



St Nicholas Catholic Primary School (Academy)
Part 1 Minutes of Full Governor's Meeting

Date	6 th July 2017	Time	6pm in School
Governor Attendees			
Name	Type of Governor	Present	Apologies
Angela Bosley	Foundation	Y	
Angela Folland	Headteacher	Y	
Frankie Phillips	Foundation	Y	
Mnsgnr Harry Doyle	Foundation	N	Y
Jane Wardle	Foundation	Y	
Lisa Thomas	Community	N	Y
Luke Robinson	Parent	Y	
Michelle Johnson	Parent	Y	
Rachel Sparks	Foundation	N	Y
Frances Dennehy	Foundation	Y	
Lucy Wills	Community	Y	
Alex Hill	Community	Y	
Other Attendees		Present	Apologies
Ali Brocksom	Clerk to Governors	Y	
Patricia Venn-Rees	Prospective Foundation		

Agenda Ref	Minute Ref:	Detail	Info Decision Question Action
1.	70.	The meeting began with a prayer Welcome to LW and AH as new Governors and PVR as a prospective Foundation Governor.	
2.	71.	Apologies & Declarations of Interest There were apologies from RS, HD and RS and no declarations of interest.	
3.	72.	Agree any items of business to be discussed that are not on agenda None	
4.	73.	PCAST Consultation We will send a collated FGB response to PCAST. Handouts showing the proposed restructure were considered and JW summarised the proposals. CAST have been directed by RSC to a new structure based on other MATs. AF delivered a short presentation to Governors about the proposed changes. Governors questions that arose after discussion included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Need evidence of success of this structure elsewhere.</i> • <i>What legal duties would academy councils have compared to what we have now?</i> 	Q Q

Approved by FGB/Signed by Chair:

..... Date:

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the Academy Council feed into the Federated Governing Body? Should the federated body have academy council members? • How would they attract / recruit governors to the FGB if distance to travel is far and the school is unknown? • What is the workload of the FGB? How long will the meetings be? • More clarity about the responsibilities of the Academy Councils is needed. • There is very little explanation of the benefits and how this would work. What is the financial impact on pupils? • There should be a range of options, not one to consider. • What are the risks and motivations to change? • Negative impact on high performing schools. • Do we have ideas about the make-up of clusters? • Is it process that needs changing rather than the structure? • How will Governor's 'know' their schools? Can the Federated Governing Body do this for more than one school? • Executive Principle cannot also be a Head. • Will there be a shortage of catholic candidates for the leadership roles? 'Reserved posts' for HT and deputy. It was suggested the Exec Principle posts may be reserved for Catholics and the HoS would not have to be. We may lose the catholic leadership of the school – the 'witness' of the school. You could end up with no catholic staff in a school. • Governors through it more important that the HoS is Catholic and not the Exec Principle. • Speed of decision making is an issue. • Different scenarios should be tested and considered. <p>Staff have been invited to make representations themselves.</p> <p>AF indicated this structure does allow for career progression. It is a structure that is being used more and more.</p> <p>A suggestion was to have 2 Federated GBs to manage Res and School Improvement and to keep local governing bodies.</p> <p>ABr and JW will draft a letter on behalf of the Governing Body.</p>	Q Q Q Q Q Q Q Q Q Q Q Q Q Q
5.	74.	Data - Results and analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End of year data was distributed including data from Target Tracker. • Yr 6 data was released on Tuesday and has not yet been analysed in depth. Reception <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good Level of Development (GLD) – 55%. This is low. We were externally moderated by the LA to assess the security 	A: JW / ABr

Approved by FGB/Signed by Chair:

..... Date:

		<p>of assessments. She was impressed with teacher's knowledge of children and our internal moderation which is secure. BASC also feeds into the profile.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>There is a significant number of children who did not reach GLD as they have additional needs and this is noted in the moderator's report as is the very good provision for them in FS.</u> • Information was distributed about the many and varied needs in the cohort. Many have referrals or medical conditions. • We are pleased with the <u>progress</u> of individual children. • Children without SEN - 75% achieved GLD. <p>Yr 1/2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phonics screening check – last year 66%. This year we have 82% and are very pleased as we have taken a number of actions this year to address poor performance (e.g. screening 6 times during the year to get them used to the test, group analysis, teacher coaching). • No significant difference between boys and girls. • 80% of PP passed. • SEN support - 41% • 100% of not SEN passed the screening. • 12 children retook the test in Yr 2 and we are up to 94% pass rate. <p>End of KS1 <u>Reading</u> (externally moderated and secure) Reaching Expected Last Yr was 77%. This year 79%. (Boys have done better than girls). Greater Depth Last year we got 22%. This year 38%. PP 66% at GD or EXP SEN support 33% GD or EXP (4 out of 12)</p> <p><u>Writing</u> EXP Last year 60% This year 70% GD Last year 18% This year 35%</p> <p><u>Maths</u> EXP 67% this year 77.5% (41% SEN) GD Last year 29% This year 38%. They are a strong cohort.</p> <p>End of Yr 6 <u>Reading</u> Teacher assessment is accurate. 32 passed reading test. 29% of group are SEN support.</p> <p>GD Last Year 29% This year 18%.</p> <p>Reading nationally last year was 66% - it has gone up to 71%</p>	
--	--	---	--

Approved by FGB/Signed by Chair:

..... Date:

		<p>this year so we are only 1% above national.</p> <p><u>Writing</u> EXP + Last year 53% This year 72% (23% at GD – last year we had 5%), We have had much support including Babcock moderation. We were not moderated at Yr 6 – we bought so much support that we feel Babcock were confident that we were secure. National is now 77% so we are below national but improved on last year.</p> <p><u>Maths</u> 57% to EXP (18% below national) We predicted 66%. We expected 31 to pass and only 25 did. 4 children's tests were much under what was predicted and have been analysed to find out what happened. Nerves played a part and we may consider what can be done about this in the future.</p> <p>The implication is that the combined score (which is more consistent this year) is 52% below an <u>increased</u> national of 66%.</p> <p>Information was distributed to Governors to show all actions taken in the SIP and the impact of these.</p> <p>Next year's priorities for maths were then distributed following analysis by SLT and the maths leader (KR) who have concluded that our vertical classes are having an adverse effect on maths results. Under the new curriculum there are objectives for each year group. Children who are able are doing well but children who are struggling to understand concepts are finding the mastery curriculum hard. Vertical classes do not suit the maths curriculum.</p> <p>In September the plan is to deliver maths from Yr 1/2 by delivering a mastery Yr 1 class, a mastery Yr 2 class and a GD group of children who are exceeding. This will be replicated up the school. The % of children securing the ARE would be expected to increase. Teachers are enthusiastic about these proposals.</p> <p>We have been accepted on to the Jurassic Maths hub to take part in a maths teaching project. Maths was a known issue which was already being addressed before the Yr 6 results came out.</p> <p><i>Governors queried the benefit of vertical groups?</i> It is an equitable way to teach and encourages much teamwork and collaboration amongst teams.</p>	
6.	75.	<p>Monitor progress of SIP for year</p> <p>Governors were asked about the feedback on the SIP this year as it has been more on data (impact) rather than actions the school has taken. They advised that they preferred the format this year and found it more useful and strategic.</p>	

Approved by FGB/Signed by Chair:

..... Date:

		<p>AF proposed that the 17-18 KPs will be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maths 2. SEN 3. Writing 4. Reading <p><i>Governors queried whether curriculum would be a KP? No but we have bought into Edison Learning which will change the curriculum</i></p> <p>PP will continue to be discussed at every RES and T&L.</p>	Q
7.	76.	<p>HTR Discussed above.</p> <p><u>Safeguarding Report (part 2)</u> This was distributed, discussed and signed.</p> <p>[FD left the meeting 8pm]</p>	
8.	77.	<p>Agreement of Part 1 and Part 2 (confidential) minutes of 24 May meeting held</p> <p>Part 1 and 2 minutes were agreed and signed.</p>	D
9.	78.	<p>Finance</p> <p>Luke fed back to FGB from RES and recommended acceptance of the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finance Report – Agree final budget for 2016-17 received from Resources • Finance Report – Approve budget for new financial year (to 31 August 2018) received from Resources <p>These were agreed unanimously.</p>	D
10.	79.	<p>Receive reports from governors who have attended training</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AH attended Babcock induction training and found it useful for understanding processes. <p>Receive reports from governors who have visited the school</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AB and FP met with the Pastoral Support Worker to better understand her role. There must be action put in place to ensure continuity if she was absent although systems are in place to do this. Her role is wide ranging and hard to measure. Governors asked if evidence could be collected on her role. There will be soft targets on the school based plans which will provide evidence of her impact. A visit evaluation was distributed. • JW carried out pupil conferencing on Accelerated Reader and met with HH. We are looking to buy more non-fiction books. Children would like to check out their own books and have more quiet time to read. A report 	

Approved by FGB/Signed by Chair:

..... Date:

		<p>will be circulated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LR met with Julie and AF for a finance visit to look at the budget. He commended Julie's work. <p>Governors were pleased that there have been a good number of focussed visits this year.</p> <p><i>The meeting moved to Part 2</i></p>	
11.	80.	<p>Review progress the school has made during the year and impact made on outcomes for pupils - recognise and celebrate (Newsletter)</p> <p>There is much to celebrate in the newsletter which will be written to go out before the end of term.</p>	A: FP
12.	81.	<p>Matters arising since agenda distributed as identified at item 3</p> <p>AF will be holding a meeting about the London trip instead of sending out a letter.</p>	
13.	82.	<p>Correspondance</p> <p>None received</p>	
14.	83.	<p>Thanks to MJ</p> <p>MJ was thanked for her significant contribution to the Governing Body as this is her last meeting.</p>	
		<p>Date of next meeting:</p> <p>20th September 6pm</p>	

Lisa Thomas
Chair

Ali Brocksom
Clerk

Date

Approved by FGB/Signed by Chair:

..... Date: