

## BRIGHTER FUTURES MULTI ACADEMY TRUST

### Luddendenfoot Academy - LGB meeting

Date: Monday 19<sup>th</sup> September 2016 **(PUBLIC MINUTES)**

Time: 6.00pm

**Attendees:** V Knight (Academy Director/Chair), P Foulkes (Parent Director), Y Ratledge (Parent Governor), M Briggs, (Parent Governor), L Harper (Staff Governor,)) J Crawshaw (Parent Governor), R Denham (HoS), C Roberts (Clerk)

ITEM	MINUTE	ACTION
1. si	<b>Apologies and consent for absence</b>	
	Received and accepted from K Maddock.	
2. si	<b>Declaration of interest</b>	
	None.	
3 si	<b>Matters Arising and Approval of Previous Minutes</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minutes accepted as a true record.</li> </ul>	
4. si	<b>Items declared confidential</b>	
	None.	
5. si	<b>Urgent business not identified on agenda</b>	
	None.	
6.	<b>GLD, KS1 and KS2 2016 results</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GLD result was 82.4% above national of 69.2% and in line with 2015.</li> <li>• KS1 results:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reading 81.8% ; National – 74.1%</li> <li>○ Writing 81.8% ; National – 65.5%</li> <li>○ Maths 81.8% ; National 72.7%</li> <li>○ Science 86.4% ; National 81.8%</li> <li>○ Combined 72.7% ; National 60.3%</li> </ul> </li> <li>• KS2 results:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reading 92.3% ; National 65.5% ; LA 65.4%</li> <li>○ Writing 77% ; National 74% ; LA 59.2%</li> <li>○ Maths 61.5% ; National 69.5% ; LA 66.2%</li> <li>○ Spag 84.6% ; National 72.2% ; LA 68.6%</li> <li>○ Science 86.4% ; National 80.8% ; LA 74.7%</li> <li>○ Combined 61.5% ; National 53% ; LA 46%</li> </ul> </li> <li>• HoS advised that writing could have been slightly higher 1/19 was slightly borderline.</li> <li>• Maths – 5 children did not achieve expected target 2 of 5 missed by 2 marks so dropped below.</li> <li>• All results in all areas were above national and LA with exception of KS2 maths. HoS reported it was great that we had maintained our results despite the challenge of the new curriculum. No downward trends have been identified despite a shift in expectations.  <b>Q:</b> is there anything we could have done for maths?  <b>A:</b> HoS advised there was nothing we could have done in regard to teaching. It was all down to individual children. Paper 3 (3-4 step problems) had been particularly challenging to some children and was a tough paper.</li> <li>• All members agreed that staff and children had all worked really hard and passed on thanks for their great effort.</li> </ul>	

ITEM	MINUTE	ACTION
7.	<p><b>KS1 and KS2 progress 2015-16</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HoS advised currently haven't got anything back on how we are going to measure progress.</li> <li>• KS1 – 1 chd had not made progress in writing but came up as a GLD exceeding but was more borderline so it was more appropriate to reflect this at KS1.  <b>Q:</b> Is KS2 exceeding based on KS1 exceeding?  <b>A:</b> It was previously based on a child's baseline, but the national baseline last year not reliable so it is not statutory to complete this this year.</li> <li>• KS2 - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reading: 2 children who had exceeded – but had got expected at KS1. We are not comparing like for like so can't compare as two different curriculums.  <b>Q:</b> Are we confident we are consistent in our assessments?  <b>A:</b> HoS reported different forms of evidence are taken into consideration which includes looking at books/reviewing SATs tests/class work etc. We were also moderated by a LA moderator who sat with teachers and went through all children's books. Any queries raised were revisited to ensure they were accurate.</li> <li>○ Maths – 5 chd from GLD made accelerated was adjusted to expected. 3 chd did not reach expected.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• KS1 to KS2 scale scores: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reading – 1 chd didn't meet KS2 but was a level 1 at KS1.</li> <li>○ Writing – all achieved.</li> <li>○ Maths – 2 chd who got 2b should have made expected standard but were borderline so will be flagged up as not matching progress on review.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
8.	<p><b>Phonics screening 2015-16</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% pass rate for phonics; national 80.6% second year of achieving 100%.</li> </ul>	
9.	<p><b>FR attainment and progress 2015-16</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This will be revisited at the next meeting as information was not present on GVO for all Governors.</li> </ul>	
10.	<p><b>In-year progress analysis 2015-16 (Y1, 3, 4 &amp; 5)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HoS reported overall all classes did well:</li> <li>• Y1 – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 3 chd were below age related (all boys). One child didn't get GLD. The general pattern is chd at mastery get to secure. Chd assessed at mastery are those children who achieved secure.  <b>Q:</b> How are we meeting needs?  <b>A:</b> Decisions are pushed up through cohort action plans that identify where targeted intervention is needed to bring chd up to secure.</li> <li>○ 1 child who was working below has now left the school.  <b>Q:</b> Is it common for parents to move children to another school?  <b>A:</b> No, the child had issues linked to concentration/behaviour/parental control but thought they were school issues. Another child moved due to receiving a fine from the LA.</li> <li>○ Y1 - 100% pass rate in Phonics. Reading and the national curriculum don't match up to what is needed in phonics. If chd haven't got the comprehension chd cannot be assessed at secure. Reading comprehension is not been given and the trust is taking a tough approach so we don't get hit hard on judgements. If we cannot see evidence secure hasn't been given.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

ITEM	MINUTE	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Y3 – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A group of chd in reading 75% at age related; 25% are not. Ten chd are struggling with reading but are making small steps of progress in term of national figure. These chd are always going to struggle if we use limiting judgements. Group work is in place working on basic skills/self-esteem/confidence, but will always show up on data. All members agreed that as long as these chd receive support and targeted intervention and show progress that is all we ask for even though on data they will show at working below age related.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Y4 – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Writing - 5 chd working below age related. Chd made good progress, 1 recently been assessed and making good progress but is still below age related. Vast majority are age related – 2 chd 1 step below; 2 chd working in Y3 curriculum.</li> <li>○ Spelling – issue for 1 chd. 2 chd working on Y3 curriculum; 2 working slightly below age related.</li> <li>○ All made accelerated progress and have managed to narrow the gap.</li> <li>○ Maths – 1 chd made 6 steps progress – only have to make 4 steps</li> <li>○ 3 chd made 5 steps; 1 chd made 3 steps who was working at mastery and has just slipped back so is receiving help to keep up with peers.</li> <li>○ Reading – similar chd working below now all made 6 steps accelerated progress. 1 chd has made 3 steps and is a high attainer.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Y5 – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reading – 5 chd working below age related; 1 chd moved from another school. All made expected progress – vast majority made 5/6 steps progress.</li> <li>○ Writing – all children made expected progress all chd bar 1 made 5/6 steps progress. 4 chd -5d should have been 5s due to couple of limiting judgements. Some chd at 4s are having targeted interventions</li> <li>○ Maths – HoS advised she has looked back into SIMS to identify limiting judgements. Appropriate interventions are in place. Most chd made 5 steps progress. 4 chd working below – and will be picked up quickly with interventions to achieve age related.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Q:</b> Are we confident we have enough resources to do all interventions?  <b>A:</b> HoS advised it is challenging; we don't have any support in Y6 in the afternoon to pick up additional support.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Have we applied for extra funding?  <b>A:</b> Yes, but not got information on outcome of request.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> What is the biggest stretch?  <b>A:</b> FR is challenging we have 1 statemented chd; 1 child waiting for an EHC plan 4 SEN chd; 1EAL plus the lower chd in Y1. Y1/2 – spread of higher Y2 &amp; lower Y1. Teacher has 9 groups for maths to plan which is proving demanding. Y4/5 – HoS teaching maths chd have been put in sets and is working well and is adding evaluations of chd to SIMs assessment on a daily basis. Y5/6 – Due to size of cohort (32) and limited space have had to split the class for literacy/reading comprehension between class teacher and TA (RD).  No spare capacity in staff for things so for examples displays around school are not all in place as we would have hoped. Trips will be coordinated quite closely and if classes in different year groups are doing the same topics trips may be planned together.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Have we reached a point where we say we are full?  <b>A:</b> HoS reported a parent of an Y4 chd is visiting on Friday, need to assess</p>	

ITEM	MINUTE	ACTION
	<p>whether we can manage another child in Y4 / 5 class if place is required. Census day is 6<sup>th</sup> October so we would not expect to take any more children after this date.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Do we know how many chd we need on roll to be financially viable for 6 teachers?</p> <p><b>A:</b> Chair (VK) and Parent Director (PF) will follow this up at the next trust board meeting as agreed that large mixed class sizes are putting a strain on staff team.</p>	VK / PF
<b>11.</b>	<b>Pupil Premium Group attainment and progress evaluation</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HoS advised because we have low numbers of pp chd in each class the percentages are very high for each child. This makes the data skewed when looking at Raise on line so the information cannot be taken in isolation as it looks like we have issues with pp.</li> <li>• Reviewed all PP and looked at whether below age related – not much of a gap between PP and non PP.</li> </ul>	
<b>12.</b>	<b>SEND group attainment &amp; progress evaluation</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall progress is good, children have made expected progress but not working at age related.</li> <li>• Limiting judgments for SEN under the new assessments will mean many chd are not going to look like they are at age related. HoS advised as a trust this is something that needs looking at. HoS advised that an additional parents meeting for vulnerable chd to inform parents earlier in the year will be arranged. This will be organised at a staff meeting.</li> </ul>	
<b>13.</b>	<b>Attendance data and evaluation 2015-16</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall whole school attendance for the 2015-16 - 96.8%.</li> <li>• Chd classed as persistent absentees reduced from 12 at the start to 8 at the end of the year.</li> <li>• Last year's persistent absentees have been flagged up and will be monitored.</li> </ul> <p><b>Q:</b> Should we aspire as a school to have some chd go to Grammar school?</p> <p><b>A:</b> Members agreed it might be something to consider to maintain numbers for the school. CH is changing it's admission policy as schools are realising that chd are being taught to past entrance tests but are not always academically more able across the curriculum. Verbal reasoning would need to be offered to chd wanting to sit the exams, maybe as after school club.</p>	
<b>14.</b>	<b>Safeguarding Audit report/GB self-evaluation and section 11 audit</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deferred to next meeting.</li> </ul>	
<b>15.</b>	<b>Home School Agreement</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HoS advised that a draft of an e-safety agreement form for parents has been created and if approved will become part of the Home School Agreement. HoS to circulate the form. Members asked to feedback to HoS and bring back to next meeting.</li> <li>• All members agreed that we have a responsibility to look after chd and educate them and are not prepared to have chd/teachers bullied by parents.</li> </ul>	HoS
<b>16.si</b>	<b>SDP link governors and visits</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HoS advised that EYFs will have an action plan not an SDP this year.</li> <li>• SDPs will be agreed at the next meeting.</li> </ul>	
<b>17.si</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Following a couple of instances of negative feedback from parents being received. A discussion took place around the Code of Conduct and the need for all governors to be mindful of how they conduct themselves and to remember that at times as a 'parent/teacher/governor' there is a need to be careful not to show frustration to other parents as we need to be supportive of the school.</li> </ul>	

ITEM	MINUTE	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chair reported that in-house training is being planned and the issues around being a parent governor and how to deal with issues in the right way and managing a level of distance could be a suggested topic.</li> <li>• Parent Director (PF) also signposted members to Calderdale One training offered as it provides an opportunity to find out how other schools deal with issues which can be shared with members. Clerk to email list of courses available to members. If members would like to attend any of the training please let clerk know.  <b>Q:</b> If there was one thing that would help the school's situation what would it be?  <b>A:</b> Increase in staff.</li> <li>• HoS stated that we need to encourage more parental engagement and if parents had appropriate skills and were willing to volunteer in school we would be grateful for any help.  <b>Q:</b> is there any spare capacity higher up the trust?  <b>A:</b> Possibly having admin apprentice for 2 days a week in the future.</li> </ul>	<b>Clerk</b>

There being no further business the meeting closed at 8:30pm

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

Version	Issue date	Change history
1.0	22.09.16	First draft of minutes
2.0	27.09.16	Approved in principle by Chair