

## BRIGHTER FUTURES MULTI ACADEMY TRUST

### Luddendenfoot Academy - LGB meeting

Date: Monday 18<sup>th</sup> September 2017 **(PUBLIC MINUTES)**

Time: 6.00pm

**Attendees:** V Knight (Academy Director/Chair), Peter Foulkes (Academy Trustee), J Crawshaw (Parent Governor), M Briggs (Parent Governor), K Maddock (Staff Governor), Academy member (PB), R Denham (HT), C Roberts (Clerk)

| ITEM  | MINUTE  | ACTION    |
|-------|---|-----------|
| 1. si | <b>Apologies and consent for absence</b>  |           |
|       | Apologies received and accepted for L Harper.   |           |
| 2. si | <b>Declaration of interest</b>  |           |
|       | None.   |           |
| 3 si  | <b>Approval of Previous Minutes/matters arising</b>   |           |
|       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raise online login for governors – HT advised updated data will be released a week on Monday. Logins will be set up to coincide. <b>HT to action.</b></li> <li>• Item 12 – EHC plans: HT advised EHC plans have not yet been received by school. Once received she will be speaking with the LA to discuss contents and identified additional funding requirements that will be needed. As new FR intake have a number of children (chd) who will require significant additional support due to wide range of needs. One Y1 child will be moving to a specialist ASD unit mid-October.</li> <li>• Minutes were accepted as a true record.</li> </ul>   | <b>HT</b> |
| 4. si | <b>Items declared confidential</b>  |           |
|       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>  |           |
| 5. si | <b>Urgent business not identified on agenda</b>   |           |
|       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None.</li> </ul>   |           |
| 6.    | <b>GLD, KS1 - KS2 2016-17</b>   |           |
|       | <p>HT gave a brief summary with the following points discussed and noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GLD – 88%; national 70.7%</li> <li>• KS1-KS2 progress data provided by LA showing progress for R/W/M. LF – Avg pt score 16.2; average pt score at KS1 15 pt, so chd were slightly above. All chd took the test achieved 100%. HT advised if a chd achieved 2b at KS1 – they should achieve expected – so would score 0. If a chd achieved 2C and achieved expected they would score more pts.</li> <li>• Reading + 7.2; Math - + 6.2. Writing – scored +1.4; writing was slightly lower as following moderation 3 chd identified as needing to submit 3 more pieces of work as they were just on the cusp of exceeding. Decision taken that the chd had worked hard enough so extra writing was not submitted. 10 chd got L3 with 3 exceeding.</li> <li>• GLD - KS1 Math: 3 chd just below decision taken to leave at working towards as if they may only have just got to achieved – which would have created more expectation further up school. Reading: quite a group achieved exceeding. 6 chd ready for exceeding; HT has no concerns that children have fallen behind. Writing: similar to reading we could have had between 3-7 chd at exceeding, but came down to consider flair. HT reported she has sort</li> </ul> |           |

| ITEM | MINUTE   | ACTION |
|------|--|--------|
|      | advice from AMS (Literacy Consultant) on how to convert to exceeding at KS2 which will be challenging.   |        |
| 7.   | <b>KS1 &amp; KS2 progress 2016-17</b>  |        |
|      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall LF was top of the LA for progress.</li> </ul>   |        |
| 8.   | <b>Phonics Screening 2016-17</b>   |        |
|      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HT reported the challenge will be convert what we have achieved in KS1. As we are only going to maintain progress by increasing number of children exceeding.</li> </ul>  |        |
| 9.   | <b>FR Attainment &amp; progress report 2016-17</b>   |        |
|      | <p>HT gave a brief summary with the following points discussed and noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One child with an EHC plan; 1 x SEN register. HT advised data has been reviewed but couldn't find any disparities between gender only through SEND, and nature of SEND chd will never make age related expectation. High percentage of chd make expected or exceeded progress. Below expected relate to high attainers. Pupil premium makes no difference in FR.</li> </ul>   |        |
| 10.  | <b>In-year progress analysis (Y1,3,4,5)</b>  |        |
|      | <p>HT gave a brief summary with the following points discussed and noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Y1 – small cohort, but had a massive spread of ability, but vast majority made progress. Quite a spread of chd, with some are accessing Y3 curriculum but we cannot hold them back. High percentage of SEN and behavioural issues to manage.</li> <li>Y2- HT advised this is the cohort that will need to closely monitoring despite best efforts and staff are doing all they can. 4 chd in writing below age related; 1 chd will make slower progress but won't be large enough to change the data. This is similar in Maths.<br/><b>Q: How does the child do with his peers?</b><br/><b>R:</b> HT advised speech &amp; language have discharged him.</li> <li>Y3 – (current Y4) Pupil premium chd are not all the gaps. 3 chd working slightly below age related, which are the same chd we had all through school. Chd were low in Y2 but the gap is not widening. Writing – 4 chd working below. Chd do read in school but don't get opportunity to read as much at home, slower at processing compared to other chd. Maths – 4 chd below, gaps are being closely monitored. Calculation is an issue for these chd so will be revisited.</li> <li>Y4 – (current Y5) Reading: small group of chd below age related, vast majority working above or at. 25% of cohort SEND including 5 dyslexic chd, so lots of additional needs in the cohort. HT advised will need to monitor couple of chd to push them on to make sure they maintain at age related and don't drop off. Targeting small groups as they move to Y5 will take place so they don't fall behind. Writing: same (3) chd as reading that will need to monitored in Y5 so they don't fall behind. 1 new chd has joined Y5 with complex needs, more interventions needed through pastoral support rather than academically. Child is joining in with peers and has made friends. Math: massive spread with high attainers who dip into Y6 curriculum down to Y1 curriculum. Additional TA support for maths in place (moved support from Y6 to Y5 as not needed) to allow staff to work in 3 smaller groups providing more tailored provision.</li> <li>Y5 – (current Y6) Reading: Group of high attainers – small group getting extra support but all working on Y6 curriculum. Similar for Writing &amp; math same chd.</li> </ul> |        |

| ITEM  | MINUTE  | ACTION |
|-------|---|--------|
| 11.   | <b>Attendance data and evaluation 2016-17</b>   |        |
|       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information shared at previous meeting.</li> </ul>   |        |
| 12.   | <b>Home School Agreement (HSA)</b>  |        |
|       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HT advised following some negative parental feedback to statement in LF HSA Parents/Carers will: I, as a parent will: Endeavour to provide a safe, secure &amp; happy environment at home for my child, acknowledging that they learn at home. Following discussion members agreed unanimously that the wording should remain unchanged and that the feedback received from a minority of parents was not justified for the statement to be changed. HSA was approved by members.</li> </ul>   |        |
| 13.   | <b>SDP link governors &amp; visits</b>  |        |
|       | <p>HT gave a brief summary with the following points discussed and noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Curriculum: VK link governor<br/> <b>Q: What is Gooseberry Planet?</b><br/> <b>R:</b> HT advised is it an on-line e-safety course for chd that the school has signed up to, as chd are not following the correct e-safety procedures even though they are aware of them. Decision taken that the best way to tackle this would be to teach them to react to being contacted on-line as opposed to trying to block sites, as they are constantly updating. PF advised that parent/carer with a Google account can provide a guest safeguarding where it is possible to look at what chd have been looking at their mobile devices.<br/> <b>Q: Can the actual cost of the resources be entered to the SDP document?</b><br/> <b>R:</b> HT agreed to add actual cost of resources, to help with the impact/evaluation to help identify whether value for money.<br/> Feedback from chd is positive and class trips are being linked to topic work.</li> <li>Curriculum – Rights Respecting Schools Award – PB link governor<br/> The award is about united nations charter of 52 chd rights and how a school develops the rights into the ethos and behaviour of the school. Objectives have been taken from the rights respect website and will be adapted to become more focused on respect. Aim in the future is to extend to parents as chd are not always given the opportunity to deal with things/issues themselves. Need to try to teach chd that their actions have a consequence and to build resilience. HT advised each strand will be unpicked and looked at to see how it translates to school Code of Conduct etc. Initial feedback from chd has been positive. Will still need to do more research.</li> <li>SEND action plan: considering having an action plan due to wide range of chd with additional needs, inc. Dyslexia. HT advised depending on finances she would like to do some twilight sessions for staff with Francine Garnier.<br/> <b>Q: How up to date are we regarding SEND funding stream?</b><br/> <b>R:</b> HT advised one pot of money 53k of notional budget. Only other help can come from CVC (Calder Valley Cluster) for specific resources the cluster is focussing on.</li> </ul> |        |
| 14.si | <b>AOB</b>  |        |
|       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2018-19 Term Dates: Proposed Calderdale term dates accepted and approved.</li> <li>Art week was a great success, chd enjoyed it and it kept them focussed until the end of term. Teachers learnt lots of new techniques too.</li> <li>School dinners – positive feedback from chd for new meal provider. HT reported Trust Business Manager had worked incredibly hard to sources a</li> </ul>   |        |

| ITEM | MINUTE  | ACTION       |
|------|---|--------------|
|      | <p>new provider and passed on thanks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed planning application by LA to build 45 houses on green belt land near the school. HT understanding of the process was that potential plots of lands were submitted to LA followed by consulting period which closes on 29<sup>th</sup> September. Chair advised that a letter of objection from the school would be drawn up highlighting concerns around impact on traffic congestion &amp; access; safety of site so near a school; potential drainage problems. <b>Chair to action.</b></li> <li>• PB advised still waiting for a response from RSC regarding re-brokering.</li> </ul> | <b>Chair</b> |

There being no further business the meeting closed at 8.00pm

Signed: ..... Date: .....

| Version | Issue date | Change history                 |
|---------|------------|--------------------------------|
| 1.0     | 21.09.17   | First draft of minutes         |
| 2.0     | 25.09.17   | Approved in principle by Chair |