overall, pupils are in line or above the national standard. The disadvantaged pupils are slightly below it. In 2016, results were down from previous years. The HT commented that this is a test, which normally takes place at Y1. If a pupil does not pass the standard, he/she will re-do the test the following year, and so on.

- 4.4.7 The Early Years Foundation Stage profile is not completed due to the lack of data for the year 2016. It will be updated when the Department for Education will release the data.
- 4.5.1 Absences and exclusions: page 15 showed all the data, divided by group, of absences, persistent absences and exclusion. 'Persistent' absences means a pupil missed more than 10% of lessons; this definition changed last year (previously 'persistent' meant 50%). The school had an issue last year with absences but the HT is aware of it. She also commented that there is a section on the school development plan to address this issue. KW noted that pupils with SEN tend to have higher absences.
- 4.5.2 The HT also noted that there is a group of challenging families in school who do not want to send pupils to school. Staff are working hard to make sure that this does not happen on a regular basis. A governor **asked** if pupils on holiday during term-time are included, and the HT said that it is a mixture of holiday and sickness. Also, a number of pupils who require medical assistance are often absent.
- 4.5.3 The fixed-term exclusion chart shows that there are only a small number of these cases: 4 pupils have been excluded in 2014 of which 2 were with SEN.
- 4.6 The last page of the report showed an overall picture of the school. In 2016, there were 229 pupils on roll; the predominant ethnicity was Bangladeshi followed by White British. The school has overall 50% of girls and boys. The number of pupils with SEN is slightly below the national average. Free School Meals are above the national average. Y1, 2 and 3 are low compared to the last three years because pupils receive free meals automatically in the first two years of school; KW noted that many parents do not apply for FSM so the figures are lower. The school has 66.9% of pupils with EAL, which is above the national average. The "stability" figures show if pupils are starting school when they are supposed to or later in the academic year. The school is in line with the national average. The school has two Children Looked After (CLA).
- 4.7 Based on the RAISEonline inspection dashboard, KW presented the strengths and weaknesses summary of the school. She noted that last year the school had more weaknesses but this year is more balanced. Overall, a school has 4 strengths and 5 weaknesses, but it varies from school to school. KW noted that Camden, which is at the top of the country for number of strengths in school, has no school with the maximum number.
- 4.8 The Chair thanked KW for her valuable work and analysis.

KW left the meeting at 19.30pm

5. Part 1 Minutes of Governing Body Meeting – November & December 2016

- 5.1 The HT informed the governors that the minutes are being re-done. They will be sent out when ready.

6. Items from Chair

- 6.1 The Chair had none.

7. Verbal report from HT

- 7.1 The HT noted that there is a new system for both EYFS and Y1-6 to track data; it will be available in a few weeks for the early years and in February for Y1-6.
- 7.2 The school had a pre-SIAMS inspection on 9th December and the inspection will take place soon. The HT informed governors that the school still has small issues in one year group. Three sections out of four are possibly outstanding; overall the score should be at least 'good'. The HT noted that staff have been thanked and congratulated for the good results achieved.
- 7.3 The school had a HR audit on 12th of January, which gave good and positive results.
- 7.4 At the HT's performance review, all the targets were set. She has also discussed with the senior leadership the priorities for the term.
- 7.5 There is a new project in place in school: "the golden pen", a reward system to improve handwriting in school. The HT commented that the first results will be clear at the next T&L report in March. Also, teachers have been encouraged to handwrite rather than type at the computer, to help pupils think about the process of writing and encourage them.
- 7.6 There will be staff appraisal mid-year reviews on 7th February 2017.
- 7.7 The spring term CPD programme is in place, including a full INSET day of training on 3rd January and RE Plans to get ready for the SIAMS inspection.
- 7.8 Y1 update – the HT will take this item under Part 2.
- 7.9 The HT is observing lessons on reading and she will also take part in Target Tracker training with another teacher to be able to better track pupils' progress. The training will then be shared with all the teachers.
- 7.10 The teaching profile that emerged is currently 88% good or better and 37% outstanding. The school aim is to have 100% of good or better by the summer term.

- 7.10 There is a SEND review scheduled for 23rd of January and a Safeguarding review on 6th February. The HT will report back when the outcomes are published. The PSHCE is auditing the curriculum on SEND and safeguarding issues; she will share the results when complete.
- 7.11 The HT commented that the overall relationship between parents and staff has improved and it is now very strong.
- 7.12 The HT noted that the learning mentor has done a brilliant job on the last months and she is currently working with 20 pupils.
- 7.13 Pupils are being monitored by constant assessment and there are strengths in nursery, Y2 and Y6 classes. The school has adopted a strong marking policy to make sure that the score will improve.

8. Verbal report from SBM

- 8.1 The SBM noted that on Monday the 9th the boiler went off leaving the school without hot water. She already contacted maintenance, which will be in school on Thursday afternoon. If the damage cannot be fixed, the boiler needs to be replaced. DG noted that the school is responsible for the costs, which should be around £12,000.
- 8.2 To improve Safeguarding the HT would like to install a monitor at the school entrance where the safeguarding rules will be displayed, so that everyone entering the school can read them. The screen will be installed at the end of term. The HT added that she would like to introduce name badges for all the staff. GW **asked** if something similar could be done also for governors and the HT commented that it was a good idea.
- 8.3 DG noted that Chair and governors had reviewed the SCR of the school, as this is a task due every 1st week of the new term.

9. Website and E-Safety

- 9.1 The Chair noted that Nick Tidey, who is in charge of this matter, was not present so no updates were given. However, he is updating the policy following the Camden version. The new version will be shared when ready.

10. Safeguarding and SEND

- 10.1 No updates were given.

11. Feedback from Governors

- 11.1 No training had been undertaken by any of the governors.

11.2 GW added that a follow-up review of the school's premises was done and the outcome was positive.

12. Any other business

12.1 GW **asked** when the next finance committee was planned and JB noted that it has to be planned for February.

12.2 GW also **asked** about the assemblies noted at page 2 of the agenda. The HT noted that the letters were the initials of the governors who were taking part in the assemblies, which are special events that happen once a month and include performances by pupils. All the governors are invited to these assemblies.

13. Date of next meeting

13.1 The date of the next FGB meeting was noted as 6pm on Tuesday 21st February 2017.

13.2 There were no other non-confidential items to discuss; Part 1 of the meeting closed at 7.50pm

* 2.3, 14, 15 and 16 are in Confidential/Part II

The meeting closed at 8.10pm.

Signed:

Date:

Chair James Poole

On behalf of the Governing Body for

St Mary's and St Pancras Church of England Primary School