

Minutes of the meeting of Granby Primary School - Full Governors School Improvement Plan (SIP) Meeting

Monday January 25th 2016 @ 5.45pm in the Camelot Room

Present: Abbey Stewart, Dale Cross, Glenys Mulvany (Chair), Graham James, John Dowson, Louisa Kiggell, Nick Sone, Peter Fowler (Head), Rob Penny, Rowena Bass, Sandra Adegun (until 7.20pm)

In attendance: Sue Foreman (Clerk)

<i>Item</i>	<i>Any other business does not appear as an item on this agenda. If governors have AOB, please notify the Clerk prior to the meeting.</i>	<i>Actions</i>
1	<p>Apologies</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Ryan Flack</p>	
2	<p>Declarations of interest</p> <p><i>Governors are expected to declare any actual or potential conflict of interest of any nature including direct and indirect pecuniary interests. Does anyone wish to declare an interest?</i></p> <p>Dale Cross declared a potential conflict of interests in item 7, the review of the management structure. There were no further declarations.</p>	
3	<p>Minutes of the last meeting (accuracy)</p> <p>The minutes of the last meeting were agreed and signed with no amendments.</p>	
4	<p>Matters arising (not elsewhere on the agenda)</p> <p>There were no matters arising.</p>	
5	<p>Governor memberships - resignations, co-options and elections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sue reported that earlier that day she had received an email from Ryan, resigning from the governing board due to work commitments. Governors were sorry to receive this news but completely understood Ryan's position. They expressed their gratitude and appreciation for all that Ryan has done; and look forward to his continued involvement with the PTA. • Parent governor elections - Sue apologised that at the last meeting she erroneously reported that John's term of office came to an end in January 2016. In fact, it does not end until September 2016. A parent governor election will be held to 	

<i>Item</i>		<i>Actions</i>
7	<p>Management structure review cont...</p> <p>A Originally, Peter brought 6 options for consideration. The exec shortlisted these to three and Peter was asked to bring these back to the executive with more detailed information and financial costings.</p> <p>Q What is the purpose of the optional Assistant Head post?</p> <p>A This has been put into the structure to allow flexibility if it is needed. Circumstances when this might be used could include: an inexperienced head or deputy may need additional management support; some unforeseen change in policy; providing for career development opportunities; supporting staff retention (important given the difficulties being experienced locally in appointing heads and deputies).</p> <p>Q What are the next steps?</p> <p>A The next steps would be to gain HR advice and take appropriate action; embark on the consultation process and take appropriate action; bring a final report back to FGB.</p> <p>The recommendation was moved by Graham and seconded by Glenys. It was unanimously agreed by governors.</p> <p>It was also agreed that the Deputy Head salary range should change from L9-13 to L11 - 15 to be backdated to September 1st 2015.</p>	<p>Peter to action</p> <p>Peter to action</p>
8	<p>Academisation Update</p> <p>Peter & Glenys provided an update on academisation. The following points were made and questions asked:</p> <p>Q What actions are being taken towards identifying schools with which to join in a MAT?</p> <p>A It is rather like a courting process where Heads are meeting with others to sound each other out. If the first date goes well, further dates will follow. No-one is ready to propose an engagement just yet!</p> <p>Q Would it be feasible to form a MAT consisting of the schools we already collaborate and work closely with?</p> <p>A This may be possible but the DfE have to give approval and it is generally expected that there will be an outstanding school in a MAT</p> <p>Q Would it be best for the pupils if the MAT is formed from</p>	

<i>Item</i>		<i>Actions</i>
8	<p>Academisation Update cont...</p> <p>local schools and existing partnerships.</p> <p>A There is certainly merit in that argument and it is one of the areas of exploration. It is still early days, but a MAT involving some or all of the schools in Development Group 6 could be a possibility.</p> <p>Q Are we also exploring the possibility of working with Sir Jonathan North Community College?</p> <p>A That is also one of the areas of exploration. It is possible that SJNCC might consider joining a DG6 MAT.</p>	
9	<p>Arbor data review</p> <p>Peter answered the following questions in relation to the KS1 report, the KS2 report and the Ofsted readiness report:</p> <p>Q Does the Arbor report tell us anything we didn't already know from our own data?</p> <p>A No. It confirms mathematics as our main priority for school improvement; and writing as a potential area for school improvement. This confirms our own data.</p> <p>Q Does the Arbor report provide us with independent verification of our data?</p> <p>A Yes Arbor is completely independent like Raise Online but more detailed and easily accessible. It uses data from the DfE and Ofsted</p>	
10	<p>Report on progress made by target groups</p> <p>Peter answered the following questions on the progress made by target groups:</p> <p>Q Is the data on SEN and EAL reliable?</p> <p>A It relates to very small numbers and so is not statistically significant. The 3 year trend data gives us more reliable data on this. Our EAL numbers are rising as we go down the school.</p>	

<p>10</p>	<p>Report on progress made by target groups cont...</p> <p>You can already see 1 EAL child in the KS2 cohort but 5 EAL children in KS1.</p> <p>Q So what about the data for FSM and PP children?</p> <p>A The pupil premium cohort (16 in KS1 and 12 in KS2) is a more reliable sample number.</p> <p>Q What does this tell us about how well we are closing the gap between the achievement of disadvantaged children and the rest?</p> <p>A We can see that our Average Points Scores are at, or marginally below, the national averages and so this is something we need to look at further. We can also see that the gap has closed by between 1 and 2.7 points from 2 years, so the trend is in the right direction.</p> <p>Q What about those non-PP families who are caught in the poverty gap because they earn too much to qualify for PP but who's income is too low to be able to contribute to the things that PP children get for free?</p> <p>A We know that there are families for whom this is true but cannot use PP funding to support them. The data does not show us anything about their achievement.</p>	
<p>11</p>	<p>SIP</p> <p>Peter presented the current version of the SIP. Phase leaders are still working on this as it is a living document which is frequently updated. It was agreed that governors would be asked to review the document and return any questions to Sue by Friday 11th February. These will then be picked up either electronically or at a future meeting.</p> <p>We will continue to look at the SIP in phase forum meetings - next one end of February.</p>	<p>All governors to action</p> <p>Sue to action</p>
<p>12</p>	<p>SEF</p> <p>Governors noted progress to date on the SEF, acknowledging that this is an organic document which is constantly being reviewed. It was agreed to send the current version electronically.</p>	<p>Sue to action</p>

13	<p>Governors effectiveness and CPD</p> <p>Louisa presented an update on governors' CPD. Governors discussed what work should now be progressed on the governor effectiveness agenda. We agreed that everyone will try to something termly. The finance GEL module looks very interesting and would be a good one for everyone to do. Sue will send the link to all governors</p> <p>It was also agreed that we need to review again the action plan we devised after the DB evaluation of governance to check progress. This will be done at the next SIP meeting.</p>	<p>Sue to action</p> <p>Sue to agenda</p>
	<p><i>The meeting closed at 8.05pm</i></p>	