



		<b>Present:</b> Mrs Billington(AB), Mrs Murray (KM), Mr Pavey (DP), Mr C Thomas (CT), Mr Wallace (IW) & Mrs Davey (JD) (clerk) – Mrs Legg (Acting Headteacher wef 1.9.18)	<b>Action By</b>	<b>Time scale</b>
		IW began the meeting by welcoming Mrs Legg (LL)		
<b>1</b>		<b>Apologies:</b> None received – all present		
<b>2</b>		<b>Pecuniary Interest:</b> Governors were invited to declare any relevant Pecuniary Interest at that point or if it became apparent that there was one later in the meeting.		
<b>3</b>		<b>Minutes of Previous Meeting 8<sup>th</sup> May 2018 &amp; Matters arising:</b> These were accepted as an accurate record. They were signed accordingly.		
<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Maths No Problem Feedback</b> – The MNP sessions have all taken place with varying numbers attending. A high % attended Willow Class sessions but far fewer parents attended the other classes. Feedback from those that did attend was very positive and hopefully they feel more positive about maths. It was agreed that these sessions will be offered again in the new academic year.		
<b>4</b>		<b>In school Pupil Attainment and Progress</b>		
<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Staff Input Sheet</b> – Governors asked to see a blanked out staff input sheet so they could understand more how the figures shared were generated. CT showed examples on the whiteboard and took questions. He advised that children were given -1 for Emerging (E), 0 for Towards Independence (TI), 1 for Expected (X) and + 2 for Greater Depth (GD)		
<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Data</b> – CT shared this term’s data showing the progress of all year groups.		
<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<p>AB asked if there were any headlines and CT highlighted Yr 4 maths as a strength with 90% at Expected (X).</p> <p><i>Governor question – IW – In maths (M) there are chapters, does this mean there is any chance that maths could score higher compared with Reading (R) and Writing (W)?</i></p> <p>CT advised this was not the case as it is all averaged out. He advised that the closer a score is to 1, the closer it is to E. 2 is the maximum score possible and +2 is the highest. CT confirmed that what he suspected and reported to govts at an earlier meeting is that the earlier chapters in the M book work slower through the work than the latter chapters which are more challenging.</p> <p><i>In terms of starting points, how can we track the children? – LL</i></p> <p>CT – We can use KS2 progress data to create a minimum target. This is available for current Y6 and Y5 as they did the ‘old’ KS1. We can’t do that for year 4 and younger because of the new curriculum. It’s still unclear how we can track the progress for these children. The method the school has created has been accepted by County as a good way to measure but the ‘pass’ marks have changed for X and GD each year hence a minimum target.</p> <p><i>IW comment – The Year 2 &amp; 3 figures look very negative.</i></p> <p>CT – this is because of the way the averages are worked out. At the end of last year, it was based on Babcock for M but now it is based on Maths No Problem.</p> <p>LL – We need to identify which children need support as soon as possible.</p> <p>AB – Children are well tracked and we do pre-teaching and instant intervention so meeting need in the moment.</p> <p><i>IW comment – Children don’t seem to have made any progress in writing at</i></p>		

		<p><i>all.</i></p> <p>CT – the on track measure is not as useful as it was anymore.  AB – 7 out of 17 joined since year 1 and 3 joined in year 2.  <i>IW – Is there a danger of teachers identifying the children as on track when they are not?</i>  AB – We moderate all year groups throughout school and Year 2 were externally moderated. All school judgements were confirmed.  Reading is better than writing - Govs may need to focus on writing in SIP to return to standards of R and M.  Data is in line with national.</p> <p>CT tabled a sheet giving an overview of PPG, SEND and mentoring groups.  He also tabled a sheet showing pupil numbers as well as % as this was requested by govts.</p> <p>It was recognised that it will be a challenge to get the Year 5s to X in Year 6 in Reading with 20% presently at E which is much higher than the present Year 6 were this time last year (they had 100% at Towards Independence (TI))</p> <p>AB – At present in Writing there is no-one in Year 5 at E or GD – what is the expectation for GD when they are in Year 6? AB suggests SEND children are disaggregated. CT to discuss further with teachers and report back.  <i>LL – What are you using to assess the children – PIRA/PUMA or something else?</i>  Teacher judgements presently used – LL commented that we need to look at other methods. LL said she found PIRA/PUMA more useful over time.</p>	CT	07/18
5		<b>External Data</b>		
5	1	All external data will be presented to govts at next week's FGB but AB gave an overview. IW said he would like to share data with AB before shared fully with govts.		
5	2	<b>EYFS</b> – 7 children so tiny cohort – one child doing Reception for a 2 <sup>nd</sup> year. Cohort not statistically viable as numbers too small. 4 achieved expected development and 3 did not.		
5	3	<p><b>KS1</b> – 7 out of 17 children joined during KS1 and 3 into Yr 2 – Of these 1 got Working towards the standard (WTS) and 2 didn't. What the cohort achieved 2 years ago is not directly transferable but is used as a progress measure.  11 of 17 are Expected (EXS)  Reading – School at least EXS 77% Nat 2017 76%  GDS 41% Nat 2017 25%  Writing – School at least EXS 65% Nat 2017 68%  GDS 6% Nat 2017 16%  Maths – School at least EXS 77% Nat 2017 75%  GDS 18% Nat 2017 21%  This means data is 'at' national  AB also tabled showing the cohort of children who have been in Offwell since Reception; progress is stronger for this group than 'all Y2'.</p>		
5	4	<p><b>Phonics</b> – Cohort of 10 – 90% achieved – 1 did not. This child is SEND. National rate for last year was 81%. Above national.  Year 2 repeated – 4 children retook – 75% achieved – 1 child did not. Overall the Year 2 now have 94% of cohort achieving the level equating to 16/17.  AB confirmed the results will be published nationally. The 1 child has SEND.</p>		
5	5	<p><b>KS2</b> – Data is below national  Background: 7/10 children for Reading and maths, 10/10 for writing were targeted to attain a standardised score of between 96 -103. 100 = expected.  110 is GDS.</p>		

		<p>36% SEND (above national, 2017, national % SEND = 14.4%, all pupils. 16.6% for Y6 in 2017)</p> <p>Reading 55% (national 75%), Writing 82% (national 78%), GAPS 45% (national 77%), maths 55% (National 76%).</p> <p>Combined R, W, M = 36% (floor = 65%)</p> <p>Writing done by teacher assessment – School at least EXS 82% GD 9% Offwell is above Nat for EXS but not for Nat GD (18%) AB moderated and agreed these judgements GAPS – School at least EXS 45% Nat 2017 77% Maths – School at least EXS 55% GD 9% Nat 76% Reading/Writing &amp; Maths – School 36% - last year 55% - needs to be 65% All floor targets have not been met for the second consecutive year. (NB we're not floor or coasting but critical for 2019). LL – Does this affect anything, could it trigger Ofsted? AB – It would if we didn't meet the floor standards for 3 years but she knows of some schools in a similar position that have had a 2 day inspection rather than 1 day and some have had the inspection within 3 years rather than 4. AB pointed out that our last 2 years' data has been since our Ofsted visit. It was acknowledged that different children did not achieve EXS in different subjects bringing our % overall down. <i>Governor question – KM – Based on Teacher Assessments does this raise the question of not matching with test results?</i> AB confirmed that we use Babcock moderation but we now need to review this again and see what happened in the tests. Last year's TA largely matched but the TA is different this year for group of 'borderline' children. Governors agreed next year's teaching team need to scrutinise scripts to find out what went wrong. AB advised that although some children did well, the cohort as a whole has not. Discussion within Part 2 Further discussion will take place at the FGB</p>		
6		<b>Headteacher's Report</b>		
6	1	The Headteacher's Report was shared with govs in advance of the meeting. AB invited questions and updated govs on developments since the report was written.		
6	2	ECHP and Autism Assessments – These are all in hand and AB has checked up on their progress. The autism assessments are on a waiting list of 2 years and the process takes 18 months to complete.		
6	3	AB advised that LL and govs need to consider the number of children with significant needs requiring support in different classes from September. Staffing ratios need to be considered. Willow, Beech and Oak classes all need full time TA support. AB has discussed with LL and has costed for 2 presently part time TAs to become full time for one year. The budget can cope with this due to the headteacher change. Hopefully new EHCP money will help. AB said that we need to support year 6 so that they reach the required level in SATs next year.		
6	4	AB said she has received the SEN funding review which needs to be completed.		
7		<b>SIP/SEF</b>		
7	1	AB has completed a full end of year review and will share this at FGB next week. There is still a blank part that needs to be completed by governors.		
7	2	AB has looked at the data and will recommend appropriate items to be included for the SIP/SEF for 2018/19.		

8		<b>SIAMS/Ethos Group</b>		
8	1	LL has had a discussion with CT about visioning. This will be a focus for the non pupil day in September.		
8	2	The compassion banner has been completed and was given to school yesterday. Will be presented and celebrated in Collective Worship Friday, 20 <sup>th</sup> July 2018.		
9		<b>Policies</b>		
9	1	<b>Gifted &amp; Talented</b> – The policy was re-adopted without alterations.		
9	2	<b>Online Policy</b> – The new model South West Grid for Learning model policy has been personalised to the school and this was distributed in advance of the meeting. Governors advised they had not had chance to look at it and it was agreed to bring this to the next meeting.	JD	09/18
10		<b>What has been the impact of the meeting for the children?</b>		
10	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gobs have looked at the challenging data and had a meaningful discussion about the way forward to address this for next year.</li> <li>• Governors have reviewed transition for the children.</li> </ul>		
11		<b>Date of next meeting:</b> To be decided		