

Arrived after Item 2

Chair

Present: Linda Tansley (HT) Headteacher

Caroline Bond (CB)
Chris Caswell (CC)
Simon Forder (SE)

Simon Forder (SF)

Owen Gardner (OG)

Arrived after Item 3

Acting Chair

Terry Genis (TG)

Gemma James-Moore (GJ-M) Jefferson Nwokeoma (JN)

Roger Panter (RP)
Lyndsey Todd (LT)

Mark Whitehead (MW)

Apologies:

Lyndsey road (L1)

Miles Le Voguer (MLeV)

In attendance: Alex Williams Clerk

1.	Welcome and Apologies for Absence. The Acting Chair opened the meeting at 6.32 pm and welcomed everyone.	Action
	Apologies were received and accepted from Mark Whitehead (illness) and Miles Le Voguer (childcare issues).	
2.	Declaration of Pecuniary Interests	
	There were no declarations of pecuniary interests.	
	GJ-M arrived at the end of Item 2.	
3.	Minutes of the Meeting Held on 7 February 2017	
	The Acting Chair went through the minutes of the last meeting, page by page. The HT made two additions to the minutes:	
	Page 3 – Changed "One of the staff resignations is the RWI Champion, what impact will	
	this have on progress?" to "One of the potential staff resignations is the RWI Champion". • Page 5 – Changed the answer to the first question on the page (Is the underlying	
	message that we are on track to maintain our Outstanding rating if OFSTED came in?) to	
	"Yes. The LLPR report expresses that evidence is strong to support this."	
	These additions were accepted by the governors. The additions were inserted into the final version of the minutes and initialled by the Acting Chair.	
	SF arrived at the end of Item 3.	
4.	Actions Arising	
	All updated - reported in the record of outstanding actions attached to the minutes or in the relevant agenda item below. Completed actions to be removed from the list.	
	Governor visit to review CPD and IRIS (26/1 – item 14)	
	To be completed in the summer term. CC to email LO with potential dates.	LO/CC/ TG
	BCP working group (21/6 – item 4)	
	Completed. Meeting set for 26 April. Sponsorship/support for competitive sports (21/6 – item 6)	MLeV
	Carried forward as MLeV not at meeting.	IAIFEA
	Email address for allegations concerning the Headteacher (20/9 – item 13)	
	Ongoing. OG circulated a revised Complaints Policy which stated that, although formal	OG
	complaints should ideally be written, alternative forms of communication would be accepted if	

complainant was not comfortable writing a complaint. Governors, however, raised concerns about the audit trail for alternative forms of communication. It was, therefore, agreed to resolve this issue outside the meeting. Governors Annual Statement (29/11 – item 12) Ongoing, HT asked that the working group meet as soon as possible to ensure early planning OG/CC/ of next vear's Annual Statement. SF SIDP Review (7/12 – item 7) Completed. See agenda Item 6 of meeting. Governor visit on School Ethos (7/2 – item 5) Completed. See agenda item 8 of meeting. Governor Monitoring Visit (7/2 – item 11) OG Ongoing. OG advised that the first meeting on S140 links had taken place and another meeting would take place in summer term. School Staffing Structure Diagram (21/3 – Item 5) Clerk HT asked that it be included on the agenda for F&P Committee on 9th May. Recommendation to then be brought to FGB on 23rd May for approval. Breakfast Club working party Ongoing SF **Equalities Annual Review** Completed. See agenda item 5. Supporting Pupils with Medical Conditions Policy Completed. See agenda item 5. SFVS Submission Completed. Governor identified to present Governors' Trophy Completed. Change of FGB dates HT asked governors to note the change of dates of two of the FGB meetings in the Summer term: Original date Revised date Tuesday, 20 June 2017 Thursday, 22 June 2017 Thursday, 6 July 2017 Thursday, 13 July 2017 Schedule of Governing Body Meetings 2016/2017 to be updated. Clerk **Policy & Procedure Review Equalities Annual Review** The Equalities Annual Review, including the recommendations from the Policy Working Group, was circulated prior to the meeting. Governors approved the review and it was Chair agreed that the Chair will send out a summary version to parents by 6th April to report on Y1 progress. Supporting Pupils with Medical Conditions Policy The revised Supporting Pupils with Medical Conditions Policy, as recommended by the Policy Working Group, was circulated prior to the meeting. Prior to the meeting, a governor had asked that the annual First Aid check, as undertaken by the Premises Committee, be renamed the Annual Medical & First Aid Check as it is this control check that will monitor the OG/Clerk effectiveness of the Supporting Pupils with Medical Conditions Policy. Governors approved the revised policy and **agreed** the name change for the control check. SIDP Review Items 6 & 7 were combined during the meeting. All the reports for these items (SIDP KAD 1-4 Easter Reviews, including an appendix for KAD 3 for the SIDP Review and Whole School Milestone 1 to Milestone 2 performance tracking data and Attaining Highly Registers for the Attainment & Progress Milestone 2 Data review) were received by governors prior to the meeting. KAD2 Q: Why are assessments for the foundation subjects not looked at using the same pupil groupings that we use for the core subjects? Would that not provide additional evidence for our success in closing the gap between PP and non-PP pupils? Prior to answering the question, the HT shared the National Curriculum guidelines on foundation subjects, History and Art and Design, and drew governors' attention to the limited guidance given for these subjects in the National Curriculum.

A: As you can see, attainment targets are very limited in the guidelines. When the government revised the National Curriculum, primary schools were given greater freedom on how foundation subjects can be taught. There is no guidance on progression of skills at each level. Therefore it would be very difficult to divide it in the same way as core subjects.

I would also like to draw the governors' attention to the latest OFSTED update which states that OFSTED does not expect school to predict progress measures. Inspectors should not use these terms and cannot insist on progress tracking. TH does, however, monitor progress for the school. However, However, without specific set national criteria for progression of skills and knowledge for the foundation subjects, assessment is 'school generated' and therefore non-comparable. Attainment is assessed as 'exceptional' and then clearly 'below', in order to identify 'expected' for other children. TH subject leaders do create progression criteria within their subjects and have tried to map progress against the National Curriculum. This mapping is, however, broad. We do also have a highly attaining register and this does cover foundation subjects such as sport and arts.

Q: How are boys being targeted to improve their outcomes? Is there risk of impacting the higher achievements of girls?

A: The school is very aware that boys' performance is, as a generality, behind that of girls. Your question is specifically about Maths. However, our data shows that, at the end of KS2, boys at the expected level is higher than girls at the expected level (Nationally, boys and girls at the expected level are equal). However, the percentage of TH girls performing beyond the expected level is greater than boy (Nationally, girls performing beyond the expected level is greater than boys). The TH curriculum has been tailored to be as boy-centric as possible. We know we have to work harder to 'catch boys' attention'. The introduction of a competitive element has been very incentivising for most boys and it has not been to the detriment of the girls. RAISEonline shows this. This is not a TH issue but a gender reality.

Q: "at expectation" table is below the 80% target across all groups. Is this because we are measuring against end of year target, or is this a cause for concern?

A: The target is for the end of the year. When they come into the new school year, they are assessed against their end of previous year attainment. They are then assessed at Milestone 1, 2 and 3. By the time you look at Milestone 3 data, we can expect to see greater progress against the end of year target.

Q: KS2 Y6 as example - Although green M 53% is 37% below target, only 2 students improved. W is 53%, only 2 students improved. R 6 students improved at 77% vs 83% target. Seems R target is realistically achievable. What is the context and have interventions been put in place? Should we be confident in the interventions and reaching the ARE targets? **A:** Yes, we should be confident of reaching the ARE targets. The Milestone objectives are very different to teaching children to 'take a test'. We start teaching Y6 children from January onwards how they can be tested on the curriculum. We give the Y6 regular trial SATS and Y6 took one last week.

The results of these are:

Subject	Milestone 2 data	Trial SATS results
Maths	53%	87%
Writing	53%	70% (this is based on ongoing assessment)
Reading	77%	63% (this Trial SATS was, however, using last year's paper which was nationally acknowledged as very difficult)

Q: What has changed?

A: The way that the results have been measured in test situations, the interventions that have been made and the progress children have made.

Q: Do you have separate Milestone targets and test targets?

A: They should be the same but we know that tests are a different experience for different children. By the end of the year, we also report assessments and they will be much more closely aligned by the end of the year. Teacher assessment is generally not far out and we submit them before the test results are released.

Q: Did the Y6 children react to Reading Trial SATS in the same way as last year's Y6 children did?

A: Yes as is demonstrated by the test outcome (63%) being actually lower than the Milestone 2 data (77%). This is the only subject where this has occurred in this trial SATs compared to Milestone 2.

Q: What are the HT expectations that 'end of year ARE targets' will be reached? **A:** I am quietly cautious but optimistic. At TH we always set aspirational targets. At Pupil Progress Meetings we always ask what interventions can be put in place. If children are finding it too difficult, we will revise targets down. What cannot be planned for is what will be in the test paper.

Q: Would it be possible to attend the Maths focused staff meeting at the start of the summer term?

A: Yes

Q: How much was Testbase? Can we measure return on investment for the resource? **A:** £240. The amount of use we have from Testbase and the ability to differentiate the questions means it is a well-used tool.

Q: Given the lower than expected impact of Singapore Maths, do we believe this a consequence of the method?

A: We are concerned about the breadth of coverage. The Y5 pupils have only just started on the geometry unit for this year as per the scheme. It is, however, used in testing as a point of application for numbers. Therefore if you don't know names and properties of shape, you can't apply your number knowledge. By Milestone 1 progress was positive and not of concern but by Milestone 2 there were some concerns. We may know later in the week once test papers have been marked. We are, however, coming to the opinion that it will be a useful additional resource but we won't be taking it on wholesale.

Q: The focus in the measure (KAD1e) is on Attaining Highly pupils, and demonstrates good progress - well done. How are children performing at other levels, and can we demonstrate similar progress for those children?

Prior to answering the question, the DHT circulated examples (MATHS Progress by PAG April 2017) of data showing progress all pupil levels (HPA, MPA and LPA).

A: This data shows that we don't just look at the highly attaining pupils but children at all level. We want governors to have confidence in the range and rigour of the data that we have and what we do to close the gaps and move progress on.

Q: Can data be presented to show the impact of assessment in helping children progress? For example, is it possible to correlate an assessment being made and next steps defined, with an improved outcome for the child?

A: We have trackers for every child for every core subject. It raises awareness for teachers and shows where the gaps are through the analysis of the domain bricks within a subject. Every pupil progress meeting focuses on what we can do different for each child and allows precision teaching to enable the child to be successful.

Q: Is there a tangible outcome from the cluster meetings? Were any actions taken away? **A:** We have just had a writing cluster group meeting. These meetings are great for testing judgements and having a dialogue on objectives and what children are producing. They are especially useful for TH teachers where we only have one class per year as this enables us to benchmark our judgements against other 'like' year groups and gives us the opportunity to get new ideas. For TH, the picture is very positive compared to other schools in our area. We are considering seeking additional outstanding schools to compare ourselves against.

Q: How is the positive development of triangulated evidence being shown? Is this qualitative or can it be quantitatively measured?

A: Grid shows progress from Milestone 1 to 2:

- Reading 80%
- Writing 100%
- Maths 70%

Q: Is Language Links differentiating those children with a learning challenge, and those for whom English is a second language?

A: Yes. However, appendix report does show that there are a mix of children that speak English as a second language but also have a language challenge in their first language as well.

Q: What is the cost of the No Nonsense Spelling programme? If there is cost, how are we measuring value?

A: It is a low-cost provision. TH are having a huge drive on spelling at the moment. For example, a Spelling Bee competition was held today. We are constantly raising the bar. Every class has a list of Non-negotiable spellings and High Frequency Words they are working on.

Q: Are we measuring an improvement in vocabulary?

A: Speaking and listening is always in focus at Tower Hill. We look for every opportunity to develop the children's language. Talk groups give an opportunity for the children to talk and increase their vocabulary. Governors on the recent Governor Visit on School Ethos had an opportunity to see the good range of topic vocabulary children are picking up. Younger children are trying to raise their vocabulary as a result. Talk groups now have topics set and are subject specific. We ensure that they are exposed to lots of vocabulary and then we are looking for this to be displayed.

Q: Is Sport Premium being used to bring in the provision for training teachers to deliver P.E lessons?

A: Yes, it has been. PE is not generally observed at primary school but I have been doing some observations recently to assess whether the coaching delivered for the teachers is value for money. I have decided that while I want to continue to use the external company for Sports provision to enable teacher release for PPA time, we are unlikely to continue to use them for teachers' CPD. We have used the Sports Premium for the CPD but are unlikely to do so in the future.

Q: To check, TH doesn't use Sport Premium for releasing teachers for PPA? **A:** No, this is paid for out of the school budget. Sports Premium is only used for CPD.

Q: The evaluation shows great progress - how does this compare to expectations? **A:** It does show great progress and exceeds expectations. The number of opportunities, especially in competitive sports, has greatly increased which is absolutely to the credit of the teacher in receipt of the TLR3 for Sports and PE development.

Q: Where can we see the 'school games values'?

A: We introduced it to the children in assembly. We have now put it on the TH website in the Sports section and on the PE noticeboard.

Q: Staff are using both SIMS and Excel to calculate assessments. Does having two tools have an impact to teaching time?

A: The tools do impact on teaching time. They are, however, used for different purposes. We will endeavour to streamline in future.

Q: Children having ownership of their own learning is great. Are they taking these opportunities? Can you see the impact?

Prior to answering, the question, HT circulated a learning note exemplification from across a variety of year groups.

A: Yes, the evidence shared shows that children increasingly speak the language of learning. Children have started to respond much more securely and maturely to teacher marking. The older they are, the more successful it is.

A governor expressed an interest in putting together case studies to report on progress to governors. The HT said that Maths and English leaders would be invited to June FGB meeting to give a flavour of their progress.

A governor also noted that parents had expressed an interested in workshops for parents and they were therefore pleased to see the mention of an upcoming Stay & Play workshop.

Q: Class 2C appears to be lowest in targets. Why?

A: We look at cohorts and create targets accordingly. A few of the highly able children have

Clerk

	left that class and that has led to a change in the balance across the two Y2 classes. We are aware that there is a disparity and we will aim to rebalance it when they go to KS2.	
	Q: Will the reshuffling of the classes be easy? A: It's not easy as there are many factors to take into consideration, anyone we move, we will have conversations with the parents.	
	Kaizen Update A presentation on the Kaizen Update had been circulated to governors prior to the meeting. The Acting Chair drew governors' attention to areas, such as Governor Induction and S140 links, where progress had been made. There are still areas where more needs to be done and OG will be following up with individual governors on how each section can be taken forward.	OG
	The HT asked whether governors felt better informed as a result of Kaizen and whether they felt that they would be able to communicate this more confidently to an external body. Governors generally felt that the approach was useful but acknowledged that more work needed to be done. The HT impressed on governors the need to make Governor visits the central element and that there is a need to make sure that they happen and are recorded.	
	FGB scrutiny questions It was agreed that a working group should be established to look at the process for compiling governor's scrutiny questions and what reasonable deadlines should be set for submitting them, due to the recent significant increase in the numbers of questions submitted following WGB training, to ensure 'manageability' of the number of questions being asked at a meeting.	SF/OG/ CC/RP
7.	Attainment & Progress Milestone 2 Data Items 6 & 7 were combined during the meeting. Please see item 6 above for discussion on Attainment and Progress Milestone 2 Data.	
8.	Governor Monitoring Visits A report on the recent Governor visit regarding "Maintain Ethos & Family Relationships" was received by the governors prior to the meeting. The governors who attended the visit found it a good and reassuring visit and the report noted that they "were reassured by what we saw and heard during the visit that the expansion is not having any detrimental effects on the school life and ethos, and that there are identifiable benefits to the expansion for staff and pupils."	
	The HT also noted that the visit had given governors the opportunity to experience the work that TH is doing to promote SMSC development. The whole school assembly, which included Christian and communal song, during the visit gave governors the opportunity to experience the whole breadth of SMSC development in action.	
9.	Good News HT was pleased to announce that the TH pupils had won the most entertaining performance at the Dance Challenge which took place at Princes Hall, Aldershot on 23 rd March 2017.	
	HT noted that TH had recently held a very successful French Friday and had also raised nearly £700 for Comic Relief on Red Nose Day.	
	LO announced that she will be going on maternity leave as from mid-September. The governors congratulated her on this news.	
	Correspondence HT had received an OFSTED school inspection update which will be uploaded to the portal.	
11.	Any Other Business Governors noted that parent feedback during Parents' Evening had been very positive. HT asked that governors produce a summarised report on the feedback received and present it to the FGB at the May Meeting.	SF/MLeV Clerk
	HT also asked that the draft questions for the Parents Survey to be sent out in the summer term be included on the May FGB agenda.	Clerk
	Meeting closed at 8.27 pm	
	Date of next meeting: 23 rd May 2017 at 6.30pm	

Schedule of Tower Hill Primary School Governing Body Meetings 2016/17

Shaded = re-se	cheduled dates	Committees					
	Full GB	Finance & Personnel	Premises	HT Perf Man.	Pay		
	20 th Sept 16						
		27 th Sept 16					
	11 th Oct 16						
			4 th Oct 16		18 th Oct 16		
Autumn Term		8 th Nov 16					
	29 th Nov 16						
			10 th Nov 16				
				30 th Nov 16			
	Weds 7 th Dec 16				Mon 5 th Dec 16		
		24 th Jan 17					
	7 th Feb 17						
Spring Term			7 th Mar 17				
	21 st Mar 17						
	4 th Apr 17						
	-	9 th May 17					
	23 rd May 17	-					
Summer Term	-		6 th Jun 17				
	22 nd Jun 17						
		27 th Jun 17					
	Thurs 13th Jul 17						

Membership of Tower Hill Primary School Governing Body

MEMBERSHIP 2016/17 Governors (13) - HT/1 Staff /1 LA/ 2 parent/ 8 co-opted				Committees					
			Full GB & Leads	Finance & Personnel	Premises	HT Perf. Man.	Pay	Pay Appeal	Policy Group
Caroline	Bond	Co-opted			✓				
Chris	Caswell	Co-opted	Pupil Premium Governor Visits Safeguarding	Chair √			✓		
Simon	Forder	Parent			✓				
Owen	Gardner	LA	Vice Chair KAIZEN lead		Chair		✓		√
Terry	Genis	Co-opted	Allegations against HT		✓	✓			
Gemma	James-Moore	Co-opted	SEND Attaining Highly	√		✓			
Miles	Le Voguer	Co-opted	Dev & Training Sports Premium		√	✓			
Jefferson	Nwokeoma	Co-opted	Forum Rep		√ Vice Chair			✓	
Laura	Ovenden	Staff	Safer Rec.	✓	✓				✓
Roger	Panter	Co-opted	Safer Rec.	✓					
Linda	Tansley	HT	Safer Rec.	✓	✓				✓
Lyndsey	Todd	Parent		√ Vice Chair					✓
Mark	Whitehead	Co-opted	CHAIR Safer Rec.	✓			Chair \[\square \]		