



**Minutes of the Avenue Junior School
Full Governing Body Meeting**

held at Avenue Road, Norwich Norfolk
on Monday 3rd December 2018 at 6pm

GOVERNORS PRESENT: Nania Poulson, Debbie Dismore (HT) Michael Hooper, Mike Grimble(Chair), Jo Thompson, Margaret Bird, Lisa Crossman, Rachel Paley, Ally Ireson, Sam Rowbury, Baiba Zivtins, Jason Menezes
Sian Jones arrived late.

Clerk: Sheila Lewis-Smith

No	Item	Action
1	Welcome and Apologies	
	Apologies from Nicola Teasdale, Toby Whalen and Peter Hundleby were given and accepted.	
2	Declaration of Business/Pecuniary Interests or Conflict of Interests	
	None declared.	
3	Minutes of the meeting held on 15th October 2018	
	All actions were either completed or on-going. The minutes were agreed as a true and accurate record and signed by NP.	
4	Headteacher's Report	
	<p>1. What happened in Reading progress in 2017 to jump from Q2 to Q5 and possibly seems to be recovering slightly? <i>In 2017, children's Reading scores were not as high as we had predicted and certainly not as high as we would have liked. Last year, there was a key focus on comprehension across the school and a new model for Guided Reading sessions was introduced and embedded. As a result, children's Reading scores were higher. There were also 3 children who were 'Working Towards Standard (WTS)' who joined us during Year 6 who had a negative impact on our progress scores and so the recovery from 2017 was stronger than the data suggests.</i></p> <p>2. Can you clarify if the Maths attainment is in line with average it is just the progress that is significantly less? <i>Our attainment in Maths was 76%, the same as the national attainment figure. It is correct that progress is the measure that is significantly less (progress should be at least 0 and our progress was -3).</i></p>	

Signed as a true and accurate record:

Date:

3. In the disadvantaged pupil category, the actual numbers of pupils are low, quite a bit lower than the other groups apart from the low prior (which is excluded) and therefore this is a small sample size - also not balanced by the sample sizes in the other groups - this could have an effect on the strength of the data, is this addressed anywhere?

Are there any pupils in this category with extremely negative progress scores which has been shown to drag down the averages (reference: Using data for improvement course).

'Small sample size' is classed as 'less than about 8' in DFE terms. Disadvantaged children's progress was disappointing (-6.3) although this group included 3 children who joined us in Year 6. Their progress was low in all three subjects. Comparative data was as follows:

	<i>All Disadvantaged Pupils</i>	<i>Adjusted (-3 late starters)</i>
<i>Reading</i>	<i>-3.55</i>	<i>-2.34</i>
<i>Writing</i>	<i>-1.37</i>	<i>-1.34</i>
<i>Maths</i>	<i>-6.33</i>	<i>-5.83</i>

In the writing progress scatterplot, there are three distinct groups - why is this?

There are 4 groups, disadvantaged not SEN, disadvantaged SEN, SEN not disadvantaged, not SEN and not disadvantaged.

SEF

1. What are the main revisions that have been made to the SEF following the feedback from Denise Walker and Simon Davies please?

The honesty and reflective thinking that went into the first draft acted as a kind of 'line in the sand' moment where we examined the areas we needed to improve and, quite rightly, focused on them in the first version of the SEF to ensure we had captured our secure understanding of the things that needed to be acted upon. They are still present. However, when we read it we didn't feel that it sounded like our school. It was too negative in as much as it didn't celebrate enough of what is great about the school.

The revised version talks more about our curriculum (a key focus for Ofsted) and the opportunities afforded to the children during their time here. The updated SEF more closely reflects our school although it in no way avoids identifying the key areas for improvement. There is also more contextual information about the socio-economic context of the school to convey a better understanding that our school is broadly average in comparison to national figures in terms of deprivation.

Attendance

2. How concerned are staff about the drop in attendance this term? The measures taken to improve look similar to ones you have already deployed – is your plan to continue to embed these actions or is there any other support you need?

It's worth considering the fact that the actions we have in place have enabled us to meet our attendance targets previously. However, we

have been hit by term time holidays that parents have taken. The specific groups (disadvantaged for example) are also targeted with intervention such as free breakfast and sports clubs. We are looking at how to engage more disadvantaged families to take up this offer.

Maths Action Plan

- When will you be in a position to add numerical targets (using NFER data) into the success criteria so we can track outcomes against the plan?

NFER data should inform Teacher Assessment. Assessment information will use NFER as a basis for judgements and only in exceptional circumstances would a NFER score be different to an assessment. We have set targets for all teachers that should align progress to meet or exceed national expectations. These targets are as follows:

Year	Low starters Inc PP and SEND			Average starters Inc PP and SEND			Higher starters Inc PP and SEND	
	Stretch	Below	20-25% ES	2% HS/GD?	Below	80% + ES	20%+ HS/GD?	100% ES?
National Reality		R 20% W 23% M 14%	R 2% W 0% M 1%		R 74% W 86% M 75%	R 17% W 13% M 13%	R 98% W 100% M 98%	R 61% W 67% M 63%
RWM		7%	0%		58%	2%	95%	28%

Of course, NFER data will also show progress just in terms of test data scores (standardised). This can easily be presented using NFER's progress tracking graphs that will show progress from the baselines completed this term. They will show a scatter graph of progress that is similar to the document you have been given (ISDR) for Year 6 analysis from 2018.

- For future versions, in the 'RAG' column, could you classify progress as red (off track and needs escalating), amber (off track but corrective action in place), and green (on track) against each action?

Item 5. Strategy doc

- Can we make the metrics more specific with numerical targets (linked back to the Maths action plan, etc)?

The targets above in the answer to question 3 are embedded in teachers' PMR and should enable us to ensure we are tracking progress for each subject. It would seem sensible to use this as the numerical target to use to measure effectiveness for each of Reading, Writing and Maths.

Attendance

"Attendance as a whole is down from this time last year in all year groups. We are still getting many requests for holidays, especially around holiday time. A significant amount of children were 'ill' the three days before the half term holiday that began on the Thursday."

	<p>Are the measures taken to reduce holiday requests likely to impact on the Christmas holidays? Given that the school finishes on a Tuesday and returns on a Thursday so the potential for the same issue to be repeated is high. Is there anything additional that can be done to prevent the reoccurrence in the short term?</p> <p><i>I will be including this in my next newsletter. There's little else we can do apart from reiterate good attendance, follow our procedures for communication with those whose attendance is a concern, fine anyone who hits the criteria but parents are now quite clever about taking the maximum time before fines kick in or phoning to say their child is ill!</i></p> <p>"Two children are attending Morning Clubs with Premier Sports that are paid for by the school in order to maintain high levels of attendance."</p> <p>Is there potential for this offer to be extended to help increase the attendance of more targeted pupils?</p> <p><i>It has been extended to everyone but there is little take up. However we intend to send a flyer to every PP pupil & parent in regards to our full offer for them and also offer the activities to poor attenders. This will be sent out for the new term.</i></p> <p>Re Norwich Opportunities Area and Inclusion Charter</p> <p>"From the Inclusion Charter we have a project underway for Y3 disengaged or at risk of exclusion run by Norwich City Community Sports Foundation. This is a six week project and we are into week 4. It hasn't been able to fully engage all of the children but there have been some of the children have benefitted from this time out of class to work to work on social skills and team work."</p> <p>What measures are being taken to increase the success of this intervention and maximise the outcomes for the pupils not fully engaged?</p> <p><i>Dawn has been liaising with the group around behaviour management however they do not have the skills to work with those very high end needs children. This needs to be fed back to the Inclusion team as they will be paying a lot of money for this. A different intervention is being sought (with funding) for those not participating fully or been distracting to the group. These children have needs that are really beyond the expertise of this group.</i></p>	
<p>5</p>	<p>Strategy Paper</p>	
	<p>A question had been raised regarding "Building Resilience" as to whether an entry as well as an exit survey should be conducted. It was suggested this could possibly involve pupils. DD cautioned about too many questionnaires for pupils.</p> <p>Governors raised the issue of the metric for Item 2. It was requested that hard numerical targets should be added. Governors also queried how "improved outcomes for pupils" would be measured. It was suggested that this would be shown in the SATs results and benchmarking data. It was noted that it will take time to build the data, as the assessment tools are new to the school. However, it was finally agreed that this is an over-arching document and that specific</p>	

	<p>targets should be contained within other documents and plans such as the SDIP.</p> <p>Governors agreed to run the strategy for the year and review in September 2019.</p>	
6	Governors' Monitoring Plan- review and agree.	
	<p>It was suggested that this needs a small working party to clarify the key monitoring opportunities for governors. There is overlap and repetition with the SDIP and too many actions in the current plan.</p> <p>It was agreed that DD, MH, NP and MG would meet to work on this document.</p>	DD to send SDIP to NP and MG as soon as possible.
7	Safeguarding – Child Criminal Exploitation; communication of issues.	
	<p>MG had attended a session regarding Youth Offending and posted supporting papers on Governor Hub. He told the governors about the County Lines, whereby young persons are caught up in drug supplying. The situation he described was very serious, often involving vulnerable and disaffected pupils. The close vicinity of a park was mentioned. It was noted that Norfolk Operation Gravity had discovered a huge number of children involved.</p> <p>Q: Will this be included in the PSHE curriculum? A: Yes, but the school needs time to consider how best to approach this. Drugs education is delivered in Year 5 and 6, so it could be built into this. The Safer Neighbourhood Police Officer has made contact with the school and may be a useful contact. MH explained that it was to do with making good choices and not so much the “stranger danger” of the past.</p> <p><i>7.07 p.m. SJ arrived.</i></p>	
8	Staffing – PMR Update	
	<p>The staff and Headteacher PMRs have taken place. JM, MG and SJ were involved in the Headteacher PMR which they reported to be a very rigorous process and format on this round.</p> <p>The Staff Code of Conduct had been placed on Governor Hub prior to the meeting. <i>This was approved and agreed.</i></p>	
9	Attendance Targets	
	This item had been discussed in Item 4 of this meeting.	
10	Parking Permit consultation – AJS GB response	
	<p>MG had met with Parkside School to discuss the issues associated with the proposed parking permit system around the school. One of the main issues is that of staff parking. Out of 74 staff, 30 drive to the school due to the distance they travel. There are 13 parking spaces on the school site, so staff rely on road parking. DD is due to have a meeting with John Atkin on Wednesday 5th December. One governor has been active in the past, canvassing people in the local streets and has been able to prove that there are spaces available at various times of the day. On a previous occasion, residents were not in favour of a permit scheme. Other issues included grandparents involved in child-care, visitors to the school (including professionals and agencies) and the lack of a drop-off or waiting bay. It was noted that there were no 30 minute or 2 hour waiting zones planned; visitors would have a 4 hour limit to park.</p> <p>Q: Will the school respond to the consultation? A: Yes, the school is against it. It was suggested that governors respond individually rather than as a body.</p>	DD to advise governors of the result of the 5/12/18 meeting via Governor Hub.

	Governors felt that there were safety issues as spaces would be taken out and replaced with double yellow lines. Other levers were suggested such as the press and local council.	
11	Committee Action points and recommendations	
	<p>a) Resources Committee MG informed the governors that due to an error on the DfE's behalf, the school will receive an extra £643 in the grant to support the Teachers' pay rise. The support staff pay awards and increased teachers' pension contributions are not in the current budget and will be addressed at Revision 3.</p> <p>Q: In the revision, can the SEND funding be explained? A: There was a small carry-forward from the cluster; £16,351 was also received but DD has been applying for more funding for some pupils. It was noted that the figure for last year was between 28K and 29K, meaning that this year has suffered a nearly 50% decrease in funding.</p> <p>Q: How are we funding the shortfall? A: The school has to make up the shortfall but it is difficult. DD continues to seek funding from various sources.</p> <p>b) T,L & PW Committee Governors were informed that the Post Ofsted Rapid Action committee had now been incorporated into the work of the TL & PW Committee.</p>	
12	Policy Reviews	
	<p>i. Pay Policy</p> <p>ii. Performance Management Review Policy</p> <p>iii. Finance Policy</p> <p>iv. Lettings Policy</p> <p>v. Respect Policy</p>	
	<p>It was noted that the Pay Policy and the Performance Management Policy had been emailed to staff for consultation. There were no responses. MG explained that the signatories for the School Fund Account had been changed within the Finance Policy.</p> <p>MG proposed all five policies and they were approved unanimously.</p>	
13	Governor training and monitoring visits	
	<p>The following training and monitoring visits were noted:</p> <p>JM – Asbestos monitoring</p> <p>NP – Ofsted walk with VNET and JT</p> <p>NP and MG have attended Part 2 of the Govern Ed course.</p> <p>MG has reviewed Pupil Premium</p> <p>PH has been asked to conduct a Governor Risk Assessment matrix.</p> <p>LC – Sports and Data Improvement courses</p> <p>MG – Norwich Opportunities Area Governors Training</p> <p>AI – Well-being monitoring</p> <p>NGN Conference was attended by DD, MB and MG.</p>	
14	Disability / Equality Issues	
	None	
15	Correspondence	
	<p>i. The Governing Body had received a letter from Norfolk County Council informing them that the school had been graded Amber.</p>	

	<p>The reason given was the rate of progress between Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 over the last three years.</p> <p>ii. NP issued governors with passwords for nsix accounts.</p>	
16	Any other Business	
	<p>i. Governors checked when the PAN should be reviewed. This was last reviewed February 2018. Governors briefly discussed the role and whether there was significant turbulence.</p> <p>ii. Governors were made aware that there had been a problem with the communication with some parents about the arrangements for their children to receive a flu inoculation. Some children had also been out of school on a trip when the inoculations were given. This has resulted in a number of children missing out on the vaccination. Governors queried whether staff could have inoculations but it was agreed that they did not meet the categories to obtain it free from a GP. It was noted that future communications would be by e-consent.</p>	Clerk to add PAN to FGB meeting in Feb 2019
17	<p>Dates of 2019 FGB Meetings -: Monday 25th February 2019 (* This was corrected from previously advised 26th February.) Monday 1st April 2019 Monday 1st July 2019</p>	
18	Confidential Items	

Meeting closed at 20.20.