|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Extra LGB Minutes of Sampford Peverell School held on 12 September 2017** | | | | | |
| **Date & Time** | **12.09.17**  **18:00** | | **Location** | | **Sampford Peverell School** |
| **Attendees** | |  |  | **Attendees** |  |
| Name | | Type of Governor |  |  |  |
| Sophie Cuthbertson (SC) | | Community Governor (Health & Safety) |  | Gail Foreshew (GF) | Parent Governor (SEND/Foundation) |
| Helen Hurford (HH) | | Head Teacher |  | Matt Huddleson (MH) | Community Governor (Chair) |
| Carl Gascoigne (CG) | | Parent Governor (Website) |  | Kevin Snow (KS) | Staff Governor |
|  | |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Apologies** |  |  | **Absent Without**  **Apology** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **In Attendance** |  |  | **Minutes to** |  |
| Lucy Poole (LP) | Clerk to Governing Body |  | School Admin |  |
| Claire Baillie (CB) | Director of School Improvement |  | Company Secretary |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **35/2017** | MH welcomed everyone to the meeting largely to be directed by CB and HH.  CB explained to Governors that in her experience a separate meeting focusing on the SIP and SEF is invaluable, particularly in light of the recent OFSTED inspection and the turbulent last year.  CB congratulated staff and Governors on the recent successful SIAMS inspection.  CB has met with staff already regarding the outcomes of the OFSTED inspection and held initial discussions, with the SLT on the new SIP. Clearly it is vital that issues raised on the OFSTED report are focused on in the SEF and progressed within the SIP.  CB circulated the most recent SATs results to all Governors for discussion. GF asked why children who underwent Yr1 Phonic Screening weren’t picked up as needing further assistance at the end of the previous year. HH was able to reassure Governors that the testing was secure and robust and that although issues were evident, these can be easily rectified and shouldn’t be a cause for concern. KS suggested that interventions may be required throughout the school as phonics don’t seem to be secure in Year 5 children which would suggest phonics are not strong in the years leading up to Year 5. CG asked if children just entering Year 1 are immediately being targeted to ensure that this trend does not continue. CB confirmed that this is happening already although HH was able to confirm that children entering Year 1 now don’t seem to have the same level of gap in their phonic learning.  SC asked if children are going to be tested annually instead of waiting until the end of a KS for assessment. CB said that children are continually assessed. SC asked if this situation is rectifiable for Yr 5/6 children before they enter high school and staff confirmed that it is. MH asked how much the behavior issues of a small minority of children might have impacted the Yr1 phonics screening. CB suggested that these issues would have affected all subjects and that her feeling is simply that not enough focus was put on phonics teaching in that year group. GF said that parents of Year 1 children have already been invited into school to engage in the RWI program and receive information regarding online tutoring to help them to assist their children in their learning. CG suggested it could be useful to have the schools own instruction for RWI for parents to access online and offered to help to set this up.  MH suggested that PP children might be being let down given that their results are not in reading and writing as they are in maths. This might show that they have the intellect to perform well, but for some reason haven’t been able to do so in reading and writing. CB pointed out that actually all children are showing this trend. MH felt that this was more pronounced with PP children, and CB responded that this might relate to the level of learning support at home, because Maths ability tends to develop in school without much home support. HH suggested that PP children need to be tracked very carefully to ensure that there are getting the right interventions across the board.  KS2 results showed that not as many children who obtained ARE at the end of KS1 maintained that level at the end of KS2. KS was able to identify a number of children who were borderline in specific subjects. These results cannot afford to be repeated and so children need to have interventions earlier. Governors need to feel sure that Year 6 staff and children need to be fully supported. MH suggested that there might be some anomalies in the figures which CB will check. GF asked if there was enough staffing support during the SATs for children who were nervous or who needed specific assistance. KS and CB said that all TAs available were used for this purpose and HH pointed out that overkill in this regard can end up having a detrimental effect.  GF asked if the length and structure of the SIP is improved from the previous one which was criticised by OFSTED. CB said that this is improved and the format is being used widely across Ventrus.  KS suggested that staff are highly motivated and ready to work on the improvements which need to be made. CB pointed out that Governors involvement in communicating with staff to ensure that they can articulate the impact of key school improvement objectives. MH asked if the aim of this SIP is to move the school from Requires Improvement to Good and if so in what timescale. CB said that there could be a monitoring visit within the next 12 months where the SIP will be looked at to ensure it is fit for purpose and that Governance is working well. Having said that CB feels strongly that the school should be working to secure good outcomes for children and accelerated progress by the end of 2017. MH asked again when we should be planning to achieve the aims of the SIP. HH pointed out that OFSTED give a school two years to have made the move from RI to Good. Some areas of change will move quicker than others. HH is very much of a view that the school should be working at a solid good by this time next year. Some areas will take longer to improve than others, particularly since some items will require the gathering of evidence. MH asked for milestones within the SIP to show dates by which these improvement should have been made. If Governors have realistic timescales by which areas of the SIP should be implemented this enables them to challenge and hold the school accountable if and when necessary. KS suggested that subject leaders might benefit from visits by Governors early on in the knowledge that this will then be followed up later in the academic year by which time the staff member will be expected to demonstrate the progress that has been made. This could be very valuable for teachers. GF pointed out that it’s important that Governors are equipped enough to be able to ask the right questions and make a positive difference. This SIP gives Governors the toolkit to obtain triangulation of evidence.  HH suggested this is included in the Governance area of the SIP. SC said that she feels that there needs to be much more regular input from Governors than the challenge just once a term. MH suggested that Governors need to take ownership and responsibility of the whole SIP. GF suggested that there are some focused targets for the first term. KS said that he feels that a Governor attachment to a specific member of staff could be very useful. SC said that a Governor/Staff relationship which is regular and sustained will grow and become more beneficial. CG asked if it would be useful for Governors to be rotated in their position but the general feeling was that knowledge base can be increased if a Governors stays in position. CG conceded but felt that communication to other Governors is key so that all Governors can confidently say that the Governing Body as a whole is monitoring the SIP. CB suggested that this can be addressed by way of an email to the Governing Body after a school visit – LGB meetings are already very long and must not be increased.  KS felt that it could be positive for Governors to be more visible in school. GF suggested that the LGB update could be included in a forthcoming newsletter and CB suggested that a bulletin could be given to parents on a termly basis. MH to write a bulletin for parents as a welcome to the new school year. Included in this bulletin should be the aims of the Governing Body and suggestions for inclusion in this were as follows:   * Continuing to support the school in raising the standards of teaching and learning and responding in particular to areas identified in the OFSTED. * Support and challenge to the new Head Teacher. * Regular visits to the school to support and challenge members of staff with implementing the school improvement plan. * Working with the school to put together a program of support for parents in engaging with their child’s learning. * Supporting the development of the outside learning area in the Early Years Foundation Unit (First Steps).   CB explained to Governors her role and that of Ashley Leeson as Directors of School Improvement. HH asked how the change in role will be communicated to parents and has been asked by a parent where Ventrus fits into the model of the school. CB suggested that HH could write her own script to explain the role of Ventrus. CG suggested there could be an explanation of the Ventrus leadership model and how this interfaces with the school on the website. CB is going to work on this. |
| **36/2017** | **Date and Time of Next Meeting**  Monday 2 October 18:00 |
|  | **SUMMARY OF DECISIONS**  **SUMMARY OF ACTIONS** |
|  | **The minutes below are approved as a true and accurate record of the meeting**  **Signed Date**  **Printed** |