



Cayley Primary School

Minutes of the Full Governing Body

Date of Meeting	7 th October 2019
Venue	Cayley Primary School, Aston Street, London E14 7NG
Chair	Nicholas Paul
Clerk	Naomi Bell

MEMBERSHIP

Type	Membership	Attendance
Staff	Lissa Samuel (Headteacher)*	Attended
	Chrisinda Nieuwenhuis (CN) (AHT)*	Attended
Local Authority	Nicholas Paul (LA) (Chair)*	Attended
Co-Opted	Chris Worthington*	Attended
	Don Hall (DH) (VC)*	Attended
	Ben Sperring*	Attended
	Susan Mordey (SM)*	Attended
	Saleha Habibz-Khatun (SHK)*	Attended
Associate	Philipp Simon (PS)	-
	Jamir Chowdhury (JC)*	Attended
Parent	Vacancy	-
	Khoyrul Shaheed (KS)*	Attended

*Denotes attendance - Denotes no response

Also in Attendance		
Zoe Winson-Stowe (ZWS)*	Assistant Headteacher EYFS and Behaviour	Attended
Hussain Shefaar (HS)*	Assistant Headteacher UKS2	Attended
Andrew Sellers (AS)*	Assistant Headteacher LKS2 (Maternity Leave Absence)	Attended

[The meeting commenced at 16.16 hours and was quorate]

PART 1 – Open Section

Agenda Item 1: Achievements and Standards Presentation

HS provided the context around 2018/19 outcomes and the way in which Ofsted inspection lines of enquiry pertain to the whole School and would consider, inter alia, the quality of education provided, behaviour and attributes, personal development and leadership and management.

The presentation would focus on attainment and progress. However, HS pointed out that as part of the new Ofsted framework the focus had shifted from attainment and progress and going forward presentations would focus on other aspects of the new Ofsted framework.

EYFS

ZWS reported the following highlights:

- The GLD outcomes in 2018/19 were significantly lower than the outcomes recorded for both the School and the LBTH in 2017/18 which was cohort specific.
- 2018/19 cohort had its own unique characteristics, including pupils with neurodevelopmental needs, Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD) etc., plus high levels of mobility throughout the year.
- There were only 3 aspects of Learning and Development (L&D) in which the School failed to exceed LBTH outcomes even though the School's overall GLD was lower than the outcome recorded for the borough.
 - Reading – Literacy element
 - Writing – Literacy element
 - The world - Understanding the world element

- The team had reviewed the outcomes which could be due to a few individual children with diverse and multiple needs. The team was in the process of developing strategies for *literacy and the world* which could potentially involve the use of the outdoors, incorporating School Journey etc. which would provide unique experiences, as well as the opportunity for children to understand the world in its unique way.
- **Literacy** – the School currently used the Read Write Inc. programme to help meet the needs of children at the earlier stages of development and those children admitted during the academic year. There had been several discussions both in-house and with the LA on what strategies/interventions would be most effective for children at the earliest stages.
- The School had reviewed its practice/provision aspect of its EYFS ethos and was also reviewing its enabling environment. It was considering how to further embed its literacy opportunities which could involve reviewing other models in other settings etc.
- The best practice that had been embedded across the School had made a significant difference which was evident in the progress made across L&D.
- There was a smaller cohort for 2019/20 comprising 2 classes in Nursery which would be monitored in the changing context of staffing allocation in relation to a smaller team, which would include an aspect of staff-wellbeing, as well as the individual aspects of L&D.
- Parent Gym – the team was promoting sessions which would be run for 7 weeks each term and directly connected to parents in EYFS and/or any parent identified as having a need or self-referrals. They sessions were well received and Denise McKenzie had received a commendation from Parent Gym organisation.

Action Point – 7 th October 2019	Lead	Timescale
AP –10/2019 – 01 –Governors were invited to view EYFS on an operational basis	All	Any

Q&A – BS queried whether the outcome for early reading and writing was historically lower than the LBTH outcomes? It had remained below LBTH and national outcomes. However, nationally writing was the aspect of an area that most children found challenging.

Q&A - SHK asked how did the outcomes compare with the data gleaned on entry for children in Reception? Every child made had made progress. The percentage recorded included children who had exceeded the Early Learning Goals (ELG).

Q&A – SHK sought clarification as to whether the team was still utilising the School’s model for capturing data on entry, and if not, what model was being followed? There was no prescribed model so team used its own observation and assessment tool which allowed each person’s mark to be assessed on entry according to the EY outcomes in the same way they would be assessed against the ELG with the exemplification to assist in that process.

Q&A – SHK asked when Reception was last moderated by the LA and did the LA review the Nursery? EYFS had been moderated by the LA in 2018 and would be moderated again in 2019 at the behest of the School. The LA does not look formally at Nursery as part of its moderation visit, but it was familiar with the overall picture in EYFS. The outcome in writing was not as a direct result of the Nursery failing to implement adequate strategies etc. The previous cohort had exhibited S&L, communication needs which appeared to be a continuing picture.

ZWS had met with the LA to determine strategies to ensure that children were secure in S&L which would underpin their literacy going forward.

Q&A - SHK asked whether there was an identifiable trend in determining whether children from the morning cohort in Nursery progressed quicker in comparison with the PM cohort and whether a child attending F/T Nursery provision progressed more rapidly than children attending P/T, especially considering some children did not attend Nursery at all? Research appeared to suggest that there should be no discernible difference, but anecdotally there were differences. The 2018/19 PM cohort presented with unique characteristics that was not prevalent amongst children attending the AM sessions which may have

been anomalous. The children attending F/T Nursery provision had access to a range of experiences on a scale not available to children attending the AM or PM sessions. However, the team was cognisant of the issue and ensured there was a balanced approach between each group to ensure access to similar experiences.

Q&A – DH asked whether there were significant differences between genders? Historically, there had been a gender based difference, in particular in literacy. The School had ensured that boys' interests were recognised and their involvement maximised. However, recently boys were amongst the School's *exceeding writers'* category.

Lower Phase

AS reported the following:

Year 1 Data

- The phonics outcome was 90% which was higher than LBTH and National outcomes.
- To ensure that the outcome was maintained the School would continue to provide support for the teachers to teach the *Read Write Inc.* programme, maintain a tracking mechanism.
- Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils compared with non-disadvantaged pupils reflected a difference of 21% (76%/94% respectively).
- The progress of disadvantaged pupils was tracked and their progress consistently reviewed. The School would ensure that interventions were put in place to ensure that disadvantaged pupils reached their full potential.
- Girls out performed boys attaining a 100% pass rate compared with the boys pass rate of 85%. It was in line with the LBTH and national pictures.
- There outcomes for the LBTH and national had not yet been published, but it was anticipated that the School would fall below those outcomes. However, the School was very good at closing the gap and making rapid progress from Year 1 to Year 2.
- The School was encouraging a love of reading - the School had delivered workshops for parents to ensure that it continued in the home environment.
- The School would move away from its established phonics programme *Read Write Inc.* in favour of real book planning which was expected to produce a positive effect on reading scores and pupils' love of reading. There would also be 121 reading sessions in which pupils would be read to on a weekly basis. The process had previously had a significant impact on fluency.

Year 2 Data

- The outcomes for Reading, Writing and Maths were above LBTH and national outcomes at 74% for Cayley and 65% national.
- There was an upward trajectory for pupils reaching EXS in writing reflecting a 7.4% increase on 2018/19 outcomes which showed that the strategies put in place around the English curriculum were having a positive impact.
- Results showed that the gap between the disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged had narrowed considerably to 73%/75% respectively.
- Girls continued to outperform boys which aligned with both the national and LA outcomes.
- The School was reviewing strategies to ensure that boys were engaged and achieved higher outcomes. There would be higher expectations of boys, an encouragement fathers to participate in reading with their children and provide positive role models.
- The School was reviewing how ICT could increase boys' attainment and was participating in a pilot project in which pupils would read stories on iPads.
- CPC –research had identified that boys preferred fiction texts so the School would introduce both fiction and non-fiction texts as part of its curriculum.
- **Maths** – Although the 2018/19 outcomes were higher in the EXS than both the LA and national outcomes, the outcomes were lower in GDS. The School would continue to use White Rose Maths which had had a significant impact on attainment of pupils reaching 84%, but there would now be a focus on the GDS pupils which reflected 17% outcome for 2018/19.
- The Maths TLR would provide training to teachers to ensure that pupils were being challenged.

- Teachers were using the 8:45-9am timeslot to rehearse the rapid recall of basic Maths skills.
- **Writing** - at GDS was lower than national and teachers needed to have higher expectations for those pupils. The School would continue to introduce writing conferences involving 121 sessions in which staff/pupils edit writing pieces. This process was successful in 2018/19 in uplevelling pupils to GDS.

Q&A – KS queried whether the parents had been informed about the 15 minute rapid recall Maths sessions and whether the School targeted those pupils which were lagging behind? Parents had been informed, but the School could recirculate the information to parents. The School already targeted those pupils which required additional support in any subject and utilised the 15 minute sessions accordingly.

[JC arrived at the meeting at 16:42 hours]

Q&A – BS asked what strategies had the School put in place to ensure that those pupils in the bottom 20% reached EXS for Reading in 2019/20? A phonics group would be set up for those pupils who failed the phonics test in Year 1, 121tuition would take place to improve reading levels, phonics revision and comprehension etc. The School was reviewing the planning which would focus on GDS and lower attaining pupils.

Q&A - BS asked whether there was more ownership in planning than last year? Yes, skeleton plans had been put in place but required teachers to adapt them to ensure that they met the needs of the pupils and it was anticipated to have a positive effect on the 20% lower attainers.

Q&A - KS commented that the School had similar issues over the last few years in Reading and Maths and asked whether there was something inherent in the School's methods that failed to bring about the required outcomes? AS pointed out that the data was above national and LBTH outcomes and it was anticipated that the School would be ranked in the top 10 schools within the borough for Reading, Writing and Maths combined. Although it appeared that 20% of pupils were not achieving EXS, the School was an Inclusive school with pupils with additional needs in every class who were making significant progress, but may not reach EXS.

BS pointed out that the new Ofsted Framework would not accept SEN/disadvantage etc. as justification for pupils not achieving the EXS. However, 100% pupils at the School had made progress from their baseline. The School also had high levels of mobility.

Action Point – 7 th October 2019	Lead	Timescale
AP –10/2019 – 02 –Whole-School progress to be identified at the next presentation	AS	TBC

Q&A - KS asked whether the data could separate out the SEN from the non-SEN? It would be unfair to ask the AHTs to provide another layer of detail that even the LA did not require. SHK believed that it should be the DHT who had a responsibility for SEND and Inclusion who should provide the information. CN commented that there was not enough time to show Governors all the detailed work, strategies and interventions that went on behind the scenes which ensured that 100% of pupils had made progress. Governors should visit the School to experience a wider picture.

Data formed only a small part of the new Ofsted Framework which demonstrated a more qualitative focus on curriculum. SH reminded Governors that Ofsted would not be reviewing the internal data being presented.

Pupil Progress meetings were held termly which tracked all pupils and in particular, the 20% of pupils which had not reached the EXS.

Q&A - Q&A - JC asked if the results had improved since 2017/18? The outcomes were higher for Writing and Maths, but lower for Reading which was cohort specific.

Year 3 Data

- Girls outperformed boys
- There was no correlation between advantaged and disadvantaged

- The English curriculum planning had shown a significant impact on Reading and Writing.
- There was a need to focus on improving the percentage of pupils working at GDS.

AS confirmed that the same interventions would be put in place as with Years 1 & 2.

Year 4 Data

HS reported the following highlights:

- Year 4 pupils had surpassed the end of year targets having achieved 72% for Reading, 80% in Maths and 52% in writing.
- Writing was consistently the area that required focus especially in relation to the percentage of pupils working at GDS. Going forward the School would focus on the area in Year 5 and 6.

Year 5 Data (current Year 6)

- The outcomes for Reading and Maths at 62% and 66% respectively were better than the previous Year 5 results. However, the cohort had transitioned into KS2 with the lowest KS1 results, but the data clearly identified that significant progress had been made.
- Interventions and strategies had already been put in place for Writing.
- The School had requested a mock moderation in February and would aim to have completed the 6 pieces of writing by that deadline, rather than June.
- The teachers themselves had asked to complete 3 pieces of writing in the autumn term and 3 after ½ term which would allow sufficient time for review.
- The School had ensured that the texts across the School linked well with each subject lesson e.g. Galapagos Islands linked with King Kong which in turn linked with Charles Darwin's theory of evolution.

Year 6 Data

- Attainment across all subjects in EXS and GDS was above the national outcomes with the exception of Writing which matched the national outcome.

Subject	Cayley EXS	National EXS	Cayley GDS	National GDS
Maths	93%	79%	65%	27%
Reading	83%	73%	53%	27%
Writing	80%	78%	20%	20%

- In terms of average point score and average progress the School was higher than national: in Reading it reflected +3.65% compared with national outcome of 0.03%.
- The School was also above LA outcomes for the 1st time in all subjects.
- Girls still outperformed boys by statistically insignificant levels.
- Boys outperformed girls in terms of progress made in Maths.
- There was a 2% gap in favour of the girls in Writing and GPS.
- Writing would need to be reviewed for the current cohort which exhibited additional SEN.
- The School had recorded its highest outcome in GDS in Maths at 65% which was in part thanks to the Year 6 teachers who ran Easter and After School clubs in order to facilitate improvement. There had also been a focus group at Stepney Green School to assist pupils working at GDS 1-day per week.
- HS had met with JC and the LA consultant to undertake an analysis of the maths outcomes for 2017/18 which had been broken down to specific areas on which to focus.
- The School wanted to build on the success, but it would be difficult to maintain the level of outcomes, in particular with the current Year 6.
- The GDS was better this year than the EXS outcomes in the blip year and the School was now in a strong position at all levels.

Q&A - JC asked whether there was anything the FGB could do to support the team in raising achievement in Writing? Writing was a national issue. The School was introducing an '*idiom of the day*'. Governors could participate by accompanying pupils on visits etc. to provide comprehensive experiences

which would inform pupils' writing and challenge pupils to write. There were no quick fixes because research identified that pupils were more prone to experiencing high cognitive load which could reduce academic success.

Q&A – SHK queried whether pupils who were admitted to the School from overseas and were new to English had an opportunity to take phonics? Yes, the School ran a new to UK programme, an accelerated phonics programme.

The Chair, personally and on behalf of the FGB, thanked the AHTs for their extra time in attending the meeting and staff for their hard work in achieving such outstanding outcomes.

[ZWS, HS, AS left the meeting at 17:11 hours]

Agenda Item 2: Welcome, Apologies for Absence

Presenting: Clerk

The Chair welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the 2019/20 academic year. It was **NOTED** that there had been no response from Philipp Simon.

Agenda Item 3: Election of Chair/Vice Chair

Presenting: Clerk

The Clerk invited nominations for the role of Chair of the FGB. Nick Paul was nominated for the role which was seconded by Chris Worthington and Ben Sperring.

There being no other nominations received the eligible members of the FGB unanimously **AGREED** to elect Nick Paul as Chair.

Nick Paul consented to continue to act in the capacity as Chair and was therefore duly re-elected unopposed for a further term of 1-year in accordance with the School Governance (Procedures) (England) Regulations 2013 and duly began his tenure as Chair at 17.15 hours which would remain subject to his term of office being extended at the next meeting.

Election of Vice Chair

The Clerk invited nominations for the role of Vice Chair. Don Hall was nominated to the role by the Chair of the FGB which was seconded by Jamir Chowdhury.

No other nominations were received and eligible members of the Forum unanimously **AGREED** to elect Don Hall as Vice Chair of the FGB.

Don Hall consented to act in the role of Vice Chair and was therefore duly re-elected unopposed for the duration of one year in accordance with the School Governance (Procedures) (England) Regulations 2013.

Agenda Item 4: Declarations of Pecuniary Interest

Presenting: Clerk/All

Governors were asked to declare the nature and extent of their interest in the transactions discussed to be considered at the meeting or declare that there were no such interests. A Governor must also absent him/herself from any discussions of the Governing Body (GB) in which it is possible that a conflict will arise between his/her duty to act solely in the interests of the School (in accordance with the requirements of The School Governance (Procedures) (England) Regulations 2013.

All Governors present submitted a Declaration of Pecuniary Interest form. There were no new declarations of interests recorded in relation to the agenda items.

Agenda Item 5: Review Governing Body Constitution, Membership, Terms of Reference and issues
Presenting: Chair
Challenge/Discussion

5.1 Governor Vacancies

The Constitution, Terms of Reference and membership had been consolidated into the School's new Governance and Financial Manual without any material changes. The complement of the Instrument of Governance (IOG) remained unchanged since 2015 and comprised to following types of membership:

Membership Type	Number permitted
Local Authority	1
Staff	1
Headteacher	1
Parent	2
Co-Opted	5

The FGB discussed whether it needed to amend its IOG in order that it provided sufficient capacity in terms of succession.

Q&A - KS asked whether in light of JM's resignation the FGB had adequate parental representation? SHK stated that there was a danger in increasing the number of Parent Governors (PG) because historically it had been difficult to secure their attendance at meetings.

The FGB **AGREED** that there should be no increase in the permitted number of Parent Governors.

The School had already begun the advertising process for a new PG to replace AM. The Headteacher and Chair had met previously with perspective PGs to ensure that they fully understood the role. CW suggested that perspective PGs could also meet with other PGs who were familiar with the role and its specific challenges. The Headteacher confirmed that the School provided a 'buddy system' for new Governors as part of its induction process.

5.2 End of Term of Office

The FGB were advised that that the term of office for PS was due to cease on 11.10.2019.

KS raised concern regarding PS continuing to receive FGB correspondence. As an Associate Member PS was entitled to receive all relevant documentation. JC noted that it would leave the FGB without legal expertise. The Chair advised that the skills audit would identify any potential gaps within the FGB capabilities.

Addendum: *The Clerk advised the School that it could retain PS as an Associate Member until the School identified an alternative method of obtaining legal expertise.*

Action Point – 7 th October 2019	Lead	Timescale
AP – 10/2019 – 03 – AM would be removed as an AM and the School would contact PM on an adhoc basis going forward	Chair	ASAP

The FGB **NOTED** that the term of office for NP was due to cease on 13th December 2019 and would be considered at the next FGB meeting on 25th November 2019.

5.3 Confirmation of Link Governors

Responsibility Area	Link Governor
Child Protection/Looked After Children (LAC)	NP
SEND	SHK/CN
Gifted and Talented	All Governors
English	SM/JC /DH
Mathematics	KS/BS

Science & Technologies (Computing)	CW/BS
Physical Development	SHK/NP
Creativity	SM/NP
Humanities (inc: RE)	CW/CN
Spiritual, Moral, Social, Cultural	JC/KS
EYFS	NP
Headteacher PM Review	BS/DH

The FGB **AGREED** that areas of responsibility would remain the same for 2019/20.

KS had not made contact with his corresponding subject lead during the last year and queried whether he had missed any meetings. KS was advised that as a Link Governor it was part of his remit to contact the subject lead/TLR and arrange appointments accordingly to review his specific area as a 'critical friend'.

5.4 Governors Skills Audit (2019)

The Headteacher reported that there were some skills audits outstanding.

Action Point – 7 th October 2019	Lead	Timescale
AP – 10/2019 – 04 – Remaining Governors to complete the skills audit	All	ASAP

The audit identified that the FGB exhibited the following:

- A significantly high level of expertise from the education sector which could have the potential to skew decisions.
- A lack of representation in HR since KB had stepped down.
- A lack of financial planning, monitoring and decision making experience which was required to build effective succession planning in the F&GP Committee following AM's departure.
- No access to free legal expertise should PS be removed as an Associate Member.
- General experience of inspection and oversight attracted variable scores.

BS had interpreted the question to mean leading an inspection as opposed to participating in a process.

Some of the lower self-evaluation scores attributed did not necessarily reflect the actual level of expertise exhibited.

The Headteacher noted that attendance at training courses had been low. The Clerk advised Governors where a fee was applicable for training Governors should seek prior approval from the School before booking on a course.

The School could narrow the impact of the gap in certain areas through relevant training. BS reminded Governors that they had access to *Modern Governor* which provided online professional development for governors and trustees in maintained schools.

The School had also signed up to *Inspiring Governance* to secure Governors with relevant skillsets.

Action Point – 7 th October 2019	Lead	Timescale
AP – 10/2019 – 05 – Clerk to recirculate the 2019/20 training schedule	Clerk	ASAP

KS requested whether he could attend the School to review the FGB strategic direction in operation in order to convey to the wider community how well the School functioned. It was suggested that he participate by reading to/with a pupil or group of pupils prior to or following a meeting with the relevant subject lead for Maths and Spiritual, Moral, Social, Cultural areas.

Action Point – 7 th October 2019	Lead	Timescale
AP – 10/2019 – 06 – Competency matrix to be completed with a summary of scores/comments	Head	ASAP

5.5 Edubase to be updated – This served as a reminder for the Headteacher.

Agenda Item 6: Agree Committee Structure, Membership and Terms of Reference

Presenting: Chair/All

Challenge/Discussion

Finance & General Purposes Committee

Names	Membership Type
CW (Chair)	Co-Opted Governor
DH	Co-Opted Governor
NP	LA Governor
LS	Headteacher
PS	Associate Member (if required)
JC	Associate Member
KS	Parent Governor

The FGB **APPROVED** the current structure and terms of reference as **RECOMMENDED** by the F&GP Committee.

Agenda Item 7: NGA Code of Conduct 2019

Presenting: Chair

Challenge/Discussion

All Governors present confirmed that they had read the NGA Code of Conduct 2019 version.

The eligible members of the FGB **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY** the **RECOMMENDATION** from the F&GP Committee that the School should adopt the 2019 version of the NGA Code of Conduct going forward.

Agenda Item 8: Competency Matrix

Presenting: Chair/All

This item was discussed under Agenda Item 5.4 Governor Skills above.

Agenda Item 9: Minutes of the Meeting held on 8th July 2019 (Circulated) & Review of Action Points and Matters Arising

Presenting: Chair/All

The minutes of the previous meeting were **APPROVED** as a true and accurate reflection of the meeting and were duly signed by the Chair at 18:29 hours.

9.1 Review of action points

ITEM	Carried Forward Actions - 21 st January 2019	LEAD	TIMESCALE
Item 6: Pupil Premium Report	Approach Docklands Museum to ascertain whether they could do a talk at the school	DH Chair	UNRESOLVED – on 20.05.2019 DH volunteered to follow-up on this action. Carried Forward to the next meeting on 25.11.2019 07.10.2019
Item 10: Governors Link Visits/Training – SCIENCE	To undertake a follow-up science visit and report back to the FGB	BS	PARTIALLY RESOLVED - BS reported that Khalida Rahman was now responsible for Science and he would schedule visits with her. Feedback to be provided at a future date.

Agenda Item	Carried Forward Actions - 4 th March 2019 actions	Lead	Update/Timescale
Item 3: Governing Body Matters	AP – 03/2019 – 02 – Ascertain whether CW and SHK wanted to continue to hold office as Co-Opted Governors	Chair	RESOLVED: The Head had contacted SHK

	AP -03/2019 – 03 – Ascertain whether AM wanted to continue to hold office as Parent Governor	Chair	NO LONGER REQUIRED: This action had been subsumed by AP – 10/2019 – 01 - below from 07.10.2019 FGB meeting which was no longer required.
Item 5: Financial Reports SLAs	AP – 03/2019 – 05 – Ascertain what the Advisory Support Service and the 2 nd entry of Professional Services entail	Head	RESOLVED – The Headteacher provided feedback to the membership
Item 6: Headteacher Report SDP	AP - 03/2019 – 07 - Evidence as to what strategies the School had in place to deal with higher achievers	Head	RESOLVED: This issue had been discussed during the earlier achievements and standards presentation delivered under Agenda Item 1 above.

Agenda Item	8 th July 2019 Actions	Lead	Timescale
Item 8: SIP/SEF	AP – 07/2019 – 01 – Bids to be submitted to organisations to secure funding for art	Head	ONGOING: The Head had submitted a bid but the School did not meet the criteria for fine art but would continue to source other options
	AP – 07/2019 – 02 - All suggestions, commonalities would be reviewed, collated and discussed with SLT to inform the School's focuses for its SDP plan going forward	Head	RESOLVED: All responses had been collated consultation which had been incorporated into the SDP

All other actions had been completed.

5.2 Matters Arising

Q&A - SHK sought clarification as to whether an operational decision had been taken to appoint AS an AHT? The Headteacher reported that there would be further discussion at this meeting.

CW asked what is the current position regarding the appointment? AS remained an acting AHT (Maternity Leave) Cover until the substantive post holder(s) returned.

KS intimated that he had received a letter from the Headteacher which indicated that AS was an AHT and pointed out that AS appeared on the School's website as AHT and not as an *acting* AHT. However, by virtue of the position being maternity leave cover it implied that the position was not permanent in nature.

Agenda Item 10: Feedback from Committee Meetings

Presenting: CW/Headteacher

Discussion/ Challenge

Finance & General Purposes Committee – 7th October 2019 (Verbal Update)

CW reported provided the following highlights:

- The Committee had reviewed the Budget Monitoring Report which had been generated from the RM System and would no longer be produced on an Excel spreadsheet.
- Some budget lines reflected an overspend whilst others reflected an underspend. The underspends would be offset against the overspends.
- The budget line for supply teachers exhibited an overspend, but that had been offset by the underspend in the staffing budget.

- The LA Accountant had advised that the costs associated with teaching posts should continue to be reflected in the budget forecast and not deleted in order to show an improved trajectory due to the potential for an additional class to be opened in January 2020.
 - The School appeared to have overspent on its SEN budget but some elements had been miscoded. The School now utilising personalised budgets for individual pupils and going forward the budgets would be reflected as specific budgets under the School's main budget. The School would receive funding from LB Newham for a pupil attending the School, but resident in Newham, which would meet the cost of visualiser equipment etc. required.
 - The FGB was advised that on advice from the LA Accountant virements would be sought at the F&GP Committee meeting in January 2020.
 - The School had recently undergone a GDPR audit which recommended that the process for parents to approve the use of their child(s) data required an explicit *prefer not to say* option.
 - The School had had an allegation of a data breach made against it by a parent who claimed that the School had released data to another school by confirming that a pupil of the School was in attendance and had not been taken to hospital by the emergency services. The allegation had been logged and fully investigated by the IOC which determined that there had been no data breach.
- The Headteacher had completed Level 2 certificate in Data Protection over the summer term.

Q&A - KS queried what had been the benefit from the restructure if the budget for teaching staff had increased? The Headteacher explained that the budget for the administrative team had increased last year because it had met the costs of the settlement agreements.

Q&A – CW sought clarification as to whether the overall administrative team budget reflected an increase or decrease? The budget had decreased and only spiked in 2018/19 due to redundancies.

Q&A – BS asked whether the Committee had discussed the projected deficit and any steps that could be taken to prevent it? This had not been discussed at the meeting. The Headteacher reported that the majority of the Schools with LBTH were projecting a deficit within the next 3-years. The School was currently reviewing its percentage spend on staffing. The 3-year budgeting forecast process had been based on costs associated with 2018/19, but those figures would not continue over the next 3-years. The School could now duplicate its budget which allowed projected spend to be removed so that they did not project for the next 3-years e.g. the budget for the admin team reflected the same projectile for the remainder of the 3-years deficit budget, but in fact had decreased significantly because the admin team had been reduced and the School was not replacing teaching staff leavers in the same way.

CW clarified that the finance system worked in such a way that one-off budgeted elements were automatically projected over the next 3-years.

The Headteacher stated that the increase in teachers' pay and the employer's pension contribution had been included in the forecast in full as it was unknown what percentage was to be met by the Government.

The Headteacher remained cognisant of the issue and would provide the FGB with new projections in the near future.

Q&A - KS reported that he had been informed by a parent that a TA had taught a class of Year 5 pupils for 2/3 days instead of the teacher. He sought clarification whether it was true and whether it was due to a lack of funding? A trainee teacher had taken the class whilst the teacher was on sickness absence. It was part of the School's usual practice to provide trainees with supervised opportunities supported by the rest of the teaching team. The TA had been supervised by HS, AHT (Upper KS2).

Pupil Roll – Consideration of pupil numbers and impact on the school budget

- There was 587 pupils now on roll which was the highest in the School's history, but there were currently had 101 vacancies across the whole School:
 - 29 vacancies in Reception
 - 17 vacancies in Year 1
 - 18 vacancies in Year 2
 - 10 vacancies in Year 3
 - 8 vacancies in Year 4

- 17 vacancies in Year 5
- 2 vacancies in Year 6

The School had previously employed 2 class teachers and a support teacher to ensure a ratio of 1/20, but the same ratio had been achieved with smaller classes so a support teaching post was no longer required.

- There were 61 pupils in Reception, but the School had not heard from the LA with regard its request to reduce its PAN. However, it was unlikely that the request would be approved because of the development of the local area. The LA needed to reduce allocations by 8.5 FE across the LBTH schools and had been inundated with several requests to reduce PANs.

Q&A - SHK queried whether it was permissible to have 31 children in a class? There was no longer a legal limit on class sizes. The limit applicable to KS1 had been removed. There had been a verbal agreement amongst some schools that their PANs would not exceed 60 pupils, a decision which could not be supported where a child was legally entitled to a place at a school with a PAN was 90.

Q&A - CW asked what was the next option available if the LA refused the request for reducing the whole school to 2FE? The School needed to be mindful of how and where it placed its pupils. The issue had been discussed with Martin Tune, LA, on 7th October 2019 as to if and when the cohort should be split into 3 classes of 20 children. However, the School needed to be cognisant that friendships had already begun to develop since the start of term. The alternative option was for the School to maintain its current class structure and open an additional BLIP class for the remaining children.

Each FE the School opened from ‘mothballing’ even for a 1-term duration could cost approx. £100k. However, the School would not employ additional NNs, but would utilise HLTAs to maintain its quality because of the issues with language development.

Q&A - SHK asked how many children were in Nursery? There were currently 58 children in Nursery, 50 of whom attended on a P/T basis and 8 children who received 30-hours funding. SHK advised that some schools were redeploying Nursery Nurses (NN) and there was no longer a requirement to have a NN in Reception.

- The School had admitted additional pupils from the local new builds and maintained on an upward trajectory.
- There were 88 pupils in the current Year 6 which had begun in Reception as a class of 62. The School still maintained 3 classes in Year 6 with support from the AHT (Upper KS2).
- The school had admitted 4 pupils on the ASD during the summer term which had a significant impact on percentages. As a school with vacancies it would be required to admit pupils from all over the borough, but when vacancies became available at a school close to a pupil’s home the parent would inevitably seek a transfer. The current level of mobility was expected to increase significantly.

Q&A - CW queried whether the links with other schools within the local area could be utilised in relation to pupil roll? Although the School would admit any applicant referred to it by the LA it might suggest parents consider an alternative school which had known vacancies on roll if it met the needs of the child.

Q&A - SHK asked whether suggesting parents consider alternative schools could lead to complaints being submitted? Not if it was in the best interests of the child. Several other schools had also adopted this process.

Agenda Item 11: Schools Financial Value Standard (SFVS) – 2019 Amended Version (circulated) Presenting: Chair

Due to time constraints this item would be carried forward until the next FGB agenda.

Action Point – 7 th October 2019	Lead	Timescale
AP – 10/2019 – 07 – SFVS to be placed on the agenda for the next meeting	Clerk	25.11.2019

Agenda Item 12: School Improvement Plan (SIP)/Self-Evaluation Form (SEF) (circulated)
Presenting: Headteacher

Due to time constraints this item would be carried forward until the next FGB agenda.

Action Point – 7 th October 2019	Lead	Timescale
AP – 10/2019 – 08 – SIP/SEF to be placed on the agenda for the next meeting	Clerk	25.11.2019

Agenda Item 13: Headteacher's Report (circulated)

Presenting: Headteacher

Discussion/ Challenge

The Headteacher highlighted the following:

Agree Attendance Targets - The attendance report from the Attendance and Welfare Officer identified that the School had achieved 95.8%, but a report generated on SIMS showed that the School had reached a target of 96% which reflected 0.2% decrease on figures recorded in 2018.

Q&A - SHK asked whether the attendance figures included Nursery figures? There was no statutory requirement to report on Nursery attendance only Years 1-6.

Agenda Item 14: Safeguarding (Standing Item)

Presenting: Headteacher

Discussion/ Challenge

Safeguarding Report

Contextual Information

The Headteacher reported the following contextual information:

- There were 3 additional families on the CP Register.
- SIMS had been updated to reflect safeguarding concerns. A comprehensive and chronological report could be generated which allowed resources to be allocated accordingly.

[KS left the meeting at 18:06]

Safeguarding/Single Central Record Audit

The Chair would undertake the SCR audit and would feedback to the FGB accordingly.

Action Point – 7 th October 2019	Lead	Timescale
AP – 10/2019 – 09 – SCR audit to take place	Chair	Following ½ term

Keeping Children Safe in Education 2019

The majority of Governors confirmed that they had read and understood the latest KCSIE Guidance 2019.

Action Point – 7 th October 2019	Lead	Timescale
AP – 10/2019 – 10 – Read 2019 KCSIE Guidance	KS/JC	ASAP

Agenda Item 15: Personnel Update

Presenting: Headteacher

Discussion/ Challenge

Staff Attendance

Due to time constraints this item was not discussed and would be carried forward to the next FGB meeting.

Review of Staffing Levels

This information was contained within Page 10 of the School Development Plan (SDP) which had been circulated prior to the meeting.

The Headteacher reported the following highlights:

- The School had 2 AHTs – one of which was currently on Maternity Leave Absence and one on secondment at another school. The School was operating with only 3 AHTs – EYFS, Upper and

Lower Phases, but it was anticipated that the situation regarding the secondment would extend beyond the originally planned 2-3 term which was due to end at Easter or September 2020.

Q&A – SHK asked when would Governors know? The School would need to receive an indication from the AHT currently on Maternity Leave Absence as to a return date or a request for an extension

[KS returned to the meeting at 18:09]

- The AHTs were currently overstretched and were delivering 11-hour working days. The School would review the current roles and responsibilities to ascertain which roles could be delegated.
- The School would advertise for a Learning Mentor/Pastoral Support Worker role because it provided a vital parental engagement connection which also allowed for an equal division of work pupils and parents.

Q&A – SHK sought clarification as to whether KD was still part of the Pastoral Support Team? Yes, but both KD and AL worked reduced hours so there was no capacity for afterschool activities etc. The new JD and working pattern would include afterschool activities which could build in capacity and impact on SLT workload.

- The current structure also included 6 HTLRs for English, Maths and Inclusion, but there was only 1 staff member in the Maths role (AT). The AHTs had undertaken that role in English at the level required to liaise with the LA consultant and staff.
- Two (2) of the TLRs who were undertaking the SENCO training role were due to finish their training.
- Following a review of the roles and responsibilities the decision to place only 1 HTLR for Maths who was responsible for the whole subject was working well.
- The School would advertise for an HTLR for English and 1 Higher SENCO for Inclusion. There were currently 3 SENCOs in training, 1 of whom could potentially become a HTLR and continue to work with the DHT going forward which would also allow for the capacity to increase to 2 HTLRs if required.

Q&A – SHK commented that there would potentially be 4 staff undertaking an SEN role? However, one staff member would be going on Maternity Leave Absence and should she return would undertake a LTLR role.

Q&A –BS sought confirmation regarding the structure and whether the HLTR and LTRs role were SEND specific rather than the wider remit of Inclusion? Yes, the DHT was responsible for Inclusion and the HTLRs would be a SENCO equivalent with the LTR in support.

- Recruiting to the 5th AHT post had been discussed at the last FGB meeting. It would work well with the HTLRs for English and Maths, especially in relation to the current curriculum redesign and development. A curriculum focus was now a major line of enquiry under the new Ofsted Framework and would become a main focus for the School over the next 3-years whilst ensuring that results were maintained.
- It was anticipated that the School could receive its next Ofsted inspection in 2020.
- It would also provide a more cost effective option rather than employing 6 HTLRs.

[JC left the meeting at 18:14 hours]

Q&A - SHK queried whether once the positions had been recruited to would it mean a reduced teaching allocation as the functions would require a considerable amount of time out of class? The Headteacher confirmed that the posts would reflect a teaching responsibility with curriculum redesign. The School only had 1 HTLR for Maths and the new Ofsted represented a specific concern in relation to TLRs and their roles and responsibilities. It required a big piece of work to enable TLRs to discuss and showcase their subjects and how they interlinked with other subjects, pupil progression, the rationale for teaching the subject/theme etc. Although the School had linked to the national curriculum well it was not necessarily at the stage where it could articulate its vision in the detail required.

Q&A – SHK asked how would an additional HTLR/AHT improve the level of articulation or would their specific remit be to showcase in front of Ofsted? The person would not be employed simply to showcase in front of Ofsted, but the AHT would be able to offer the level of coaching and mentoring required.

Q&A - SHK queried whether adding coaching and mentoring of new staff would increase teachers' already exhaustive workload? It was a change to their existing roles and responsibility. The HTLRs had approached the Headteacher and requested the change to the structure.

Q&A – Did the TLRs suggest incorporating a 5th AHT? The Headteacher confirmed that the TLRs had requested that another AHT be appointed.

Q&A - BS commented that new structure could build capacity, but sought confirmation that the appointment of a 5th AHT would not place the School in an even worse financial position in the near future? The Headteacher confirmed that the School would potentially save approx. £12k.

Q&A - CW queried what would be the financial impact of advertising and appointing staff? The majority of adverts would be placed internally or circulated as part of the LA Bulletin which would not incur any costs to the School. A HTLR post had increased to £6,800 and the difference between the HTLR and AHT pay rate was approx. £3k. The Leaning Mentor role attracted an approx. £25k salary.

KS commented that the appointment of a 5th AHT should not be attributed to the increased hours teachers worked in order to complete their respective workloads which could be as a result of time management or capability issues.

- The costs relating to the existing/historical 5th AHT post were supported and factored into the approved budget and did not represent a change in structure.

SHK commented that the budget had been approved prior to the current financial situation before the pupil roll had fallen. However, the Headteacher pointed out that the numbers on roll had increased to its highest ever recorded level and clarified that the structure would consist of 3 HTLRs and 1 additional AHT instead of 6 HTLRs which amounted to a potential saving of £12k.

SHK pointed out that the inclusion of a 5th AHT would provide a heavily weighted staffing structure in favour of SLT.

[JC returned to the meeting at 18:19 hours]

Q&A - SHK sought clarification whether AHTs/ DHT worked the equivalent 1265 hours associated with teachers? There was no limit applicable to the number of hours SLT undertook to fulfil their role. The School was currently devising an adequate recording system which would record the hours all teaching staff worked. Staff were currently expected to arrive at the School between 08:30 hours – 08:45 hours and could leave after 3:30pm in accordance with the NEU agreement, but there was an expectation that teachers would attend staff meetings.

Q&A - SHK commented that 3 AHTs had given up their free time to present to Governors and stayed longer than expected, but the DHT did not see fit to come to this meeting? The DHT had not been invited to attend the meeting.

BS commented that the proposed structure was similar to many other 3FE schools in the LA. The SLT believed that the proposed structure was a positive operational decision then Governors should support the decision. The Headteacher had confirmed that the finances would support the proposed structure going forward.

Q&A - SK asked how the School managed to identify finances required to pay teachers at leadership level when it could no longer deliver some services in relation to the curriculum, such as swimming? SHK referred to the earlier discussion under Agenda Item 10: Feedback from Committees which she had

interpreted as the School not having sufficient funding for pupils with SEN, but could potentially recruit a 5th AHT. The Headteacher clarified that the discussion regarding the SEN budget had been in relation to reviewing the way in which the funding was allocated within the core budget.

Agenda Item 16: Any Other Business

Presenting: All

There were no Chair's urgent actions recorded as having taken place since the last FGB meeting or since the production of the agenda.

Agenda Item 17: School Policies

Presenting: Headteacher

Discussion/ Challenge

The FGB reviewed the following policies because there had been insufficient responses received through its virtual Governors meeting policy prior to the meeting.

- **Pay Policy in line with Teachers Pay and Conditions Document**

The School had updated the 2018 version of the policy to reflect the 2.75% increase in salaries. The School remained unsure whether the LA would have sufficient capacity to review policies going forward since there was no longer a specific schools HR team.

The FGB **AGREED** the above policy subject to a further issuance of the policy being received from the LA.

- **Governance, Financial procedures (including Governors Allowances, Scheme of Delegation and policies)**

The School had put all the policies and procedures into a manual which would also include the NGA Code of Conduct which could be accessed through DB Primary.

Action Point – 7 th October 2019	Lead	Timescale
AP – 10/2019 – 11 – Password reset to be provided	Head/SHK	ASAP

- **Safeguarding & Child Protection Policies and Procedures (Including Prevent)**

The Headteacher had placed all relevant policies and procedures into a manual which also included the 2019 KCSIE guidance which could be accessed through DB Primary.

- **THSP- Child Protection Procedures for Staff Working in Children's, School and Family Settings**

The FGB **RATIFIED** the above policies.

- **Appraisal Policy**

Action Point – 7 th October 2019	Lead	Timescale
AP – 10/2019 – 12 – Appraisal Policy to be placed on the agenda for the next meeting	Clerk	25.11.2019

Agenda Item 18: Governing Body Development

Presenting: Chair

Due to time constraints this item would be carried forward to the next agenda.

Action Point – 7 th October 2019	Lead	Timescale
AP – 10/2019 – 13 – Governing Body Development to be placed on the next agenda	Clerk	25.11.2019

The Clerk reminded Governors that the Annual Conference would take place on Saturday 2nd November 2019 from 09:30am at Bow School.

Agenda Item 19: 2019/20 Meeting Dates**Presenting: Clerk**Headteacher's Appraisal Panel would take place on 15th November 2019.**Agenda Item 20: Any Other Business****Presenting: All**

There was no other business recorded.

Agenda Item 21: The Date of the Next MeetingThe date of the next meeting of the full governing body was confirmed as Monday 25th November 2019 at 4.00pm.**Agenda Item 22: Confidential Items (Observers and Staff to Withdraw)****Presenting: Chair**

Refer to confidential minutes.

[The Chair closed the meeting at 18:27 hours]**SUMMARY ACTION LOG**

ITEM	Carried Forward Actions - 21 st January 2019	LEAD	TIMESCALE
Item 6: Pupil Premium Report	Approach Docklands Museum to ascertain whether they could do a talk at the school	DH Chair	UNRESOLVED –Carried Forward to the next meeting on 25.11.2019 07.10.2019
Item 10: Governors Link Visits/Training – SCIENCE	To undertake a follow-up science visit and report back to the FGB	BS	PARTIALLY RESOLVED - BS reported that Khalida Rahman was now responsible for Science and he would schedule visits with her. Feedback to be provided at a future date.

Agenda Item	Carried Forward Actions - 8 th July 2019	Lead	Timescale
Item 8: SIP/SEF	AP – 07/2019 – 01 – Bids to be submitted to organisations to secure funding for art	Head	ONGOING: The Head had submitted a bid but the School did not meet the criteria for fine art but would continue to source other options

Agenda Item	7 th October 2019 Actions	Lead	Timescale
Presentation	AP –10/2019 – 01 –Governors were invited to view EYFS on an operational basis	All	Any
KS1	AP –10/2019 – 02 –Whole-School progress to be identified at the next presentation	AS	TBC
Item 5: Governing Body Skills Audit	AP – 10/2019 – 03 – AM would be removed as an AM and the School would contact PM on an adhoc basis going forward	Chair	NO LONGER REQUIRED
	AP – 10/2019 – 05 – Remaining Governors to complete the skills audit	All	ASAP
	AP – 10/2019 – 06 – Clerk to recirculate the 2019/20 training schedule	Clerk	RESOLVED: 04.11.2019
	AP – 10/2019 – 05 – Competency matrix to be completed with a	Head	ASAP

	summary of scores/comments		
Item 11: SFVS	AP – 10/2019 – 07 – SFVS to be placed on the agenda for the next meeting	Clerk	25.11.2019
Item 12: SIP/SEF	AP – 10/2019 – 08 – SIP/SEF to be placed on the agenda for the next meeting	Clerk	25.11.2019
Item 14: Safeguarding Update	AP – 10/2019 – 09 – SCR audit to take place	Chair	Following ½ term
	AP – 10/2019 – 10 – Read 2019 KCSIE Guidance	KS/JC	ASAP
Item 17: Policies	AP – 10/2019 – 11 – Password reset to be provided	Head/SHK	ASAP
	AP – 10/2019 – 12 – Appraisal Policy to be placed on the agenda for the next meeting	Clerk	25.11.2019
Item 18: Governing Body Development	AP – 10/2019 – 13 – Governing Body Development to be placed on the next agenda	Clerk	25.11.2019

Chair's signature:  Date: 25/11/19

Nicholas Paul