



**NOTES OF A MEETING OF THE TEACHING AND LEARNING
COMMITTEE OF ALDERLEY EDGE PRIMARY SCHOOL
HELD AT THE SCHOOL ON 22nd OCTOBER 2019**

Governors Present:

Claire Finch (CF)	Chair	
Lindsey Walsh (HT)	Head Teacher	
Nick Hughes (NT)		
Andrea Hogan (AH)		
Wendy Davies (WD)		
Esther Clarke (EC)		
Mel Rose (MR)	Staff Governor	
Sheila Keegan (SK)		

Also in attendance:

Claire Leslie	Clerk to the Governors	
Lyndsey Platt (LP)	(Observer)	

PART ONE – NON-CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS

	<i>The meeting opened at 5:07pm</i>	Actions
1	<p><u>APOLOGIES & ADDITIONAL AOB ITEMS</u></p> <p>There were no apologies to be received.</p> <p>AOB: Brexit planning.</p>	
2	<p><u>CONFLICT OF INTEREST</u></p> <p>Governors were asked to declare any potential pecuniary interest or conflict of interests with the business to be discussed during the meeting: NH is a governor at Rushton Primary School and a teacher at Wilmslow High School.</p>	
3	<p><u>PART ONE MINUTES</u></p> <p>The Part One minutes of the meeting held on 13th May 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.</p>	
4	<p><u>MATTERS ARISING</u></p>	

	Standard items on the action log would continue to be carried forward. Other actions had been completed.																
5	<p><u>DATA</u></p> <p>The Head Teacher spoke to the data shared with governors in advance of the meeting via the GVO.</p> <p>Good level of Development It was noted that the headline “Good level of development” was encouraging. The percentage had been as follows: 2017 72% 2018 76% 2019 73%</p> <p>This had been achieved despite a number of children joining the school mid year (including two just before Christmas) from a variety of backgrounds and with a range of needs. This allows very little time for the school to impact the children’s education prior to the tests.</p> <p>In order for a child to be assessed as having “good development” the child must achieve the expected level in a minimum of 12 out of 17 areas.</p> <p>Phonics Test The Year 1 Phonics test secured 100% pass which was very pleasing. 3 children passed the Phonics retake in Year 2 and all children who resat the examination showed considerable progress.</p> <p>Key Stage 1 results</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="260 1301 1329 1487"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Reading</th> <th>Writing</th> <th>Maths</th> <th>Science</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Expected level</td> <td>77</td> <td>73</td> <td>80</td> <td>83</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Greater depth</td> <td>40</td> <td>17</td> <td>37</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These results were encouraging and it was particularly pleasing to see the number of boys who had achieved “greater depth” in writing.</p> <p>Key Stage 2 results</p> <p>See the table overleaf. It was noted that this cohort was quite polarised with some very strong children and some weaker but with few in the middle ground. This was unusual.</p>		Reading	Writing	Maths	Science	Expected level	77	73	80	83	Greater depth	40	17	37		
	Reading	Writing	Maths	Science													
Expected level	77	73	80	83													
Greater depth	40	17	37														

KS2 percentage attaining expected standard or above in:	School Standard	National Standard
Reading	90	73
Writing	86	78
Maths	72	79
Grammar, Punctuation and Spelling	76	78
Science	90	83
Combined	69	66

The maths results had been disappointing. This cohort had been taught maths by the Singapore method for a year. No trends could be identified from the papers.

The grammar, punctuation and spelling results were also disappointing. These are affected by spelling ability and there were a number of dyslexic children in the class. The school had not taken adequate account of this when the targets had been set.

KS2 percentage attaining greater depth in:	School Standard	National Standard
Reading	45	27
Writing	21	20
Maths	48	27
Grammar, Punctuation and Spelling	28	36
Combined	21	11

The Head Teacher was pleased with these results. The combined result was particularly pleasing. The school average scale score also demonstrated pleasing strength.

	School average scaled score	National average scaled score
Reading	108	104.4
Grammar, Punctuation and Spelling	105	106.3
Maths	106	105

The Head Teacher had undertaken a complete and robust data analysis. She had looked at the length of time children had been in the school, the numbers of those joining and leaving and had considered the impact of the support required for children who have Education Health Care Plans (EHCPs) and any mental health issues.

The Head Teacher referred governors to the data prepared by the Fisher

	<p>Family Trust (FFT).</p> <p>The organisation takes account of progress measure and trends to produce reports. The reports are very visual and where a measure is shown as green on the charts the school's metric is above expectation.</p> <p>All progress measures were positive. The Head Teacher noted that the average score from Key Stage 1 was +2.5. Average progress would show as zero. Anything above zero is positive and below zero is negative.</p> <p>Only 26 children in the cohort had been matched by the FFT. The other children did not have appropriate data. Where children transfer from another school their data is used without the possibility for AECPS to verify that data for itself. A child can be removed from the data if that child has entered from a non-English speaking country.</p> <p>It was noted that the 2018-19 Year 6 cohort were the last to have been assessed on the old levels programme. The new Year 6 have data on the new bandings and there should be better correlation of that data.</p> <p>Q: Has all this analysis led to any changes at the school? A: The school was confident that measures put in place were effective. Books are moderated each week and regular lesson observations were carried out by the senior leadership team. It was noted that each cohort of children was different and that comparison of results across year groups was therefore of limited value in identifying the school's direction of travel.</p> <p>The results for Grammar, Punctuation and Spelling had been analysed at question level and Pupil Premium analysis had been overlaid.</p> <p>Children in receipt of Pupil Premium were being measured against a child of similar ability not against the entire cohort. A useful measure was "Value Added."</p> <p>Q: What did Value Added mean? A: It assessed the value a child gained from attending AECPS rather than another similar school.</p> <p>Q: How was the school learning from the data? A: It informed target setting and the school would remember to take account of dyslexic pupils when target setting. The grammar measures meant that the school had to take care to go back to the foundations of grammar teaching and ensure that teachers were consistent in teaching. Some very good and consistent teaching practice had been observed.</p> <p>The 2018-19 Year 6 cohort had been a very relaxed group which had affected their performance. The new Year 6 were much more competitive and driven as a group. The target for KS2 results for the 2020-21 Year 6 cohort was considered</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>for approval.</p> <p>The FFT data allowed a school to predict outcomes from a use of baseline data. The school could choose to measure itself against an average primary school or one performing in the top 20%.</p> <p>The school Learning Partner had already approved the proposed targets. The targets had since been revised as a new child had joined the school. A further new joiner was expected after half term.</p> <p>Q: Is there an expectation that the school improves on its own past performance? A: Yes but AECPS is a small school with a cohort which is ever changing and where special needs provision has an enormous impact.</p> <p>Q: Were the targets too high given the cohort? A: Nobody but governors and the school scrutinised targets. Ofsted do not consider them. It was important to have targets but overall the school needed to ensure that it was putting the right measures in place for each individual child.</p> <p>Q: How many children in the current Year 6 were in receipt of Pupil Premium? A: 3.</p> <p>The targets were approved subject to final oversight by the Learning Partner.</p> <p>Q: Were there other resources which would help the school? A: The Head Teacher would like an accelerated reading package. These produce questions on reading books that children take home and support comprehension. There was evidence that children (particularly boys) enjoyed the approach. It would require a very considerable investment in books as well as in the package and was not currently affordable. It was possible that the situation might change after academisation.</p> <p>Q: Was there any similar system to support Grammar, Punctuation and Spelling? A: The Head Teacher was not aware of one.</p>	
6	<p><u>SEND REPORT</u></p> <p>CF had met with MR. Work had been undertaken to make the website disability compliant. A lot of additional training had been undertaken including in the use of new equipment needed for the physical handling of children. Training in technology had also taken place.</p> <p>Q: Was participation in the funding pilot making any changes?</p>	

	<p>A: No. The Head Teacher and MR had attended a meeting. The Head Teacher had decided that all children covered by an EHCP in the school should be in the programme and MR had completed all the required paperwork for each child. The National Health Service had not yet completed their versions of the required documents.</p> <p>It had been guaranteed that schools entering the pilot would not lose money. The new system would not see any more funding but there would be some reallocation of funds. It was possible that more funding could be made available to schools in the pilot.</p> <p>The new system would provide a pot of money per child. It could be challenging for parents to appreciate the way in which this was spent. For example a parent might see the advertised salary of a member of staff recruited to support a child, but would not necessarily appreciate that the on costs of employment of that member of staff would also need to be charged to the pot of money attributed for support of an individual child.</p> <p>Q: At the recent Cheshire East Governors' conference reference had been made to Axis in connection with special needs. What was this? A: Axis was a new free school being built in Crewe as SEN provision for Cheshire East Council (CEC). It would be part of the Yes Academy Trust which had developed from the Fermain Academy, a free school making Alternative Provision for children in Macclesfield.</p>	
7	<p><u>GOVERNOR LINK REPORTS</u></p> <p>A number of link visits had taken place. CF had carried out a safeguarding and Pupil Premium visit (and SEND as set out above).</p> <p>Action: CF to put up report of visits on the GVO.</p> <p>EC had carried out visits covering Art, PHSE, SMEH and RSE. WD had carried out Assembly and Health and Safety visits. SK had carried out visits covering English, History and Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS).</p> <p>Action: SK to put reports on the GVO. AH do arrange an RE visit. AH would also take on responsibility for Geography. WD would take on responsibility for Music. CF would take on responsibility for Modern Foreign Languages (MFL).</p> <p>Q: How are the visits used to support improving outcomes? A: Those who visit should follow up on action plans and can always ask for something to be added to a meeting agenda.</p> <p>The Head Teacher noted that a full Ofsted inspection is referred to as a</p>	<p>CF</p> <p>SK AH</p> <p>WD CF</p>

	<p>“Section 5” inspection. A long inspection is called a “Section 8” inspection. If AECPS were to receive an inspection it would be under Section 8 because the school has been categorised as “Outstanding”. This was very unlikely at present; there were 12 outstanding schools in Cheshire which had not been inspected for 12 years. AECPS was not one of them and it would be expected that they would be inspected before AECPS. It was noted that only 5-10% of schools were now being awarded “Outstanding”.</p> <p>It was possible that the school could be subject to a “deep dive” inspection in a specific subject area. This would be in History, Reading, Geography or MFL. In such inspection the inspectors would involve link governors and would ask the same question of governors, teachers, subject leaders, senior leaders and children to assess the quality of the teaching. The curriculum intent would be under scrutiny and it would be necessary for everyone to understand the core drivers and aims of the school. It was noted that the training session on 17th June 2019 had been helpful in supporting governors holding the school to account. This was available on the GVO.</p>	
8	<p><u>HOME SCHOOL AGREEMENT</u></p> <p>This had been sent out to all students again at the start of term and rigorous steps had been taken to collect signed copies. It was agreed that this did not need to be included on the autumn agenda for this committee. It should be considered annually in the summer term.</p> <p>Action: Clerk to place on the agenda for the summer term meeting and ensure that it is no longer placed as an agenda item for the other two Teaching and Learning committee meetings.</p>	Clerk
9	<p><u>SSDIP</u></p> <p>This was available on the GVO. It had been changed over the summer. Its period was being brought into line with the school academic year rather than the financial year as hitherto. This was on the advice of the school Learning Partner. Accordingly the current plan would run for a few months over a year.</p> <p>The new plan had been broken down into the five Ofsted areas: Quality of Education Behaviour and Attitudes Leadership development Personal development EYFS</p> <p>Q: There were a lot of policies and many relate to one another. Would it be helpful to structure them in the categories of the plan. A: No, the policies go across all areas.</p>	

	<p>Action: The plan to be formally approved by all governors at the Full Governing Board. Clerk to ensure that it is placed on the agenda.</p> <p>The Head Teacher noted some questions for link governors which arise from the plan: How do teachers ensure that children know more and can do more? How do children remember what is taught? How does the school know what is being taught well and that appropriate curriculum coverage is occurring? How does the school assess teacher wellbeing?</p> <p>It was noted that three local schools had recently been subject to Ofsted inspections. The Head Teacher had been to a briefing meeting. All had said that Ofsted did not scrutinise progress data other than at very high level.</p> <p>The use of Classroom Monitor as an assessment tool was popular with staff. It was very easy to use. There had recently been considerable issues with a software upgrade but as a result of her complaints about this the Head Teacher had secured an offer of the use of the program free for a year.</p>	Clerk
10	<p><u>GOVERNORS' DEVELOPMENT PLAN</u></p> <p>Governors have their own action plan within this. Training on holding the school to account had been undertaken and governors had found this useful.</p> <p>There was an action point for governors to understand their strengths, an audit had been undertaken and recruitment had been considered. A governor able to support with Health and Safety work would be a desirable addition to the governing body.</p> <p>It was important that governors were trained to make visits and prepare effective reports.</p> <p>Continuing to fund the clerking gold package was regarded as important.</p> <p>Action: New governors were asked to reflect on the induction process and let CF know what had been beneficial and whether there were any suggestions for improvement.</p> <p>Governors were asked to consider further training, particularly in the areas of HR, Finance and Pay. Governors could access training on Modern Governor.</p> <p>Tim Nelson (the school learning partner) was to be asked to provide data training for governors.</p> <p>The clerk noted that there was a new Department for Education (DfE) link for a course on Prevent. Governors who have not undertaken this in the</p>	WD and EC

	<p>last two years should do or repeat the course.</p> <p>Action: Clerk to send out link.</p>	Clerk
11	<p><u>PUPIL PREMIUM</u></p> <p>CF had put the governor visit report on the GVO. There had been a shift in focus to early intervention. The number of children in receipt of pupil premium had increased to 15 with 3 in one year group. Children receiving pupil premium were tracked against a child of similar ability. Work was being undertaken on parent engagement.</p> <p>Q: Was the pupil premium tracking only done on reading, writing and maths. A: Yes, because this provided the most robust data.</p>	
12	<p><u>ATTENDANCE</u></p> <p>This was at 96.8% representing a good improvement. National targets were set at 95% and the school adopted this target.</p>	
13	<p><u>ASSESSMENT</u></p> <p>This had been covered in some detail above.</p> <p>It was noted that a full review of all data had taken place at the end of the 2018-19 academic year. The school's achievements had been examined against targets and this had informed a new action plan for all pupils and a separate plan for pupils in receipt of Pupil Premium.</p> <p>Q: Who carried out the analysis? A: This was done by LW. Teaching staff are not expected to report on data. Vulnerable children, including those in receipt of Pupil Premium were looked at separately.</p>	
14	<p><u>SAFEGUARDING</u></p> <p>The link visit had taken place. A very ambitious action plan had been put together for the 2018-19 academic year but with the exception of some very small points everything had been accomplished. A very few small issues had been held over to the current academic year. Much training had taken place at school and child level. A child friendly policy is now on the school website.</p> <p>Lock down practice had taken place. No parents had commented or complained. The children were very calm and well behaved; the practice</p>	

	<p>was notified to staff by WhatsApp and by word of mouth. The children had been trained in advance in “SSS”. Slide, sit, silent. They are to slide off their chairs onto the floor and sit silently. This can be communicated to them by sign rather than orally. The practice will take place annually but will be repeated in Spring 2019 so that all points learnt from the last practice can be re-assessed.</p> <p>There was now a new Designated Safeguarding Lead. MR would be taking the role alongside LW and was fully trained for the purpose. Ruth? had been trained for Squirrels.</p> <p>Ms Metcalfe had been on assessment training for Educational visits co-ordinator and was introducing new practices and retraining other staff on visits.</p>	
15	<p><u>BEHAVIOUR REPORT</u></p> <p>There was nothing of concern to report.</p>	
16	<p><u>GOVERNOR TRAINING</u></p> <p>This had already been covered.</p>	
17	<p><u>ENGAGEMENT WITH PARENTS</u></p> <p>LW spoke to the parent survey the results of which had been placed on the GVO. This had been very positive and there had been a 10% increase in engagement over the previous year.</p> <p>Q: Had there been responses to the invitation to join Parents’ forum? A: Yes, around 10 parents had responded which was a useful number. LW would limit engagement to 2 parents per class in the event that more acceptances were received.</p> <p>It was important that a governor were able to engage with this too. AH committed to attend the meeting on 21st November 2019 on behalf of governors.</p> <p>The school would continue to consider communication methods. A meeting with parents had been held to explain Classroom Monitor. LW had explained that this gives one simplistic view of progress. She had stressed that the school maintains an “open door” policy and that there are a range of ways in which parents can engage with their child’s progress including book viewing sessions and opportunities to meet teachers.</p>	
18	<p><u>HEALTHY SCHOOLS UPDATE</u></p> <p>There was nothing new to report.</p>	

19	<p><u>REVIEW OF ANTI-BULLYING POLICY</u></p> <p>Further work was being undertaken on this. Parent forum would be looking at proposals and the school council had already started to consider it. Governors and staff would also be involved in discussion. It was expected that the new policy would be available by January 2019.</p>	
20	<p><u>RELATIONSHIP AND HEALTH EDUCATION</u></p> <p>The school has been teaching in this area for some time and lessons will become a statutory requirement by September 2019.</p> <p>Each class has three lessons as follows: Keeping clean Growing and changing Families and care</p> <p>The school will review the curriculum to ensure that the government guidelines are covered but LW is very confident that this is the case.</p> <p>Drug education will also be included as will mental health.</p> <p>Q: Have any children been withdrawn from these lessons? A: No.</p> <p>Year 6 parents are invited in to see what is being covered. A video is used for sex education, it is old fashioned but effective and age appropriate.</p>	
21	<p><u>GVO</u></p> <p>It was noted that this is well used.</p> <p>Q: Had any consideration had been given to using Governor Hub rather than GVO. At the recent conference Governor Hub had been demonstrated and it seemed a very user friendly tool. A: The clerk explained that TS as Chair of Governors liked the format of the GVO. The cost of GVO was higher than Governor Hub but the GVO did handle policies better than Governor Hub. It was also easier to manage comments on confidential folders through the GVO.</p> <p>It was noted that consideration would have to be given to what platform would be used after academisation. The clerk was aware that TS had already been in discussion with GVO staff.</p>	
22	<p><u>POLICIES</u></p> <p>The following policies were approved: Cared for Children English</p>	

	<p>Safeguarding Intimate Care Baby Sitting Learning Support Assistants</p> <p>The following policies need further urgent attention from governors: Additional Needs Equal Opportunities Social Media Peer on Peer Abuse Target Setting Pupil Premium Modern Foreign Languages</p> <p>Action: Governors were asked to look at the policies needing further attention urgently and note any comments or approvals. It was agreed that the Head Teacher and CF might decide when sufficient governors had engaged to ensure a robust approval. The Head Teacher will make any amendments required and the policies will be placed on the website as required.</p> <p>Q: Is there a policy regarding what work teaching staff can undertake outside their teaching contracts? A: Staff must declare any employment undertaken in addition to the teaching contract.</p>	<p>All Governors LW and CF</p>
23	<p><u>TO NOTE ARRANGEMENTS FOR PRODUCTION OF MEETING PRECIS</u></p> <p>Action: CF will prepare a draft within 1 week and forward to LW for approval before placing it on the school website.</p>	<p>CF and LW</p>
24	<p><u>DIRECTOR'S REPORT</u></p> <p>The report and precis have been placed by the clerk on the GVO. Governors have had the opportunity to look at them.</p>	
25	<p><u>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</u></p> <p>It was noted that there were families in school who might be directly affected by a change in their immigration status and who might be in need of support. It was expected that any families affected would be able to apply for settled status under the EU settlement scheme.</p> <p>It was noted that the DBS system for checking the backgrounds of those working with children might change as a result of Brexit.</p> <p>It was noted that the school has school lunches provided by Cheshire East Council (CEC). It was hoped that CEC have made adequate arrangements to ensure that any food shortages in the event of a disorderly Brexit will not impact the provision of the meals.</p>	

	EC had put up a paper on the GVO delivered by Ian Gilbert, it is worth reading, it focusses on support for disadvantaged students and encourages creativity in curriculum planning.	
26	<p><u>IMPACT STATEMENT</u></p> <p>The core strategic functions of a Governing Board as defined by the DfE are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure clarity of vision, ethos and strategic direction; • Hold the Head Teacher to account for the educational performance of the school; • Oversee the financial performance of the school, ensuring value for money; • Promote the highest possible standards for Safeguarding. <p>Governors reviewed the SSDIP. Governors scrutinised summer 2019 results and questioned the school's analysis of results and progress. Governors reviewed and questioned proposed targets. Governors took additional responsibility for subject areas and noted the new Ofsted framework and inspection priorities. Governors reviewed the school's participation in the EHCP pilot funding project to understand any implication for school finances. Governors confirmed that adequate SEND training was taking place. Governors confirmed that safeguarding visits had taken place and that arrangements had been found to be satisfactory. Governors questioned the emergency lockdown procedure and confirmed arrangements to learn lessons from the first practice.</p>	
27	<p><u>MEETINGS</u></p> <p>The next meeting was confirmed for 3 March 2020.</p> <p>It was confirmed that all governors' meetings would be held at 5.30pm except for the Teaching and Learning Committee which would continue to start at 5.00pm for the greater convenience of members of staff who attend.</p>	

The meeting moved to the Part 2 agenda at 7.15 pm.

Chair

Date