



**Minutes of the meeting of the SIB held at Flora Gardens Primary School on Monday
3rd October 2015 at 4:00pm**

Members:

(*Absent/ Apologies)	Name	Post
	Mr Vic Daniels	Chair
	Mr Sam Naismith	Head
	Mr John Hamilton	GB Chair
	Ms Sam Hill	
	Mr Derrick Wright	
	Mr Denis Goldthorpe	LA Adviser

In Attendance:

Mrs Natasha Stroud	Clerk to the Governing Body
Ms Barbara Graham	Deputy Head Teacher
Ms Katy Asserati	Assistant Head

ITEM NUMBER	ITEM	ACTION OWNER
1/16	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	
	All members of the SIB were present.	
2/16	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
	There were no declarations of interest to be made.	
3/16	MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 20th June 2016 AND MATTERS ARISING	
	The minutes of the last meeting were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.	
	RESOLUTION	
	The minutes were approved as a true and correct record of the	
4/16	DATA	
	Three areas of focus had been identified and were noted by governors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEN • More-able • Reading <p>It was explained that Early Years (EY) Good Level Development (GLD)</p>	

was above the national average and the LA however the figures showed that this had dipped from the previous year's data. It was asked why the figures showed it had dropped and the H/T explained that taking into account the level of deprivation and the nature of that cohort, it was pleasing that the school remains above local and National averages. Ms Sutherland – LA Early Years Lead Adviser – had visited the school and gave clear distinct advice on how to reach Outstanding.

It was asked how the school ranked compared to others in the Borough. It was confirmed that the school was 18 out of 37 in terms of EY but lower down for KS1 & KS2. The School had offered to share their SATs results with other schools in the borough for comparison however no response was received.

Y1 Phonics results were close to both local and national (one child made the difference).

KS1 was noted at 73% across the board however Reading was lower than national by 1%.

It was asked if the impact on reading was due to EAL. It was confirmed that in the particular class it was due to high levels of SEN. Reading was a key area of focus this year and additional reading provisions were in place and being led by Ms Woodcock.

The H/T the Pearson reading model that was an example of the additional push on reading that the school is introducing. The added benefits of this model will be seen in Homework Comprehension, Spelling and feedback – balancing teacher workload.

It was asked if SEN in KS2 was a concern and the H/T confirmed that it wasn't. A Governor asked what the issue in this phase was. It was explained that due to the incredibly low starting position the current leadership took the school over from they had focused on key areas which meant that inevitably some areas would develop at a slower pace. However, significant improvements in all areas – see data. Three areas that needed additional focus and plans have been recognised and the SDP focuses on these.

It was noted that the reading test paper was extremely hard and nationally Reading was lower and the school still has high mobility.

The Chair explained that there was an understanding of the issues and barriers however how could Governors be sure how this was being tracked. Ms Asserati explained that this was through:

- Snap shot data
- Interventions with a large focus on Reading
- Internal tracking – subject by subject
- Target support – small groups
- Milestones attached to SDP

In response to a question it was noted that the LA review was being carried out on 19th October 2016. It was asked if this was too soon. Mr Goldthorpe advised that it had already been pushed back and this is the furthest date that he could secure.

In response to a question regarding the frequency of SIB meetings and

	<p>what Governors could expect to be presented with, the H/T advised that the SDP was RAG rated and updated monthly and data points were every half term. This would fit with the SIB cycle. It was asked how Governors would be reassured and the H/T confirmed this through milestones within the SDP, data at capture points, triangulation, lesson observations and learning walks. It was noted that all teachers completed target tracker and then were externally moderated.</p> <p>It was noted that Governors needed to be satisfied that external moderation was robust. Ms Asserati advised that the log was available for viewing. It was explained that the school had been working with St Cuthbert's with St Matthias and this was developing. It was asked how the quality of external moderation was checked and it was explained that the Borough did this externally too and the school were likely to be moderated this academic year by the LA. Links had also been established with St Stephens who also used target tracker. Moving forward St Stephens and St Cuthbert with St Matthias will continue to be worked with in partnership.</p> <p>Governors were highly satisfied with the Maths results for KS2 which were 85%. This was pleasing.</p> <p>Regarding SEN, routines and systems were in place and data would be reviewed after half term and compared with the data captured at Christmas. Time was made available for Ms Cenac to ensure everything was in place and she was working closely with Ms Graham. Quality First Teaching was continuing and interventions were taking place. The routines will take some time to become established but should have an immediate boost.</p> <p><u>Predictions vs Outcomes</u> This was an extremely important document and was reviewed by governors. It was noted that if it established that progress was improving since the SATs and the school could show how robust data was they would be in a better position to convince Ofsted that it was a Good school.</p> <p>After the data point Y2 and Y6 leads would be asked for their most likely predictions for the three key focus areas. It can then be seen how this changes and would be tied in with progress data.</p> <p>It was suggested and agreed that the predictions paper would be made into a landscaped document and updated at data points this would then be reviewed by the SIB.</p> <p>Ofsted is likely due in 2017 academic year however as the school had a relatively new H/T this may happen within 30 months of his appointment.</p> <p>SIB meetings would be synchronised with data points.</p> <p>Raise online was available at the end of October 2016.</p> <p>It was noted that in year progress this year were critical</p>	
5/16	COMMISSIONING PLAN	
	<p>The Chair of the Governing Body advised that he had seen the plan and confirmed he was satisfied. Mr Goldthorpe would look at the training element and would liaise with the Chair of Governors.</p>	

	<p>Mr Goldthorpe was helping with the SEN element.</p> <p>Ms Blinko was scheduled to carry out 5 days with the school but the H/T felt this could be reduced to 2 days and the remaining money for the 3 days would mean that the school could commission someone to further help with Reading.</p>	
	RESOLUTION	
	Reviewed	
6/16	AGREEMENT ON PROPOSED ACTIONS	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Predictions Y2 & Y6 to be updated and included in all SIB meeting packs • SIB meeting to take place on 16th November after the next data point • Milestones to be included in agenda packs for SIB meetings • Raise online to be reviewed and worked on by the relevant link governors – one page summary to be included in the agenda pack for the next meeting • Tracking data to continue to be broken down into groups 	
8/16	DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING	
	16 th November 2016 at 5pm	

The meeting closed at 5pm

Signed.....

Dated.....