

**CHAPEL ALLERTON PRIMARY SCHOOL GOVERNING BOARD  
QUALITY OF TEACHING, LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE**

Minutes of the meeting held in school on Tuesday 7 February 2023 at 6.30pm

<b>PRESENT</b>	Tom Leech (Chair)	Yolanda Cerda
	Bobbie Gresser	Emma Heatley
	Faye O'Toole	Samantha Todd
	Amy Wilson	

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Sharon Burn (Clerk – Governor Support Service)  
Becca Pinder (Deputy Headteacher/Associate Member)  
Emily Stephenson (Year 6 teacher and school writing lead)

<b>1.00</b>	<b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND MEMBERSHIP MATTERS</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
1.01	Apologies were received and accepted from Mary Dailey. The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.	
<b>2.00</b>	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>	
2.01	There were no new declarations of interest.	
<b>3.00</b>	<b>ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS</b>	
	There was no other urgent business.	
3.04		
<b>4.00</b>	<b>MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING</b>	
4.01	<b>Resolved:</b> That the minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 8 November 2022 were accepted as an accurate record and the Chair was authorised to sign the minutes.	
<b>5.00</b>	<b>REVIEW ACTIONS AND MATTERS ARISING</b>	
5.01	<b>Governor monitoring of music (minute 5.03 refers):</b> The Chair reported that he had arranged to visit school on February 22 and would do a deep dive in music with Helen Davey, the School Improvement Advisor (SIA).	<b>Chair</b>
5.02	<b>Pupil Premium (minute 8.08 refers):</b> The Chair reported that he would be coming into school on Friday to look at the Pupil Premium strategy with the Headteacher and he would do a learning walk. He noted that data would be discussed in this meeting. There was further discussion about government grant funding under item 7 of this agenda.	<b>Chair</b>
5.03	<b>School Development Plan (SDP) (minute 8.09 refers):</b> Action completed. The Deputy Headteacher (DHT) reported that the action plans had been reviewed and updated. The SLT (senior leadership team) had responded to governors' requests for more specific detail about funding and impact. The updated SEF (self-evaluation) and SDP had been circulated to governors prior to the meeting.	
5.03.01	The DHT highlighted that she brought some extra documents to	

the meeting. These provided statements the school's Core Values and Curriculum Intent and an explanation of how the curriculum worked. BP asked governors to take the documents away, read them and send any questions to the SLT. After that they would be sent out to staff.

## **6.00 STRATEGIC OVERSIGHT (IMPLEMENTATION)**

6.01 The Chair reported that he had met with the DHT last Friday and they had looked at the statement of Core Values. (See above). Governors agreed to review the Core Values and Curriculum Intent and send any comments or questions to BP by the end of next week.

6.02 The updated SEF had been sent to governors prior to the meeting. The SLT had edited the document in response to discussions with governors at the last full governing board meeting, but judgments remained the same. Governors were pleased with the updated SEF and noted that the language in the document was more reflective of what school was doing.

6.03 The DHT noted that the SEF interacted with the SDP. The SEF Identified the actions school needed to take going forward and the SDP mapped out how actions would be implemented. Governors were pleased with the additional clarity and detail which had been included in the SDP in addition to the broad statements.

*Emily Stephenson had been invited to the meeting to talk about writing in school. Governors agreed to change the order of items on the agenda.*

## **8.00 THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION**

8.01 Helen Davey had visited school in November and met with the English leads. She had looked at the action plans for phonics, reading and writing. Her report had been sent to governors prior to the meeting. Emily provided governors with an update on teaching and learning for writing

8.01.01 Emily explained school had allocated separate leaders to phonics, reading and writing. The leads worked together as a team. Emily had been the lead for writing since July. It had been a challenge. The previous writing lead had done lots of CPD (continuing professional development) but had left unexpectedly for another job. Emily noted that as an experienced Year 6 teacher she had a good understanding of the skills and knowledge children should have at the end of primary school.

8.01.02 Covid had made a big impact on progress in writing. The school had learned from the experience of the first lockdown and changed its approach to teaching writing in the second lockdown. E.g., Providing more examples of *what a good one looks like* for children learning at home. Writing however, had still been difficult to teach remotely.

8.01.03 Emily had done lots of research into the Pie Corbett approach on

Governors

which Talk for Writing was based. Staff had not been really clear on what the writing process should look like, but Emily had led two staff meetings and now staff had a better understanding of the process.

- 8.01.04 Emily explained that school needed to do a lot of work to ensure that children were secure with basic writing skills. E.g., Using full stops and capital letters consistently. The biggest problem currently was that children were still making basic errors in Year 6. Children would not achieve the expected standard if they did not have basic skills. School needed to ensure that basic skills were taught properly and that children progressed through school secure in the objectives from each year group.
- 8.01.05 School was introducing an *ALWAYS* toolkit which outlined what should be evident in every piece of writing in terms of punctuation, common spellings etc. Children should be able to check for the things that should always be there. The DHT noted that school was establishing a re-set of expectations.
- 8.01.06 **Q:** Was this the sort of thing that would address the drop in attainment from Year 4 to Year 5?  
**A:** Emily pointed out that objectives got harder as children got older. School needed to address the gaps in skills. It was difficult to teach objectives if the gaps were still there. Errors would become compounded. The DHT added that last year had been a particularly difficult year for Year 4.
- 8.01.07 **Q:** Was school still using the *Talk for Writing* framework?  
**A:** School still believed in the principles of *Talk for Writing* and wanted to continue with elements of it. Emily explained that previously the process had not been cohesive enough. She had worked with staff. The process had three stages:
- Imitate
  - Innovate
  - Independently apply – it was noted previously the third stage had been invent but children were not able to invent until they could independently apply. School would still use a core text as a model and ask children to write a different version of that.
- 8.01.08 Emily noted that it would take a couple of years for the approach to writing to embed but eventually the differentiation between the year groups would widen because children would become more skilled as they progressed through school. At the moment school was drawing children back to basics and focusing on key things. E.g. Using tense properly. School would build upon improvements and children would develop to become independent and creative writers.
- 8..01.09 **Q:** A governor noted that the need for children to know who they were writing for had previously been highlighted.  
**A:** School was doing work to enable children to clearly identify the

audience. The children needed to know the answers for:

- What is your piece of writing?
- What is the purpose?
- Who is the audience?

Emily had done some work with the staff around this.

8.01.10 Emily told governors that she had done some useful work with Steve Dawson and he had helped to put an overview in place. School now had a good mix of fiction, non-fiction and poetry texts to work with. Steve had been back to school to review and provide feedback.

8.01.11 **Q:** How do you evaluate implementation and impact?  
**A:** Emily and Steve had looked at a selection of books. They had fed back to staff individually and as a whole. Emily will look at books again after half term with the SLT. They would be looking to see that expectations were in place.

8.01.12 The DHT noted that teachers were going to Emily for advice. They were consulting her and asking for feedback. BP said that the Headteacher would arrange a staff meeting for feedback towards the end of term. She added that she would like to get some pupil voice about writing.

8.01.13 Emily noted that even children who were weaker writers were now finding it easier to plan their writing because they had a clear structure to follow. School was hoping for more creative writing to develop.

8.01.14 The Chair asked if it could be arranged for governors to see the results of the writing monitoring. Emily said that it would take a few months for the approach to embed. She hoped that impact would be evident by the end of the year. It was agreed that some of the children's work would be shared with governors in either the summer or autumn term.

8.01.15 Bobbie Gresser noted that Amy Sanderson was the governor for writing and suggested that it would be useful if Amy and Emily could arrange to meet in the summer term.

Governors thanked Emily for attending the meeting and providing the update. Emily left the meeting.

## **7.00 THE IMPACT OF GOVERNMENT GRANT FUNDING**

7.01 The following documents had been circulated with the agenda:

- Evidencing the Impact of Primary PE and Sport Premium
- Pupil premium strategy statement 2022/23

7.02 The DHT drew governors' attention to PE and Sport Premium and noted that school had a statutory obligation to account for implementation of the funding and impact. She highlighted key points.

- School had introduced Real PE. There was a new PE lead

Agenda

and there would be more training to upskill staff. The PE was part time but would be arranging CPD for staff.

- School was bringing quality coaches into school.

7.02.01 **Q:** What was the frequency of visits from Leeds Rhinos?

**A:** Leeds Rhinos came into school every Friday but they were also doing some extra coaching in school. E.g. some sessions in Year 2. The DHT noted that school had a good relationship with Leeds Rhinos and they were doing some great work in school.

**Q:** Did they send inspirational people in to school?

**A:** Yes. The DHT assured governors that the coaches were always of a high quality.

**Q:** Did the coaches work with children with SEND?

**A:** Yes. They were very good at adapting to children's needs and SEND children were fully involved. The DHT added that school paid into the Cluster each year and the Cluster provided opportunities for children with SEND. E.g. Children went ice-skating last week. Since September there had been three events for SEND children alongside standard ones such as athletics.

7.02.02 **Q:** A governor referred to swimming and asked if there was a target for competent, confident swimmers?

**A:** The DHT thought the target was about 80%. School was currently achieving 50%

**Q:** Did some children not get involved?

**A:** Some children had never been swimming before. Some of the Year 4 children could swim but some children in Year 5 still could not swim. The school concentrated on children who could not swim. All children went until Easter and then those who still could not swim continued after Easter.

It was noted that Leeds City Council (LCC) offered free swimming lessons over February half term but there was only a 25% take up. The DHT said that she would follow that up and get more information about the free swimming from LCC.

DHT

7.02.03 **Q:** A governor noted that there was more detail to add in evidence of impact for key indicator 2 on page three of the PE/Sports Premium report.

**A:** The DHT said that the actions for key indicator 2 would be funded from a different budget and the evidence and impact would be documented elsewhere. Governors suggested that it should be noted where the evidence of impact was. E.g. Outdoor learning action plan. The DHT agreed and said that she would follow that up.

DHT

7.02.04 **Q:** Did school make a link between PE, well-being and mental health?

**A:** Yes. School recognised that it was important for children to spend time outdoors and be physically active. The DHT noted that there were units in the PSHE (personal, social, health education) curriculum which linked to PE. She pointed out that

Commando Joes was linked to PSHE. The staff governor highlighted the importance of PE for the children she taught. They loved it and their behaviour was affected if they could not do it for any reason.

7.02.04 The DHT assured governors of the school's commitment to PE and pointed out that it allocated a full two hours a week to it. The Chair noted that the QTLA Committee was monitoring PE and asked if the PE lead could be invited to the meeting in the summer term. The DHT agreed to arrange that.

DHT  
Agenda

7.03 Governors focused their attention of the Pupil Premium strategy statement. The DHT explained that she had taken more of a lead on the Pupil Premium strategy. She told governors that school had learnt a lot during lockdown about children's home environment and experiences and barriers to learning. For some children there were often multiple barriers. BP highlighted the impact of Covid. She said that school was looking at how funding was spent and how impact was achieved.

7.03.01 The DHT referred to challenges presented by weak language and communication skills and pointed to the specialised speech and language TA (teaching assistant) support school was providing. The TAs worked with children from Foundation Stage 1 (F1) up to Year 6. Staff worked to identify children early in F1 and worked very hard with children and their parents. The DHT explained that children were given support on rotation. The Speech and Language Therapists (SALT) would leave a programme of activities for a specified period and the TAs would deliver it to children. Children would be reassessed at a later point and would be given further support if necessary.

7.03.02 It was noted that staff absence had impacted TAs capacity to deliver the SALT programmes. The DHT said school had currently one job vacancy which it was struggling to fill.

7.03.03 The Chair reported that he would be coming into school to observe some of the work school was doing with Pupil Premium pupils.

Chair

7.03.04 The DHT highlighted other aspects of provision from the Pupil Premium strategy.

- School funded breakfast club.
- School funded residential visits for children in Year 6.
- School provided enriching experiences for children who would not normally be able to access them.
- The Pupil Premium funding partly paid for the Safeguarding and Welfare Officer (SWO) and partly towards the SEND lead and the SEND HLTA (higher level teaching assistant).
- Pupil Premium funding also paid for the early starter clubs.

7.03.05 **Q:** A governor referred to the impact on behaviour and readiness

for learning and asked if there was any success criteria for that?

**A:** There was discussion about behaviour for learning and emotional well-being and how success could be measured. Governors suggested that there should be a less data driven measure for that. It was agreed that case studies would be a valuable way to look at the impact on the emotional and mental well-being of children. The DHT referred to a child in Year 6 who had been supported by school and had developed more positive learning behaviours in readiness for high school. Governors pointed out that the growth mindset was a school core value and school needed to consider how to demonstrate that children were achieving progression in terms of resilience, aspiration etc.

- 7.03.06 **Q:** A governor noted that there was a reference to language deficit among disadvantaged children in early years. Did that impact on their ability to establish relationships with peers?  
**A:** The DHT did not think so. She pointed out that Reception children did a lot of work with learning partners which was supported by the practitioners. Children did learn quickly from each other. Staff ensured children had lots of opportunities to talk and supported conversations. BP noted that children's behaviour could be affected if they struggled with emotions and did not have the language to express how they were feeling.

## **8.00 QUALITY OF EDUCATION**

8.02 Writing had been discussed in detail. (see item 8.01 of these minutes).

In addition to the SIA's report the following documents had been circulated with the agenda.

- The pupil progress data for summer 2021/22 and autumn 2022/23.
- Diminishing the Difference Snapshot
- Disadvantaged :Pupil Progress Meeting -spring 2023
- Usage of Outdoor Area

There was discussion about pupil progress data. The DHT highlighted key points.

- 8.02.01 Assessments were triangulated. Teachers used their knowledge of the children, assessment activities and tests and predicted where they thought the children might be. At this point in the year teachers tended to err on the side of caution.
- 8.02.02 Referring to Foundation Stage 2 (F2) the DHT noted that the children would be in a different position at the end of the year. F2 children would make progress between now and the summer.  
**Q:** A governor asked why there was no summer reading score for F2.  
**A:** The F2 scores came in after the document had been produced.
- 8.02.03 It was acknowledged that there had been a drop in the

percentage of children working at the expected standard (Ex) and greater depth (GD) in some year groups. The DHT assured governors that each and every pupil was looked at and challenged at pupil progress meetings. Interventions were put in place where it was needed and school expected the Easter data to reflect actions.

- 8.02.04 **Q:** Was there usually a dip in the autumn term?  
**A:** The DHT said that there could be. The children had been off school for the long summer holidays and the teachers were still getting to know them in the autumn.
- 8.02.05 **Q:** A governor asked for clarification about working towards WT + (working towards+).  
**A:** That was the group of children not at Ex but who were targeted to achieve Ex by the end of the year. School looked at those children to see what it could do to get them to age related expectations.
- 8.02.06 Governors noted that in Year 5 there was a big jump from WT+ to the column for WT and SEND. They were keen to ensure that the children were getting the support they needed. The DHT assured governors that school was taking affirmative action for all pupils in the WT group. Phase leaders had been asked to monitor interventions and ensure children were getting the support they needed. BP pointed out that it was a balancing act to ensure that the children were receiving interventions and accessing a broad and balanced curriculum. E.g. Time taken out of class in the afternoon to do extra writing was time away from other subjects.
- 8.02.07 **Q:** A governor asked about the provision for GD children in Year 5.  
**A:** There were two part-time teachers in Year 5 and Wednesday was a cross over day. On Wednesdays one teacher could purely teach maths and English to children working at GD. The rest of the children could do basic English and maths work without slowing down GD children.
- 8.02.08 A governor pointed out that the Year 5 cohort would have been in Years 2 and 3 during the Covid disruption. The DHT noted that the effects of Covid would last for a long time. She told governors that the children in the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) had been impacted in terms of language and communication skills and social and emotional development. This in turn impacted on readiness to learn. BP pointed out that pre-Covid, the school's percentage of children working at GD had been higher.
- 8.03 There was discussion about progress in maths. The DHT acknowledged there had been a drop in progress for some children. She told governors that school was putting a bigger focus on fluency. Expectations had been reset and school was monitoring how strategies were implemented. E.g. Times table rock stars. BP informed governors that the SIA would be doing a maths deep dive when she visited after half term. She would look

at maths in the morning and music in the afternoon.

- 8.03.01 The staff governor pointed out that if teachers were concerned about a child, they were more likely to assess them at WT than Ex because that would ensure the right action was taken. Interventions would be put in place and there would be an evidence trail of action. The DHT said that she expected the picture to be better at Easter. She noted that currently interventions had been impeded by staff absence.
- 8.04 The DHT drew governors' attention to the Diminishing the Difference Snapshot and the data for different groups. She highlighted that all groups were not performing at the same rate as their non BME (black, minority, ethnic) counterparts. School was doing additional pupil progress meetings for disadvantaged pupils. These would alternate between the scheduled pupil progress meetings and the DHT would do them. BP said that she would be looking at how often teachers speak and read to the pupils.
- 8.04.01 **Q:** Was it almost like the issues around SEND. Were teachers not taking responsibility for these children?  
**A:** The DHT explained that the alternate pupil progress meetings would spotlight children. It was a positive piece of work and there had been good feedback from staff. All staff had appraisal targets around disadvantaged pupils. BP pointed out that often the disadvantaged children were children with SEND or WT. The school wanted all staff to be Pupil Premium champions and to ensure first quality teaching for all children. She assured governors that all teachers were doing everything they could to close the gap. BP pointed out that however, that all children benefitted from quality first teaching so the gap was hard to close.
- 8.05 Governors referred to the SIA's report and agreed that it had been very positive. The DHT highlighted that Helen Davey had been impressed by the teachers' level of knowledge. The phonics leader had worked tirelessly to ensure that the Little Wandle phonics programme was implemented and being taught with fidelity. The phonics lead was given release time for monitoring once a week and she had observed good practice. Teachers were supporting one another.
- 8.05.01 The DHT reported that the phonics lead was identifying and ironing out any issues quickly and a very structured approach was taken to support children who had not passed the phonics screening in Year 1.
- 8.05.02 It was noted that Helen Davey had suggested that school do more to promote a love of reading. The DHT said that the reading leader was looking into that. School would be focusing on poetry on World Book Day and the story corner at lunchtime was established.
- 8.05.03 The DHT highlighted that VIPERS was embedded and the

revised approach to writing was up and running. It just needed time to embed.

8.05.04 Governors were pleased with the SIA's report and noted that it was very thorough.

8.06 Governors referred to the report on the usage of the outdoor area. The DHT highlighted that a lot of work had been done on the outdoor area in response to feedback from staff and children about what they wanted.

8.06.01 It was noted that the biggest issue in the outdoor area was the use of the biodome. It did not lend to growing opportunities in the winter months. There had also been issues with the solar panels in the windy weather. BP reported that school had contacted the company concerned. Governors agreed that the area outside F2 was excellent.

8.06.02 **Q:** What were the barriers to using the outdoor areas? Would the outdoor learning leader be able to look at that?

**A:** The DHT assured governors that the outdoor learning leader was good at encouraging children and staff to use the outdoor area. It was being used by Forest School. She noted that the SIA had highlighted the importance of learning objectives when using the outdoor area. BP did expect more story times outside in the spring and summer months.

8.06.03 **Q:** Did the PE leader and the outdoor learning leader work together?

**A:** The DHT agreed that it would be a good idea for the two leaders to work together. There were opportunities for overlap in PE and learning outdoors.

## **9.00 EARLY YEARS FOUNDATION STAGE (EYFS)**

9.01 The DHT confirmed that the EYFS framework was in place. Policies and procedures were in place and all EYFS practitioners had paediatric first aid training.

9.02 It was noted that the PDBW Committee would be looking at safeguarding in the EYFS at their meeting in March.

## **10.00 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

- The full governing board meeting would be on Thursday 9 March 2023 at 6.30pm
- The QTLA Committee meeting would be on Tuesday 2 May 2023 at 6.30pm
- 

The Chair closed the meeting at 8.15pm