



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

held at Avenue Road, Norwich Norfolk  
**on Monday 25<sup>th</sup> February 2019 at 6pm**

**GOVERNORS PRESENT:** Nania Poulson (Chair), Debbie Dismore (HT) Michael Hooper, Mike Grimble, Jo Thompson, Lisa Crossman, Ally Ireson, Baiba Zivtins, Sian Jones, Peter Hundleby, Nicola Teasdale

**Clerk: Sheila Lewis-Smith**

No	Item	Action
<b>1</b>	<b>Welcome and Apologies</b>	
	Apologies from Jason Menezes, Rachel Paley, Margaret Bird and Sam Rowbury were given and accepted. It was noted that Toby Whalen had resigned from the governing body. The governors expressed their thanks for all his contribution and work for the governing body.	<b>NP to thank Toby</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Declaration of Business/Pecuniary Interests or Conflict of Interests</b>	
	NP works for VNET	
<b>3</b>	<b>Minutes of the meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2018 - accuracy</b>	
	All actions were either completed or on-going. The minutes were agreed as a true and accurate record and signed by NP.	
<b>4</b>	<b>Minutes of the meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2018 – matters arising</b>	
	There were no matters arising but governors observed that there had not been many actions in the minutes and felt that they should always attempt to be proactive and reactive as a governing body.	
<b>5</b>	<b>Headteacher's Report and SEF update – questions to HT before meeting</b>	
	No questions had been raised regarding the HT's report prior to the meeting. <u>SEF</u> – Governors observed that it was a full, thorough and well-mapped out document. <b>Q: Can the apparent fall back in results in Year 4 for reading be explained?</b> A: Yes, in September the figure was 91% (broadly at) and in December it was 82%. The school has changed its assessment system during this time. The previous one, Herts for Learning, included children at the low end of expected level. The new NFER tests are standardised and	<b>DD and MH to add an amendment/note to the top of the SEF detailing change in assessment systems.</b>

Signed as a true and accurate record:

Date:

	<p>cuts out some pupils previously classed as “broadly at expected” level. Governors suggested removing the terminology “broadly at” on the tables.</p> <p><b>Q: Why is the terminology “Higher standard” in Maths and Reading but “Greater depth” for Writing?</b> A: These are terms used by the Key Stage 2 measures of attainment for the various subjects.</p> <p><b>Q: Was the result for Year 4 in September from the end of Year 3?</b> A: Yes, so the end of Spring assessments should show improvements in the results.</p> <p><b>Q: is the SEF a good reflection of the school?</b> A: Yes, we have reflected the gains that have been made, particularly in maths. It now reflects and acknowledges achievements; inconsistencies have been addressed. Where improvements are still needed, such as in some historic results, they are reflected in the SEF.</p> <p>MG acknowledged that a great deal of effort had been put into the school by a lot of people.</p> <p><u>Attendance:</u> One pupil is arriving late after registers close every day. A great deal of support has been put in for this pupil but currently the situation remains the same. DD suggested that she creates 2 sets of data-one with and one without the pupil. It was stressed that it was important to get this pupil into school on a daily basis due to safeguarding issues.</p> <p><b>Q: The PP Absence target is set at 6%. Where is it currently?</b> A: At 7.7%. The school were told to reduce the PP absence in line with the Non PP pupil absence and the school is moving towards this. The governors were happy that the school has reduced the figure from 17% last year to 7.7% this year. DD added that the school has a number of approaches to address poor attendance including home visits, phone calls and prioritising families.</p> <p><u>Safeguarding:</u> <b>Q: How is CPOMS being integrated into other systems?</b> A: The school is currently refining the system and the DSL’s are due to meet this week. By the end of March, it is anticipated that all teaching and support staff will be able to access and use the system. DD felt that the one of the best parts was that the system allowed quicker feedback to the person who raised the concern.</p> <p><b>Q: How user friendly is it for all staff?</b> A: The MSAs will not be using the system but will refer directly to safeguarding leads. Other staff will be able to access the system confidentially via a computer in the finance office. NT reported that it was quicker and easier to use than the current system.</p> <p><b>Q: What else can the system capture?</b> A: Behaviour, bullying and prejudice related acts.</p> <p><b>Q: What is the annual cost?</b> A: £800</p> <p><b>Q: Given that the number of safeguarding reports has increased, is it possible to compare school figures with national figures?</b> A: There is no comparison that is readily available; the school compares year on year.</p> <p><b>Q: Is the increase due to actual incidents rising or are staff better at reporting?</b> A: People can report more effectively now and the school has seen a rise over the last three years in both numbers and types of concern.</p> <p><b>Q: The figure looks low in Year 4?</b> A: This is a settled cohort overall with lower levels of SEN and PP than is average in the school. The cohort is also two thirds girls.</p> <p><b>Q: We note that there are four fixed term exclusions.</b> A: This is a reflection of the type of challenges faced by the staff and pupils, where a number of pupils are physically very challenging. The support for these</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>pupils has been high but the school now has drawn a line when it comes to the level of abuse to staff seen in some pupils. These have been fixed term exclusions but some may become permanent if behaviours do not change.</p> <p><b>Q: Have the exclusions helped the situation?</b> A: It can do in some instances, especially where there is parental support and they have taken some responsibility. Whilst the school has its Behaviour Policy, exceptions are made when children have additional needs. However, it is recognised that some children choose their poor behaviour.</p> <p><b>Q: How long do you exclude for?</b> A: It varies but usually up to 5 days. Alternative provision to educate the child has to be made from day 6 of an exclusion.</p> <p><b>Q: How does the Norwich Opportunity Area charter help?</b> A: The school does all in the charter and more. A managed move can be considered, to place the pupil for a trial period in another school. They may return or the school may take a pupil form elsewhere. The Inclusion Lead from NOA, Andy Turvill has visited the school to access our inclusion policy and is supportive of all the support in place.</p> <p><b>Q: What incentive does the school have to take a managed move pupil?</b> A: None really as it is a protocol in the NOA. Governors considered how this worked with the Fair Access Protocol, where parents have choices.</p> <p><b>Q: We have signed the Inclusion Charter, but what does this mean in cases such as this?</b> A: We have accessed some counselling support for it. Dawn Jones is the Inclusion Champion for the school. It was suggested that a governor should attend the Norwich Opportunity Area Inclusion training. This is to be held on 15<sup>th</sup> March, either 2-4 p.m. or 7-9 p.m. at The Mercure Hotel, Boundary Road.</p> <p><b>Q: Are we a more inclusive school than others?</b> A: We are inclusive and we put a lot of resources and support into being inclusive. There is, however, a tension between the increase in needs and the decrease in funding.</p>	<p>Govs to attend NOA Inclusion training – MG Part 1 and others (JT) Part 1 and 2.</p>
<b>6</b>	<b>Safeguarding;</b>	
	<p>The Safeguarding Action Plan was reviewed by MH and MG had created actions. Most of the actions are on-going.</p> <p><b>Q: When was the SCR last checked?</b> A: By NP in October 2018. <i>It was agreed that NP should conduct the Safeguarding Audit / SCR check.</i></p>	<p>NP to conduct Safeguarding Checklist by next FGB Meeting 1<sup>st</sup> April 2019</p>
<b>7</b>	<b>Approval of PAN, as agreed by email</b>	
	<p>This had previously been discussed with governors by e-mail. <i>It was agreed unanimously to keep the PAN at 120 places for 2020 - 21</i></p>	
<b>8</b>	<b>Review of Spring School Census</b>	
	<p>Governors asked what information this census captured. DD informed governors that it detailed numbers on role, ethnicity, SEN, etc. It was noted that there are only 116 places filled out of 120 available in Year 3. Governors discussed how the school could attract pupil numbers. One issue is that parents hold the places they are offered but subsequently do not take up the place as they choose to go into private education and therefore children on the waiting list are given alternative placements. Birth rate has an impact – Year 5 and 6 are currently full whereas across the city Y3 is lower. Governors discussed how useful the issuing of a prospectus would be, although this is readily available for no cost to the school on the website. Social Media was suggested as means of self-</p>	

	advertising. Governors praised the school's recent engagement in Climate Protest, which had resulted in TV coverage for the school. DD agreed to add information about the financial impact to schools of parents not taking up places at school in future literature regarding Year 3 entry to the school.	
<b>9</b>	<b>SFVS – for submission 28<sup>th</sup> February</b>	
	NP thanked MG and DD for their work in completing this. MG confirmed that it has been submitted and congratulated governors on the good level of financial training that had been undertaken. He confirmed that the SVFS is looked at by the Financial Support Officer and provides good evidence of financial diligence.	
<b>10</b>	<b>Parking Permit consultation - update</b>	
	<p>Governors were informed that a proposal had been issued to residents today. This proposed that Caernarvon, Swansea, Wellington and Milford roads would not be permitted, which could cause more issues around the vicinity of the school.</p> <p><b>Q: Is this unhelpful for staff?</b> A: Yes, the school will need to revisit its Travel Plan. The school remains concerned about the situation for staff, visitors and children. There will be just 3 parking permits issued to the school, which will need to be used for visitors and not the 74 staff. The "Lift Share" scheme that runs in Norwich was mentioned. Governors discussed the purpose of creating parking permit areas and the pressure the proposals will put on parking around the school. It was not felt useful or necessary to take any further action or respond at this time.</p>	
<b>11</b>	<b>Committee Action Points and recommendations</b>	
	<p><b>11.1 Resources</b></p> <p><u>11.1.1 Budget Revision 3</u></p> <p>MG advised that Year 3 in the budget is currently in deficit as additional government grant funding is not guaranteed in the third year. It was noted that the budget is incredibly tight and of real concern. One example given was the Educational Psychology support; the school previously had 21 days under the cluster arrangement. This costs £390 a day, so the school does not think they can afford the previous level of support and will have to prioritise, which will be a struggle.</p> <p>The LA have accepted the budget plan for one year only, as they cannot accept deficit budgets. The school is overspending by £65,000 which will increase. It is not tenable to keep using up surpluses to cover this overspend. The National Funding Formula might result in less funding and it was suggested that a large number of schools are struggling to balance Year 3, whilst those with large numbers of PP receive additional funding. The school is still awaiting the SEN funding, although the TLPW Committee had noted that this has halved in the last year. The PP funding is fairly static.</p> <p><b>Q: Can PP funding be spent on teachers?</b> A: Yes, it is already.</p> <p><b>Q: Is the PP funding based on accurate numbers?</b> A: As far as the school knows; information is sent out to parents regarding how and when they might qualify for FSM. It was suggested that Universal Credit might reduce the PP numbers.</p> <p>The school expected the 2019-20 budget to be issued in the next few days. The NGA has made representations to MPs regarding budgetary pressures. Governors observed that a school of AJS's size was impossible to run with a decreasing budget; supply cover is essential, given the workload in the</p>	

	<p>school and the need for release time to achieve this.</p> <p><b>11.1.2 Staff</b> The school is not in a position to extend temporary contracts and some staffing may need to be reduced. <b>Q: What does this mean in real terms?</b> A: It may be necessary to review the support staff levels against the needs of the children. We will ensure the essentials are met and may have to do some things differently.</p> <p><b>11.1.3 Premises</b> There are no major plans and the school has been advised that the oil found in the store may be left there, as it is fine where it is. <b>Q: Will the work be done in Peapods?</b> A: Yes, one room will be split into two and we are prioritising other areas to spend capital budget.</p> <p><b>11.1.4 Health and Safety Monitoring Report</b> No further information available.</p> <p><b>11.2 Teaching, Learning and Pupil Wellbeing</b> The Chair of this committee said that the governors had asked for more robust reporting in English and Maths and that the school had responded to this, which addressed how confident the governors felt about how the in-year data will impact on the final results. There was clarity about the attainment and progress across cohorts and groups. Secondly, the governors were told about the presentation on the Curriculum that had been led by Assistant Head, Steve Chambers. This work was in response to Ofsted's new requirements regarding the curriculum. SJ said that there had been information about metacognition and how the content is sequenced and planned. The presentation had shown the curriculum to be interesting and balanced.</p>	
<b>12</b>	<b>Policy Reviews</b>	
	<p><b>Resources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pay Policy -</li> <li>- Performance Management Review Policy</li> <li>- Charging Policy</li> <li>- Governor Expenses Policy</li> </ul> <p><b><i>All four policies proposed by MG and seconded by SJ.</i></b></p> <p><b>Teaching, Learning and Pupil Wellbeing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assessment Policy</li> <li>- Home School Agreement 9 incorporating policy on Social Media)</li> </ul> <p>These policies were postponed for approval by FGB.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Anti-bullying Policy</li> </ul> <p><b><i>This policy was proposed by NP and seconded by SJ.</i></b> It was noted that the pupil contribution is still to be updated and added.</p>	
<b>13</b>	<b>Governor training/ monitoring visits/ involvement in school form</b>	
	No further updates given.	
<b>14</b>	<b>Disability/ Equality Issues</b>	
	None	
<b>15</b>	<b>Correspondence</b>	
	None	
<b>16</b>	<b>Any other business</b>	
	None	

Signed as a true and accurate record:

Date:

<b>17</b>	<b>Dates of 2019 FGB Meetings -:</b> <b>Monday 1<sup>st</sup> April 2019 at 6 p.m.</b> <b>Monday 1<sup>st</sup> July 2019 at 6 p.m.</b>	
<b>18</b>	<b>Confidential Items</b> One item presented. Separate minutes produced.	

Meeting closed at 19.47

Signed as a true and accurate record:

Date: