



Little Paxton Primary School Governing Body Minutes for the meeting of the Full Governing Body held on Monday 16th January 2023 at 6.30pm

Present:

Neil Donoghue	Co-opted Governor	Tim Gawler	Parent Governor
Maxine Howells	Co-opted Governor	Nicola Hubbard	Parent Governor
Andrew Kinglake	Parent Governor	Nickie Moore	Head Teacher
Alex Simkin	Staff Governor	Bex Jenkins	Teaching and Learning Lead

In attendance:

Alice Davis Clerk

1. Welcome and apologies

The Chair welcomed the Governing Body (GB) to the meeting. The Chair also welcomed Rebekah Jenkins, the lead of teaching and learning at LP, who attended the meeting to discuss last terms data shared with governors prior to the meeting, and address any questions they may have.

Apologies received and accepted from:

Ian Cunningham	Parent Governor
Samantha Byers	Parent Governor

The meeting was quorate.

The Chair informed the GB that Austin Willet resigned from his position as a parent governor earlier this week. The Chair thanked AW for all his work on behalf of the GB.

The Chair asked the GB to declare any other business to be discussed in item 14; ND and the Chair both declared AOB.

2. Declaration of interests

There were no new declarations of interests made.

Clerk to share updated version of the interests table for publication to the school website. ACTION

3. Governors' responsibilities: Challenge, Scrutiny, Support

The Chair reminded the GB of their role:

- Ensuring clarity of vision, ethos and strategic direction;
- Holding the headteacher to account for the educational performance of the school and its pupils; and
- Overseeing the financial performance of the school and making sure its money is well spent.

4. Objectives for 2022/2023 School Year

- To further develop leadership capacity across the school by ensuring that all leaders understand their roles and responsibilities and ensure they fulfil their roles in an agreed timescale.
Leaders should accelerate their work to ensure that all subjects are planned carefully. Leaders should ensure that teachers have the subject specific training they need to implement the curriculum successfully (OfSTED 2020)
- To embed and ensure intent, implementation and impact of Little Paxton's curriculum develops strong outcomes for all children, reversing Ofsted's finding (February 2020) that: too many children have gaps in their learning because of weaker planning in the past
- To ensure that the planning, teaching, and assessment of writing develops strong outcomes for all children. The teaching of writing is monitored effectively by ESLs, PLs and CLT to ensure consistency. Planning of writing is based on the children's prior knowledge and is adapted based on ongoing assessment.
- To improve the provision of SEND across the school.

5. Approval of minutes from previous meetings

Minutes for the FGB on 12.12.22 were circulated for governors to review prior to the meeting.

The minutes were proposed to be **approved** by ND and seconded by the HT.

A governor asked the chair for an update on the progression of the stage 2 complaint disclosed at the last FGB meeting. The chair confirmed that the complaint has been resolved and is now passed the period in which the family can make an appeal.

6. Action Log

Action log updated and included within the meeting folder LINK JAN ACTION LOG

7. Head-teacher's report and reports from external advisors (Presented by Nickie Moore and Rebekah Jenkins)

The chair thanked the CLT for providing the data within the report shared with GB. The data presented was collected manually on this occasion, currently the CLT are looking at introducing a software called insight which will be beneficial to the process of data analysis. The HT felt reluctant to introduce a new system currently due to various system changes already taking place for staff. When the software is introduced it will be in a way that considers staff wellbeing and workload.

A governor asked if within the data it would be possible to have comparators, including data from different cohorts within the school.

The CTL explained that the data submitted is current data as opposed to end of year data, hence comparison cannot be made at this stage. However, spring term data will be EOY predictions which can be used as comparative data. Due to disruptions in education, historical data nationally is not as easily obtainable.

A governor asked the CLT to provide further insight into issues with staffing and how the school are ensuring interventions are carried out despite this.

The CLT have built in extra capacity amongst middle leaders, including 2 new phase leaders. Upon investigation, the main issues were found to be children struggling to access classroom learning and therefore staff having to leave the classroom. Following vacancies in the positions of Inclusion worker and SENCo the CLT were able to look at the needs of the school and children and adapt the vacant role descriptions accordingly, resulting in the roles becoming more involved within the classrooms. The school have appointed two behaviour and inclusion mentors who are based in a space where children struggling within a classroom environment can go to during the school day and be supported there. A new family mentor has also been appointed by the CLT.

These changes have released capacity both in the CLT and classroom teams, allowing for interventions to take place. The CLT have also ensured that phase leaders are actively seeking to share resources across year groups to ensure the needs of classes and year groups are met.

A governor asked the CLT if the inclusion worker and SENCo roles were full time or part time.

The CTL confirmed that both roles are full time. The full time SENCo is classroom based for 2 days out of 5, which is made possible through support from the part time SENCo.

Governors felt positive knowing measurable data will be available going forward, but concern was felt over being able to look back for comparative data. One of the LA advisors has shared a tool with the CLT to enable them to compare EYFS, Y2 and Y6 data which the school feel will be beneficial.

The CLT are starting to look at Y6 data predictions, by utilising the tool provided by the LA the school will be able to use the pupils Y2 data to inform what each child should achieve in their Y6 SAT's.

Governors felt it important for the CLT to use these forecasts to identify groups requiring additional support. The CLT have made the bottom 20% of attaining pupils a priority. The national tutoring programme, a government funded scheme, was explored as a form of interventions, however the CLT felt the tutor allocated to the school was not a good fit hence this was not continued.

Phase leaders have been tasked with running pupil progress meetings and reporting to the CLT which children have been identified as requiring additional support and what is being done to address this. Governors felt very encouraged by this process.

A governor asked the CLT for more information about how the school are supporting pupils above the bottom 20%, particularly those in the top percentages.

Whilst the CLT are prioritising the bottom 20%, children who should be working at greater depth have also been identified and the CLT have discussed ways in which these children can be best supported to achieve this. The October 2022 staff meeting looked at provision for challenge in lessons across the curriculum in order to enable higher attaining pupils to reach greater depth results; this should be identifiable on the lesson plan and within the children's books. The GB noted this as something for curriculum link governors to look for at the next link governor visit. Continual analysis of data within curriculum subjects and flexible grouping to ensure children are challenged accordingly are also being implemented across the school.

A governor asked for clarification over the comments made regarding English attainment in Y2 within the reports shared.

This question was shared with the Y2 class teachers prior to the meeting, and it was clarified that the concerns with English attainment within this year group is that fundamental skills have not stuck from the Y1 curriculum, therefore children cannot move onto new content as directed by CLT. The school feel it is important to construct learning on strong foundations hence this decision to restructure lesson plans to recover foundational skills until they are at a strong level was made.

A governor asked for an update on the completion of the priorities for action as detailed in the Maths SIR shared prior to the meeting.

The HT confirmed the school have actioned everything highlighted as a priority within this report. Phase leaders are following up on individual children highlighted as requiring additional support and flexible grouping is being

implemented across the school. The maths advisor has since been back for a follow up visit and is pleased with the progress made. Once this report is received this will be shared with governors.

LA improvement group meeting

The notes from this meeting are confidential and cannot be shared with Governors due to vast content of topics covered, hence the chair shared key points from this meeting with the GB. The chair confirmed that governance will be a key line of enquiry in the next Ofsted inspection, so it is important that governors are prepared and aware of this. At the next improvement meeting the chair will feedback the strong link governor visits that have been completed as well as the high levels of governor challenge within meetings.

A governor asked for clarification on the distractions disrupting the sharing of information within the school mentioned within the meeting.

The CLT are currently facing staffing concerns in which a group of staff members who are struggling with changes following historic employment have been raising concerns consistently but have not yet formally raised a grievance. The LA improvement group have been hearing this consistently, hence they have deemed this ongoing concern as distracting. It has been made clear that if a formal grievance needs to be raised then this should be completed following the process outlined within the school's grievance policy. Should a formal grievance be raised, the chair will likely call on other governors to support the chair with this investigation.

A governor asked if appropriate consideration of concerns raised by these staff members has been appropriately given.

The CLT felt that ample time has been given to these staff members to discuss their concerns, however what they are requesting from the CLT cannot be fulfilled. The CLT have been ensuring that they take the emotion and people out of the situation and view concerns raised impartially to properly analyse the grievance raised. The CLT are continually collecting staff voice data so this can be discussed at CLT meetings pragmatically.

A governor asked for clarification on Gemma Manning's professional skillset, an associate member of the GB. It was discussed that GM was made an associate member due to her HR expertise, however contact with GM has not been made for a considerable amount of time. **ACTION 027** The Clerk will contact GM.

A governor asked for clarification on how the LA would be supporting the GB in response to critical feedback made within the LAIG.

The chair asked governors to think about what they would find beneficial in terms of support so that the chair can approach the LA with these ideas.

Detailed responses to questions submitted prior to the meeting will be appended to the minutes.

8. Review of Governor Action Plan

RAG ratings and comments from governors on the Governor Action Plan were shared and reviewed prior to the meeting.

A governor asked if it would be beneficial to share the action plan with the local authority.

The Chair confirmed that the LA advised of content when the action plan was being created but agreed that sending them a rag rated version could be helpful. **ACTION 028** Chair to send RAG rated Governor Action Plan to Tina Hubbard.

The governor visit schedule was reviewed. It was decided that a link CLT member and their contact details would be included on the schedule to enable governors to set up visits **ACTION 029**.

Following the resignation of the finance link governor, it was felt that the GB should consider the process of finance reporting and remodel if necessary. The possibility of the SBM attending FGB meetings to allow all

governors to be involved within the communication between the CLT and GB regarding finance as opposed to channelling this communication through one governor.

ACTION 030 recruit a co-opted governor with skills in finance, Clerk to confirm if this could be a distance position and meetings could be attended exclusively by zoom.

Vacant link governor roles were discussed:

- Leadership and management – MH will take this role.
- HT performance management – NH volunteered to take this role; SB will also be asked.
- English writing (SDP objective) – NH Volunteered to take this role.

ACTION 031 Governors to review their link role descriptions shared on the google drive and confirm they are happy with them.

ACTION 032 English writing link role description to be drafted by Chair (see SDP)

The chair informed the GB that the LA suggested utilising a FGB meeting to cover some training material supplied by them. This will be completed at the next FGB meeting (February 2023).

9. Budget Update

Due to a delay in the sharing of documentation this will be rolled over to the next meeting and the SBM will be invited to attend the meeting.

ACTION 033 chair to draft finance question as a basis of discussion in response to the documents shared by the CLT.

10. Website checklist

The Chair discussed many positive attributes of the schools website and how impactful this is to anyone looking for information on the school, including Ofsted.

ACTION 034 HT to populate the update column of the website checklist confirming completion of actions.

11. Link Governor reports

The chair shared the link governor report on last terms SCR compliance check with the GB in IC's absence.

This is going to be followed up termly and updated accordingly.

The chair raised that it is a delegated decision for governors as to the renewal period for staff DBS checks.

ACTION 035 HT to get an updated SR policy from EPM and governors to make a decision regarding the renewal period on DBS checks to be included within the policy prior to ratification.

CCC single central record audit is currently being completed by the CLT and should be completed ahead of the next safeguarding link governor visit.

It was felt that a report template specifically for safeguarding visits would be beneficial, and should include logging review of the SCR. **ACTION 036** Clerk to discuss report template with IC.

12. Training

ACTION 037 AS will circulate a document containing compulsory governor training and the process of recording this training following the meeting.

ACTION 038 AS to update the FGB Skills Audit

AK attended the Ofsted readiness training session provided by the LA last month, he discussed the key points to share with fellow governors at the meeting and more detailed information from the training has been shared with governors to review at their leisure.

One recommendation made in the training was that the creation of a crib sheet for all school leaders to access should they be approached by Ofsted. The HT has encouraged all staff to do this. The HT has also created an Ofsted folder on the shared google drive to which she is adding anything she feels will be relevant for the inspection.

Governors agreed that a shared document should also be created for governors. The CLT offered to support the creation of this information sheet.

ACTION 039 Chair and Clerk to arrange an Ofsted readiness preparation sheet containing likely questions from Ofsted, and to start delegating these questions to governors to answer.

Another key point taken from the training was the availability of Mock Ofsted visits held by the Cambridgeshire LA. **A governor asked the CLT if this had been offered by the LA.** The CLT confirmed that they are currently completing mock “deep dive” with the LA.

ACTION 040 Chair will ask LA if mock Ofsted governor questions could be provided at the next LAIG meeting.

Other training attended since last meeting:

Data training - AK

Managing allegations, complaints, and grievances – SB, Clerk

13. Safeguarding

The safeguarding link governor visit report was discussed, with both the SCR and Safer recruitment being highlighted as priorities.

The CLT have updated their safeguarding register from this term which is now rag rated:

Green – children with historic safeguarding kept on file.

Yellow – Children currently being monitored.

Red – children of primary concern

The HT informed the GB that there was a serious safeguarding incident last week that lead to a strategy meeting with police and social care, and resulting in section 47 involvement.

The schools use of a paper system for safeguarding was discussed, and whilst remaining conscious of not creating additional work for the CLT and changing school systems further the GB felt moving to an online system would be beneficial to the school.

14. Review impact of meeting

The chair asked the GB to reflect on the impact of this meeting. HT felt that the governor challenge within the meeting has been highly valuable to the CLT and lead to data being looked at in greater depth.

Governors felt that finance data needs to be looked at as a priority, and that the meeting schedule should be looked at to ensure required data can be provided in a timely manner for meetings. A suggested meeting cycle has been drafted to address this and will be discussed with the clerk.

15. AOB

Strikes – Once the HT has more information on this, she will update the GB.
The Chair reminded governors to complete their pen portraits for Paxton press.
The Chair thanked the GB for their time and the meeting was closed.

15. Dates of next meetings of the Governing Body

Full Governing Body 27/02/2023.

The meeting closed at 8:44 pm

New actions arising from this meeting

Jan 027	Clerk to contact Gemma Manning (Associate Member)	Clerk	ASAP
Jan 028	Chair to send RAG rated Governor Action Plan to Tina Hubbard.	Chair	ASAP
Jan 029	link CLT member and contact details to be added to the governor monitoring visit schedule.		ASAP
Jan 030	recruit a co-opted governor with skills in finance, Clerk to confirm if this could be a distance position and meetings could be attended exclusively by zoom.	All	ASAP
Jan 031	Governors to review their link role descriptions shared on the google drive and confirm they are happy with them	All	February
Jan 032	English writing link role description to be drafted by Chair (see SDP)	Chair	February
Jan 033	chair to draft finance question as a basis of discussion in response to the documents shared by the CLT.	Chair	February
Jan 034	HT to populate the update column of the website checklist confirming completion of actions	HT	ASAP
Jan 035	HT to get an updated SR policy from EPM and governors to make a decision regarding the renewal period on DBS checks to be included within the policy prior to ratification.	HT, FGB	
Jan 036	Clerk to discuss Safeguarding visit report template with IC	Clerk, IC	
Jan 037	AS will circulate a document containing compulsory governor training and the process of recording this training	AS	ASAP
Jan 038	AS to update the GB skills audit	AS	ASAP
Jan 039	Chair and Clerk to arrange an Ofsted readiness preparation sheet containing likely questions from Ofsted, and to start delegating these questions to governors to answer.	Chair, Clerk	
Jan 040	Chair will ask LA if mock Ofsted governor questions could be provided at the next LAIG meeting.	Chair	

Autumn Term (2022) Pupil Outcomes

1. How does this data compare to national (based on 2019 data) and local averages and the government's floor standards?

This data does not compare to national data as it is not end of year data. The Spring Data drop will be end of year predictions so we will add a comparison to the last national data for EYFS/2/6. Also, worth noting, that the last set of national data was pre-covid and the impact of the pandemic has not been seen on published results so be aware we will not be comparing like for like.

2. What, if any, impact does the context of our school have on pupils' attainment?

The school is very good at changing and growing with the needs of the children and the changes in context.

3. How do children in our school progress compared with expectations?

Not sure which expectations this question is referring too:

If school expectations: then we track children on a document called class on a page that allows staff to see where the children were at the end of the previous year attainment wise and then colour codes them so we can quickly identify, at data drops, those children who have made less than expected progress (red) or have made accelerated progress (green). These 'red' children are then discussed at Pupil Progress meetings - what are we doing to support them and ensure accelerated progress next term. We want all of our children to at least maintain where they were at the end of the previous year e.g. ARE to ARE as the demands of the curriculum increase each year.

Children in Year 6: we have 2 systems we are using to measure their progress FFT (fisher family trust) and also our Maths advisor shared a document DS and RJ are going to be using to analyse their data further. This analysis will be shared with you in the Spring data drop when looking at end of year predictions and expected progress.

4. How does the school's performance compare to those for other similar schools?

Again, comparative data is not available since 2019 but this is something we will provide in Spring when we're looking at end of term predictions rather than current data.

Our Year 6 team moderate with Buckden Primary School as they are a very similar school. As a leadership team we have tried to open up other opportunities for other year groups to do the same with the St Neots School Forum but this has not yet been successful. We will keep the GB updated with progress in this cross school moderation.

5. Which groups of pupils in terms of gender and ethnicity are the highest and lowest performing?

We would need to analyse the data in more detail than what we currently have to answer this question. As mentioned we have not asked the staff to analyse their boy girl split but can add this to the Spring Data. We also do not break down ethnicity further than our focus group of EAL. As we have only a few children.

6. How are FSME, SEN and EAL students progressing compared with other students in this school, and compared with FSME students in other schools?

It varies from child to child and year to year. As you can see from the data, some year groups have a higher percentage of children from these groups than others.

Again, these children are discussed at PP (Pupil Progress) meetings so the PL (Phase Leaders) and CLT are aware of what is being put in place to support the progress of these children.

For the SEND children we are exploring a new way of tracking their progress and celebrating small steps of success. JA and RP are looking into this and rolling it out this year. It is called PIVOTS.

7. The Pupil Premium outcome numbers across the board are significantly lower than the main cohort. How does this compare to previous years? How is the PP funding being directly used to support these children? What evidence do we have of this?

We have to complete a PP report, which is on our website, to explain how we are spending the PP funding, this is our main piece of evidence.

This is a trend we have seen in our school, locally and nationally pre-covid. However, the gap, for some of these children (especially our FSM/EVER6 PP children) the gap has widened due to COVID. RJ has completed training on supporting disadvantaged children with the National College which she is using to support staff to ensure progress for these children. We have also had training from the English and Maths team about how to scaffold support in the core lessons to enable these children to make accelerated progress.

Catch up funding is also being used to support these children, and secure progress, with after school booster groups in Year 6 initially.

8. How are low, middle, and high ability children progressing and attaining?

Attainment is shown on the data sheet.

Progress will be shared with end of term predictions in Spring Term

9. Are there any gender variations? Is this tracked?

We have not asked the staff to share this data with us but will add it to the Spring Data Drop. It is easy to track with our class on a page but would take time to collate for the meeting on Monday.

10. Do we know how these results have been changing over the past three years: are we improving or not?

Yes, we track results each year, even during the pandemic. It depends how we are measuring improvement.

I think we need to measure improvement on the attainment and progress of that cohort through our school to measure whether we as a school are improving. End of KS results are so cohort specific. We do obviously compare ourselves to National benchmarks. Our Year 6 SATs last year were very strong.

11. If progress is under national expectations, if so, why is this?

Progress will be discussed in Spring as this is current data not end of year data.

12. What is your strategy, to support the tactical analysis in this paper, for improving the areas of weak performance? How are the subject leads developing strategies and how are they being supported? What support are other leads such as SENDCO and PP lead being given?

Appointed new PLs - induction plan prepared and lead by RJ supported by AJ. This has identified key aspects of the role and link into the SDP to ensure they are able to support their phase team and improve outcomes for our children.

AJ is meeting regularly with subject leads and supporting them in their role.

LA advisors are working with English and Maths leads.

Strategy is High Quality Teaching for all children with interventions for those who are identified as falling behind.

Pre/post assessments in every unit in Maths and Cold/Hot Write in English to identify the needs of the cohort and specific children which allows for flexible grouping (EEF recommendation). Teachers adapt their planning as well in light of these assessments.

SENDCo being supported by established Deputy SENDCo and AJ leading her induction.

13. How does this data relate to the quality of teaching across the school?

Our learning walks have shown that the quality of teaching and learning is good across the school. As a leadership team we quickly identify any year groups, or individual teachers, where support is needed and put plans in place.

As you can see from the analysis, the teaching staff are aware of those children who they need to focus on making accelerated progress and are putting lots of different things in place during the Spring term.

14. Are staff aware of which pupils and groups of pupils are underachieving? How are these identified and supported?

Yes, definitely.

Summaries/analysis completed by the year group teams.

CLT look at all summaries

PLs then have PP meetings with their phase which feeds into the termly standards meeting.

Staff are supported by Leadership team to scaffold learning for these children, PLs monitor the progress in Learning Walks and through PP meetings. Staff identify children through assessment within and after lessons (this might be marking), testing (NFER/Phonics Screening/SAT papers), TAFs (Teacher Assessment Frameworks - Years 2 & 6). ELGs (Early Learning Goals - Foundation), pre/post unit tests in Maths, Cold Writes in English, STAR quizzes yr3-6 reading and Little Wandle assessments EYFS-Year 2.

15. What strategies are in place to ensure the most able pupils are stretched?

INSET training October 2022 - challenge in English and then looked at the strategies we are using across the curriculum.

This is monitored through learning walks, book studies, pupil/staff voice, planning monitoring.

Flexible grouping challenges the more able children, using them as peer mentors (explaining their thinking to other children), starting these children at different points in the lesson, having a challenge activity for them to tackle.

16. How do you know they are working?

See above - monitoring schedule

17. How has / will this data be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the SDP priorities and actions?

This data will be used as part of the discussion in our Termly Standards meeting and when we RAG rate the SDP again.

18. There are several comments about the level of resourcing in the report such as Yr 1 "Our biggest barrier in year 1 is limited adult support," Yr 2 "We would like to do more interventions." Yr 3 "When possible we would like to run interventions or booster groups for these children but so rarely happens due to staffing." Yr 5 "We have a larger cohort and have had limited adult support for a large proportion of Autumn term. This has meant that much needed interventions and classroom support has been limited until later in the term." Are these problems limited to these years or is it related to the reduction on TA per year? What is being done about this? Does this relate to the distractions mentioned in the LA Termly Review paper?

We have had children with significant needs in Year 1 and Year 2 which have meant adults who would be able to be used for interventions have had to support these children whilst we are applying for EHCPs.

This term we have a Behaviour and Learning mentor, JS added to the team, to support with these children so that the staff in the year group are able to be used for interventions.

We have had meetings with both the Yr1 and Yr2 teams to discuss how to work effectively together to support the children e.g. flexible grouping.

In Year 5 we have a long term staff absence. At October half term we put KV, a HLTA into this team to support them and they also now have a very capable SCITT trainee who previously worked at our school CK, to support them.

Year 3 have 2 HLTAs and we had a very high staff absence in the Autumn Term. When a teacher is unable to attend work we try and get supply first but agencies were not able to provide teachers so we use our HLTAs then LSA3s to cover if needed. We also need to ensure that our 1:1 children are covered at all times due to their EHCPs so this is why year 3 often lost adults. This is something we, as a leadership team, are looking at. LC is in this year group and is phase leader so is keeping us updated.

Leadership team have shared examples of effective use of LSAs in year groups such as 4 and 6 who only have then 1 LSA also but work more collaboratively.

DS is working on a project in his role as PL, which we want to begin in his phase and then roll out across the school, to do with peer coaching and supporting each other as we did pre-covid.

There have been many distractions that have prevented us from moving forwards in the way we would like too but we feel our staffing structure with our new PLs, additional SEND capacity, additional inclusion capacity and specific staff CPD will make a big difference in the Spring Term.

19. Year 2 has a stated plan to move away from Little Wandle. Why is this? How will this affect learning and support improvement? Is this move being considered by any other year groups?

This is a planned, strategic, move. The Year 2 TAF requires the teachers to have evidence of reading in order to make their TA (Teacher Assessment) at the end of the year. This means Year 2 move to Guided Reading in the Spring Term and away from daily phonics lessons. This is no different from previous years. Those children who still need phonics instruction have interventions (in this case they are joining the Year 1 sessions) as well as being part of the Guided Reading Groups. Year 1 and EYFS will follow Little Wandle throughout the year as planned.

20. The data table does not appear complete with many fields absent. Is this data being recorded? When could a complete dataset be shared? From my reading only Years 2 & 4 have supplied all of the data.

The main data that is missing is the combined. This is a new field and we are going to use it in the Spring. Some staff are used to using it but others are not so RJ will be giving training on how to work this out before the Spring Data Drop.

The Year 5 group data will be sent to you before Monday.

RJ to check any other missing data.

21. Where do we think we will be next year? What are the target percentage improvements for the numbers of pupils WA and GDS?

We will have a better idea after the PP meetings which are taking place next week and we will feedback to the FGB. As this is current data, not predicted data, which will be discussed next week at PP meetings, comparing it

to previous year percentages/key stage data is not comparing like for like and will support teaching and learning/priorities for this term.

Little Paxton SIR Maths - Sept 2022.

1. There are some priorities for action, please could an update be provided on the completion of these? I note the written HT report has previously told us these visits have occurred and the November FGB minutes record that key headlines were provided by the HT, however my recollection is of more positive feedback than these reports convey. Please could Governors have an understanding of this apparent variance?

We are actioning all of the advice from the SIR Maths. LC and MD have already followed up with the individual year groups with regards to the points made. It was a very positive visit but, as always, there are things we can improve. Maths advisor came in again to run moderation training and was impressed with the staff's understanding and the children's books even after a short time.

Local Authority Termly Review

1. This paper mentions there are too many distractions impacting on the capacity to provide good quality education. What are these distractions, what has/is being done about these and by when? Can it be proven everything, including new or recent initiatives and those activities which are not National Curriculum in the school will directly improve teaching and learning and OFSTED rated improvement? How is this being evaluated? What can Governors do to support this?

Distractions:

- Letters to FGB - anonymous
- Staff member with long term sickness
- Staff absence (higher than usual but this is a national issue)
- Complaints to OFSTED

RJ is leading teaching and learning. With the support of the PLs and DHT teaching and learning is a priority this term. All staff CPD is linked to what is happening in the classroom. Even if there are distractions, which there always will be, we now have the leadership structure, and capacity, to continue to develop teaching and learning.

LP Website Checklist

1. Noting OFSTED reference the website prior to a visit, is there a timeframe by when we will have closed these gaps?

Done before the meeting

Autumn Term Data Drop and Analysis 2022

% Table

· Can the acronyms be added to the acronym sheet so that the % can be better understood by non-educational specialist? I am not sure what PRE-KS, WT, ARE, GDS or ARE+ means. EAL is also not defined or PP. Whilst, these might be known can we add them to the acronym sheet anyway for future reference.

RJ sent this along with the data sheet, sorry if this hasn't been included

Key

R - Reading

W - Writing

M - Maths

Comb - Combined (Children who are at the expected standard in Reading, Writing and Maths)

SPAG - Spelling Punctuation and Grammar

PREKS - Pre Key Stage (these children are significantly behind)

WT - working towards the expected standard

ARE - Age related expectations

GDS - greater depth

ARE+ - those children who will be ARE and GDS

PP - Pupil Premium

EAL - English as an Additional Language

SEND - Special Educational Needs and Disabilities

· Would it also be possible to get a copy of the criteria/ grade descriptors or guidelines that are used when assessing pupils between “grades?” It would be nice to see how the assessments carried out are aligned with the assessment criteria so that we can better understand the rationales/explanations given further along in the report.

RJ contacted SB and the question has been answered later in another question*. SB was happy with the answer.

EYFS

· What intervention are you using to improve fine motor skills?

We use a book called ‘Write from the start’ which has pages of interventions which aims to develop the earliest skill in laying foundations for handwriting and hand eye coordination.

We have also started (this week) a letter formation intervention, which supports children with their fine motor skills but also support their letter formation.

· With more children becoming ready to read, could this be an opportunity to communicate with the parents and encourage parent support with reading, with guidance from EYFS team?

The EYFS have been informed of our new phonics scheme Little Wandle, we have held a phonics evening where the parents have come to find out about what the new scheme is and how we teach it at school. The parents have been communicated with some of the sounds children have learnt through home learning as we have sent this home. We have also sent home tricky words for them to practise and use. We have previously sent wordless books home with the children, and with this we have sent communication via tapestry which informed parents of how to support children with sharing and reading books. Giving the parents prompts on how to support segmenting and blending without having words in the book. We will be sending reading books with words home with the majority of children for the first time this week (13/1/23) and we will be sending communication through tapestry as to how they can support their children reading at home.

Year 1

· Can we add LW acronym to definition sheet, please?

Little Wandle?

· What is “writing club?” which students are selected for this? Are students who engage with this the same cohort of students or are the students rotated?

It's a writing intervention with the core children. It was called a club to keep it exciting. This is to support the children with the key writing skills for year 1. It is the same 12 children. 3 at a time run Monday-Thursday lunch time. This is the only time the adults in year 1 are able to run interventions. This is currently not happening (wb 9/1/23) as the HLTA who runs this club has been covering classes.

· How are GD students defined?

Nobody is currently at GD. They are defined based on their knowledge they have in a specific subject and whether it's above the year 1 level. They are being assessed where they are at now, having covered a third of the content for the year.

· What interventions would you like to run for the bottom 20%?

We would like to run Little Wandle daily catch up interventions. Currently an LSA from year 2 has been coming down Thursday afternoon for 45 mins to target children across the cohort who need phase 3 recap, we would like this to continue. The year 1 team has started an intervention book to record the things they are doing. We would like adults to do 1:1 reading with the children in the week in addition to the reading squad.

An adult to run a pre/post teach intervention, to support the children before and/or after the learning. They don't have an adult to do this as the HLTA across the year group is being used to cover classes 2 days a week and be a 1:1 for a child.

· How are you planning to go from “we would like to run more interventions” for bottom 20% and PRE-KS to being able to run interventions for these pupils?

The year 1 team have timetabled when the HLTA in that year group is spare to run interventions and has allocated 50 mins on a Friday afternoon, as that is the only time that adult is spare, however she is currently being the class teacher, so she is out supporting PE with the other year 1 class and teacher. The year 1 team really needed an additional adult to support them in running other interventions during the week.

They are currently teaching 2 phonics sessions a week to catch them up as they started in September with reception spring 1 as they had to learn the new catchphrases for Little Wandle. When they finish this, they will go back to teaching one session which will free up some time to run some more interventions. However they are aware that they need to start formal handwriting.

· What are the consequences if the majority of students are still in the “working towards” bracket at the end of the year?

The children are currently put at WT as the year 1 team has assessed based on where the children are right now and they haven't taught the whole year 1 curriculum. If the children continue to stay at WT they will be behind in their learning as they move up into year 2. It will also mean year 2, will be left to support the children before the end of KS1 SATS.

· How many students would benefit from EHCP's in addition to the one year 1 child who is under review? How have these students been identified as needing EHCP's? What support provisions have been given to them in the past, which have suggested/led to the conclusion that they would benefit from EHCP's? How is the new SENCo

team going to support year 1 with these challenges? When you say that you are not alone in your need for additional people in year 1, is this a comment relating to other years in Little Paxton School or is this from talking with teachers from other schools? If it's from talking from teachers at different schools, have they shared ideas/methods that they have used to try and overcome this problem?

2 more. 1 child has been diagnosed with autism however he manages in class with quality first teaching and he doesn't need any more than that. He finds social situations difficult to read. Moving forward he may need an EHCP or additional support as he moves into Year 2 and KS2.

The other child is working at pre KS. He has been flagged with the previous SEN team as mum thought he was autistic and other things. The adults are trying to do 1:1 interventions for example 1:1 correspondence to 10.

The one child with the EHCP on review still doesn't have a 1:1 and therefore the adults are stretched in supporting her and the rest of the children. This has been shared with the deputy head and the CLT are aware.

The comment about additional adults is related to Little Paxton, as lots of year groups feel they would need another adult to support their year group.

Year 2

·What do you mean when you say:

"still much lower than anyone would like," We would expect at this stage the cohort to be a higher percentage of ARE across the board. The cohort is a very tricky one and this will be a challenge to get many of them to ARE (one we are of course up for and trying our best with)

"writing is a concern?" The fundamentals haven't stuck and aren't there as much as you'd hope at this point in Year 2. Lots of recapping going on.

"Maths is not where we would like?" We would expect at this stage the cohort to be a higher percentage of ARE across the board. A lot more concrete teaching than abstract needed. Although, now we are more confident that Maths will be better by the end of the year. Confidence of staff has grown that more will make progress to ARE.

Is there a particular criteria you are working with, which allows you to make these comments? In which case, can we see this criteria? TAF is what we are working against.

·What do you mean by "we would like to do more interventions?" what is preventing you from running more interventions? We were struggling with adults to run them but now we are in a better position as we have a more structured timetable for the children with SEN and we have better scheduling for the adults we have. It is in a better place now for us to run interventions.

Year 3

· What does "streaming" across Maths and English to support these children mean?

It means that the children are grouped flexibly for each unit based on the assessment data and taught the skills they need to make progress. The adults move around so that the children are all getting access to the different teachers. It means that precision/adaptive/reactive teaching can happen.

- Is there a way to implement an intervention that is more consistent but doesn't rely heavily on adults? Is there an opportunity to communicate with parents to help support this?

DN, LC and DS are working on interventions across KS2 as a result of the data and analysis for this term.

Year 4

- What are the significance of the 11% and 4% statistics stated?
- What is NFER maths/ reading papers?

These are the papers we use every half term in Years 3-5 to assess where the children are. They are similar to SATs and staff are able to input the scores from the tests and then they can analyse which areas of the curriculum the children are confident with, which need more work and the needs of specific children. This supports their grouping and planning for the next term. They support staff in making judgements on where the children are now and predictions for the end of the year because they are a standardised national assessment tool. We purchase these resources to support teacher judgement.

- What is AR quizzing?

Accelerated Reader - system we have in place for KS2 (Year 2 to have access as well now they are moving away from phonics books). The children take a quiz which gives them a reading level and enables them to select a book to read that is at their level. Once finished the children take a test on the book and staff track their results. Each child completes a STAR test at the beginning of each half term. This gives them a new reading level but staff also are able to analyse the data and see which children need additional reading intervention. DN analyses this data further in her role as English Lead.

- How is the success criteria different for pre-key stage pupils compared to standard success criteria?

More visual clues/colour coding to ensure these children understand exactly what they need to do to be successful in a lesson or across a series of lessons.

Year 5

- Will the scaffold sheets given to SEND and children working below pre-KS be tailored to SEND students and their learning preferences so that they are not disadvantaged? If not, is there a difference between SEND and pre-KS pupils, and if so, how will SEND pupils be supported with a generalised scaffold sheet?

There is one scaffold for all SEND and pre-ks. Most of the children that are Pre-KS are also SEND. KH will take children in small groups to allow them to have access to extra support as well as the scaffold. EG: Providing cut and stick activities for some SEND/Pre-KS children rather than asking them to write.

- What weekly reading interventions are being given to SEND and pre-KS pupils? How are these interventions being monitored to assess progression and/or value?

6 from each class which are the lowest from NFER and AR tests have weekly interventions with KH. 4 SEND children take part in these in which 3 are pre-KS. The intervention involves looking through the Year 3 NFER papers and picking apart questions together and teaching techniques for retrieval, inference and other reading skills. The pre assessment was a year 5 NFER paper and progression will be monitored using the spring term NFER

data to compare. Also assessed with AR star tests/weekly reading scores. All SEND and pre-KS also read at least once a week 1-1 with an adult.

Year 6

- How does using online Maths support improvement of reasoning skills? Is there data to show that this method of intervention is better than potential others available?

Currently using a free trial. It is effective because the children get an instant response when they get a reasoning question wrong with a hint on how to solve it. The children also really enjoy using the technology. We can also freeze the screen and discuss a question all the children struggled with with the whole group. It provides the teaching staff with instant data. It is improving their ability to tackle the questions in the reasoning papers (2 and 3).

- How is peer coaching/mentoring used? Is there training/support given to the mentor? How is this approach going to be monitored in terms of success?

Bloom's taxonomy is a piece of research that talks about how we can challenge the more able children through getting them to use higher order thinking skills. One of the ways for children to embed their learning is to explain that skill or knowledge to another child e.g. how they solved a 2 step problem. This approach is part of high quality teaching and is different to peer mentoring as a role (which we are introducing but for play/lunchtime).

- How will the SEND team support to identify children with significant learning needs and how will these children then be supported by SEND team? Is this a priority for SEND team over the other SEND (EHCP's) issues raised in this outcome report? If it is, has there been a timescale agreed for this to be completed by so that other issues are addressed also?

JA already supporting the Year 6 team. RP has been to meet the children and staff. Year 6 teachers have identified these children and have been given the support they need to ensure these children have what they need for this year. It is not a priority anymore but was part of the story behind the data.

General Questions from Outcomes Report

- Behaviour was mentioned in Year 1 & 2 analysis. Are there behavioural interventions that could be used to improve the behaviour of SEND pupils? Has the new SENDco got ideas/experience that could be shared/used to support/address this problem so that it reduces the problem in class?

Meetings with the Year 1 and Year 2 team have already taken place (Year 1 last term Year 2 last week) to support the team and improve behaviour.

JS (behaviour and inclusion mentor) has already had an impact on supporting these children with difficult behaviour and enabling the staff to continue teaching.

More capacity within the leadership team with our 2 new PLs is also positive as there are more people to support these year groups and children. AJ supporting year 1. More capacity within our SEND and Inclusion team. RP working in Year 1 2 days a week to support initially and then to teach. Strategies are being shared regularly with these year groups. Also, staff CPD this term links into supporting children in the classroom as we have a teaching and learning focus.

- Could we approach other local schools to see how they are approaching running interventions or booster groups with limited adult support? Is there good practice we can learn from others?

Good idea - as mentioned earlier we have tried to make links with local schools as we had pre-covid. This is something we will continue to improve.

· How can we increase/ optimise adults to support interventions, if employing more staff is not an option

Now we have our year group teams working more effectively together and sharing resources, the next step is phases working together to pool adults. The appointment of our new PLs will support us working more across year groups. Pupil Progress meetings this week will identify any common needs across phases and then we can discuss how to use time/adults more effectively.

*Also question from SB from above

What is the source of the data for the percentages obtained for R, W, M and SPAG? Are these based on teacher assessments or tests or a combination of different factors? Little Wandle check-in has been mentioned for reading in EYFS, but I am not sure on the source of the other data?

The data is teacher assessment/judgement, AFL (assessment for learning) from lessons, marking of learning from the classroom, tests and other assessments.

EYFS: use the EYFS Curriculum which has an Early learning goal for each of the 7 areas they assess on (3 prime, 4 specific). They also complete a baseline assessment, which is shared with the LA so that we can track both attainment and progress of the cohort. Use Little Wandle assessments (please see Year 1 for more information).

Year 1: will use more formal testing at end of year to support their final assessments (NFER). Use Little Wandle assessment tool for phonics (there was a pre-assessment before we started the programme and assessments took place every 3 weeks initially but is moving to every 6 weeks from the beginning of this term. We are able to track progress and attainment using this tool. Our Reading Lead, CC, checks this data and reports to the CLT. They also use past phonics screening checks to support their judgements and identify children who are falling behind. Teacher judgement and outcomes of lessons support the current data.

Year 2: Children sit past SAT papers every half term which enable the team to make accurate assessments and identify gaps they need to close (this information will support planning and grouping). They have a TAF (Teacher Assessment Framework) which is secure fit (children have to have achieved, and there be evidence of, every statement for the level at which the team assess that child). This means currently, not many children will be ARE as they have not taught the whole curriculum and to assess a child at ARE they need all the statements at WT and all the statements at ARE (and evidence of this). Also use Little Wandle assessments in the autumn term. They will be using AR (Accelerated Reader) to help them assess reading from the Spring Term.

Years 3-5

In addition to teacher knowledge of the child, outcomes from lessons staff use the following tests/assessments to support their judgements:

STAR tests for Reading (this gives you a reading age for each of the children in your class and measures attainment and progress).

NFER (National Foundation for Education Research) tests for Reading and Maths which give you a score for each child in your class and this translates into whether they are working towards, working at or working at greater depth.

Year 6:

Children sit past SAT papers every half term which enable the team to make accurate assessments and identify gaps they need to close (this information will support planning and grouping). They have a TAF (Teacher Assessment Framework) which is secure fit (children have to have achieved, and there be evidence of, every statement for the level at which the team assess that child).

In addition as a whole school the leadership team also have provided the following support for staff in assessing children's attainment:

Maths: moderation and observations for the staff team (including LSA3 and HLTA) - looked at our own Maths books with guidance to be able to moderate where the children were with advice from GC

English Writing: moderation training for our English Advisor then we moderated our books in year group teams. All staff have access to an end of year expectation for writing for their year group. We also have examples of writing for Year 2 and Year 6, exemplification materials (both national and county), to support judgements. This is something we are looking to purchase for the rest of the school.

The need for intervention is mentioned a lot with different year groups. What is the school doing to ensure that these interventions are available to all students who need it? Is there anything that we, as governors, can do to support the delivery of these interventions?

As a leadership team this is a real priority for us. Having additional capacity in our leadership team (with our new phase leaders) and also in our SEND and inclusion team will enable us to ensure more interventions happen.

After pupil progress meetings next week the PLs will be able to identify interventions that are needed across their phase and pool adults in the afternoon so that these needs can be addressed. E.g. if year 6 are already doing a grammar intervention and some children from Year 5 are struggling then we could combine the groups. We have most of our year groups working effectively as a year group team, we now need to begin working as a phase then whole school to share resources and play to people's strengths.