Chetwynd Junior School

Performance & Standards committee

Minutes

Date: Monday 15th July 2024 at 5:30pm
Location: Held in school

Governors In Attendance

Stephanie Lawes (SA) Head Teacher
Chris Atkins (CA)
Phil Sanders (PS)
Steve Mountford (SM)
Louise Kitson (LK) Co chair
Julie Attwood (JA)
John Waine (JW)
Nathan Townsend (NT) Co chair
Jodie Marston (JM)
Greg Shute (GS)
Michelle Wallace (MW) (Observing)

In Attendance

Cassandra Sutcliffe (CS) Clerk

Meeting actions	Who / Date for completion
Work on data presentation options for governors' meetings	PS, September 2024
Circulate the quiz on Prevent training	SL, July 2024
Provide the governors with a glossary of terms	SL, Autumn term 2024
Circulate the meeting dates for next year, along with pay committee dates	SL or SGP, July 2024

Item	Minutes	Action
1.	**Welcome and apologies.** The co-chairs welcomed governors to the meeting which started at 17:30 and was quorate throughout. There were no apologies received. GS was introduced to the committee as the new parent governor and introductions were made.	
2.	**Declarations of interest** There were no declarations pertinent to the meeting agenda declared.	
3.	**Review of current academic data** The headteacher displayed the 2023-2024 data and stated that it had been updated to illustrate a year group's progress on entry and how they progress year by year. The dip in Maths was explained to be due to the change from White Rose to NFER as the assessments are more challenging, but provide a more accurate picture. <u>Gov – Do you expect the dip to continue or is it just an initial dip?</u> The headteacher explained that it would continue until all pupils had started on NEFT in Year 3. <u>Gov – Will you be offering morning maths club next year?</u> It was confirmed that they would continue and the team had identified different groups for that focussed work. The chart for Year 3 was displayed. A governor requested a line chart, instead of a bar chart, with a line showing the expected targets vs what the pupils were achieving, through Years 3-6. The headteacher explained that there were no standardised scores for Years 3-5, just average scores. A governor suggested doing a line graph per subject and proposed putting a group together to work on data options so a final version could be agreed. The headteacher added that the data presented at the meeting was purely to aid the governors' understanding. It was agreed that PS would visit in September to put together graph options for governors to choose their preference. Year 4 data was displayed and the headteacher commented on the unusually high grammar scores from the previous year which would need investigating, the greater number of boys in the cohort and trying to close the gender gaps earlier.	**Action: PS**

	Year 5 data was displayed and the headteacher commented on the inroads being made since their entry to the school, the high percentage on the SEND register, the gender imbalance with 20 more boys than girls, the desire to unpick the non-readers next year and ensuring disadvantaged children were reading at home. The year 6 data was displayed and the headteacher explained the missed education in year 3 due to Covid and that they have come out of year 6 having done incredibly well in their SATS. A governor commented on the positive SATs results and how it displayed how well the school had done. The subject specific data for Writing, Reading, GPS, and Maths were taken in turn and the main figures were drawn out by the headteacher. A governor requested the colours on the line graphs to be more contrasting and PS would also look into this. The GAP data comparing disadvantaged and SEND children to the rest of the class was considered. The headteacher explained that this was how the DofE analyses the data. Positive comments were made on the disadvantaged pupils data, that the GAP had been closed over time. The headteacher stated that she planned to set a target on the SEND GAP for the new SENDCo. Finally, the headteacher pointed out the combined score percentages. The governors congratulated the staff for their hard work in achieving the results shared. The headteacher thanked MW for her focused Maths work with a group of girls, building their confidence. <u>Gov – If Ofsted came in today, would they say we have added value?</u> The headteacher felt that the school could evidence that.	**Action: PS**
4.	**Curriculum developments** The headteacher commenced this section by asking the governors to reflect on the developments made recently, as many had been involved in the curriculum and made visits to the school. The headteacher and governors each fed into the discussion and the following were some of the thoughts expressed: subject leads had been developed and unnecessary content stripped out, there was no subject hierarchy, DT bridge models had been well received and externally praised, the children could articulate and relate to their learning with enthusiasm, subject leads had time to dedicate to their subjects and felt more confident, the subject differentiation between history and geography was hard to identify, confident conversations with two year 3 pupils, united staff working collaboratively, and how the children's behaviour at the residential was a credit to the school, <u>Gov – Do frequent visits hinder the teachers/pupils?</u> Staff shared that drop-ins made the staff more confident, provided practice at explaining their subjects, things could be nipped in the bud with younger teaching staff, children were calmer now with an unfamiliar adult in the room, and staff felt that their teaching was developing. It was shared that next year, the programme would be carried on, but reducing to only the three core subjects in the summer term due to how busy the school was at the end of the year. A positive story was relayed about a playground incident and the support staff were praised in how they managed the situation. It was shared that many of the year 6 pupil voice comments included the lunchtime supervisors.	
5.	**Safeguarding** An introduction to Prevent, a government initiative to address radicalisation with early intervention, was made by the headteacher. Staff had recently had a refresh on the topic and governors would be sent a short online quiz following the meeting. She handed over to MW who led the training on Prevent.	**Action: SL**

	MW commenced by explaining that Prevent was set up to stop people becoming terrorists or supporting violent extremism. She spoke of the importance of the programme and shared examples of dangerous content that children can be exposed to. A graph was shared illustrating how the issue was on the rise and a list detailing radicalising warning signs was explored. Gov – How do you know that white supremacy is an issue in Nuneaton? MC confirmed that this was the most frequent type of prevent referral made around Nuneaton. At the end of the presentation, the headteacher stated that there was work to be done in the school and made a request for the PHSE Governor Lead to monitor this area. Staff need to be aware but also less sensitive to decide how to address the topics in an age appropriate way. The reporting process was touched upon; how suspected incidents are to be reported by the staff member directly to the police.	
6.	**OPAL** MW was excited to share the school's plans to follow the OPAL programme where children would access the outside space all year round to engage in different types of play. The space would be sectioned into zones and the school planned to send a letter to parents requesting donations for things like pallets, plates, pots, pans and den building material. OPAL hopes to improve children's ability to play and interact with each other. Stories were shared of little successes already seen and governors liked the idea of returning back to play like they remembered from their childhoods. MW described her visit to St Paul's and was convinced of its potential for Chetwynd. Gov – Do the staff find it helpful? MW relayed a story where the school chose not to get the equipment out and the contrast was noticeable as there were more playground incidents that day. The headteacher added that the school would need to purchase a shed for non-weather-proof items but felt that the benefits outweighed any work. Gov – Will you start on day one in September? The headteacher explained that it would take time to build up resources but the programme would commence at a low level from day one. Gov – Did the school visited recommend certain activities? MW said that the school's mentor would work with the school on choosing the activities, building it up as time went on. Gov – Will you present this to parents? The headteacher confirmed that next summer the school would have an OPAL afternoon and invite parents in.	
6.	**Pupil Premium impact** The governors looked together at the monitoring visit report for Children in Care and Previously Children in Care. Plans were shared for staff training on the October inset day from the LA Safeguarding Team and would cover trauma and examples of how to support children. This also responded to the staff questionnaire requesting more training on dealing with certain behaviours. PS, the lead on this area, explained that Warwickshire CC come in every year to assess and provide this report. The headteacher would be taking over this area, working with JM as the children often overlap into SEND. A governor requested a glossary of terms and the HT stated that she was working on that. The report highlighted academic success as a weakness and the headteacher explained that this was difficult as the pupils are often on the SEND register. The strengths at the end of the report were looked at together with the agreed actions.	**Action: SL**

	RADY The updated RADY had been added to the folder for governors to look at. The headteacher explained that it was linked to her performance management. The first number shows things at September and the second number reflects where the school was at the end of the Summer term. Some of the successes shared by the headteacher included more involved governors, PP children results, and focussed inset days targeting gaps. The challenge of having three new teachers next year was noted. <u>Gov – Do you differentiate PP children in the class</u>? The headteacher responded saying that the school tries to spread the PP children across the classes, as well as disadvantaged SEND and able children. There was nothing differentiating them from other pupils. <u>Gov –What happens when you hit four on everything on RADY?</u> The process starts again for new year groups. The headteacher concluded by commenting on the amount of financial contributions schools can ask parents to make each year and that the school would look to limit this in the future.	
7.	**Any other business** There was no other business to share.	
8.	**Date of next meeting and meeting close** The headteacher displayed suggested dates for next year, provided by the SGP. The first date back being Tuesday 7th of October. The dates would be circulated after the meeting, along with two pay committee meeting dates. It was noted that most of the dates take place on Mondays and no objections were made. *CA left the meeting.* JM confirmed that she would be willing to stay on as staff governor. The option for others to put themselves forward would be made available but typically the staff were not forthcoming. The need for another parent governor was noted and an advertisement was made at the Year 3 evening. With no further business to discuss, the meeting closed at 19:05.	**Action: SL**

Committee Chair

_____