

Sandbrook Primary School
Minutes of a Governors Meeting
held on Monday 11th July 2016

Present: Vida Wilson (Chair), Claire Temple (Headteacher), Chris Mervyn, Carol Jones, Michelle Richards, Sharon Lloyd

In Attendance:

Agenda item 1	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE
Louise Hughes, Jan Wynn, Nichola Humble (Clerk)	

Agenda item 2		PECUNIARY INTERESTS	
Discussion: There were no governors in attendance who had Pecuniary Interests.			
Conclusions: N/A			
Action items		Person Responsible	Deadline

Agenda item 3		MINUTES OF THE GOVERNORS MEETING HELD ON 26 MAY 2016 AND MATTERS ARISING	
Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Agenda item 3 – Governors would like clarification for parents from Edsential of the criteria and process needed for children with diagnosed food allergies - outstanding• Agenda item 4 – Facebook. CM has discussed required changes with parent (SW)• Agenda item 5 – Restructure. This is currently with our HR department.• Agenda item 6 – Academies. CT discussed research she has done with this. Currently region specific for trusts. MR suggested that there was a Moreton school interested in being a MAT with Sandbrook. VW has asked if it was possible to look at different avenues/options.			
Conclusions: <p>The minutes of 26th May 2016 were agreed as a true record.</p>			
Action items		Person Responsible	Deadline
Clarification of criteria for food allergies		NH	asap

Agenda item 4		HEADTEACHER’S DATA REVIEW REPORT AND MATTERS ARISING	
Discussion:			
CT provided statement from NGA and NAHT about KS2 SATS in 2016. Data was discussed with the following questions/points raised:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ MR: why did we not hit target of 80% - This was set before cohort was confirmed.➤ VW: are expected standards set by Sandbrook – No, because it is data from Wirral.➤ MR commented that Year 2 children seemed well prepared and relaxed for SATS tests.			
Year 6			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ VW: discussed frustration of one or more children and 1 child = 7%➤ SL: Why did only 29% hit combined target – CT explained that schools did not have practice papers, clear explanation of standards and what they actually look like. We are not bottom of Wirral – there are some ‘good’ schools below us.➤ SL: Do we expect the standard will shift next year – CT: we hope they will remain the same but the government keep changing stance.➤ MR: How is it looking for next year, VW: If Year 5 had done these tests, how would it be looking – CT explained that next 2 cohorts are very interesting. There are a large number of SEN and LAP. Progress measure is 6% of schools below floor and we haven’t been able to plan for progress.➤ CJ: What did we do for this cohort – CT explained that it was harder than ever before and only 1 child has asked about what their results mean.➤ VW: What is the cohort next year – CT: 29, with an improved level of support from parents when meeting with them took place. But, we cannot get them to ARE with them only at school for 11% of the time. CT has looked at some of the questions and the expectation on being perfect has stepped up so therefore we have had to do that in schools. Although this has had a negative response from some parents.➤ VW: Does school re-iterate standards in newsletters etc. – CT: It is, but not continually.			
CT then explained scaled scores and the clustering of children around the higher end. She also explained individual scaled scores and how 3 marks could have had an impact on our %.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ MR: Well done to the teacher and all of the children.➤ VW: Echoed this and the hard work of staff during a turbulent year.			
Conclusions:			
Action items		Person Responsible	Deadline
none			

Agenda item 5	SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• CT: Didn't have KS2, KS1 or FS targets but all set before standards were released. Surpassed phonics target. Work in KS1- a good set of data – evident with Wirral averages• CT explained that CM is seen as a leader in S Maths but we haven't been able to roll it out this year due to staffing. Sept 2016, all Yr 1-6 staff will be trained by OLOP.<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ SL: Will we roll it out to all year groups – Yes, because the opportunity to train all staff is free.➤ VW: Will it all sit on CM's shoulders – CM will be leading as subject co-ordinator for whole school	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ SL: How will it work in Year 6 – CT stated that Mark Cotton (OLOP) showed that it is evidenced as effective ➤ MR: Is it likely to support LAP – CM gave example of an SEN child who has made 6 steps progress but explained that, for some SEN, they still need traditional support such as TAs. • We have evidence that more teachers in the building are 'good'. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ VW: Are teachers more motivated – CT stated that there is now a team of teachers driving school forward, holding children and each other to account. ➤ VW: Are new staff at the same standard – We have developed our recruitment process linked to our school vision. Therefore a lot of our questions are around the person and feedback. ➤ VW: CT has worked hard and is a wonderful role model for all at Sandbrook. ➤ CT: Ofsted commented informally about grit shown by children due to the 5S and Growth Mindset. ➤ VW: Does school still have poorly behaved children – Number and nature of incidents is reducing and staff are developing an understanding of the child through coaching and using different strategies. ➤ SL: Stated that the strategies JW is using in her class makes her a fantastic teacher. ➤ MR: Stated that children with SEN at Sandbrook are so well supported that they do not feel any different to any other child. ➤ CT: We have a staff that are now kind and helpful. ➤ CJ: Stated that the stability of TA's has also had a positive impact. Have we seen any growth/development – CT confirmed that the majority had realised that there is a shift in school and that they now know what is expected. Teachers are now able to hold TA's to account as well. ➤ CT/CM to look at options regarding having TA's on the entry doors. 		
Conclusions:		
Action items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Review TAs on doors	CT/CM	Sept 2016

Agenda item 6		UPDATE FROM FINANCE & PAY/PERSONNEL COMMITTEE AND MATTERS ARISING	
Discussion			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">CT went through staffing for Sept 2016.<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ SL: Have many parents questioned the 1/2 class or 5/6 class – CM: only 2 parents have asked for clarification about KS1 organisation.Discussion regarding Loganberries take-up. CT asked if we could buy some places as we don't want to risk losing the facility. Suggestion is 3 places a day for half a term. We will then be able to offer support to targeted families.			
Conclusions:			
It was agreed that CT could check with our bursar if it was financially viable			
Action items		Person Responsible	Deadline
CT to have discussion with bursar		CT	Sept 2016

Agenda item 7	GOVERNORS' REPORTS ON TRAINING
Discussion:	
None	

Conclusions:		
Action items	Person Responsible	Deadline

Agenda item 8		POLICIES FOR ADOPTION	
Discussion			
None			
Conclusions:			
Action items		Person Responsible	Deadline

Agenda item 9		ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
Discussion:			
None			
Conclusions:			
Action items		Person Responsible	Deadline

DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING
The date and time of the next meeting is TBC.