

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

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

PRESENT	Tom Leech (Chair)	Emma Heatley
	Mary Dailey	Samantha Todd
	Bobbie Gresser	Amy Wilson

IN ATTENDANCE: Julie Kirkpatrick (Clerk – Governor Support Service)
Becca Pinder (Deputy Headteacher/Associate Member)
Louise Goulsbra (Observer)

		ACTION
1.00	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND MEMBERSHIP MATTERS	
1.01	The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies were received and accepted from Jenny Hand.	
	.	
2.00	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
2.01	There were no new declarations of interest.	
3.00	ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS	
3.01	There was no urgent business to discuss.	
4.00	ELECT A COMMITTEE CHAIR	
	This item had been actioned in the previous FGB 21 September; Tom Leech was re-elected Chair of this committee and Emma Heatley (Shadow Chair).	
5.00	MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING	
5.01	Resolved: That the minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 02 May 2023 were accepted as an accurate record and the Chair was authorised to sign the minutes.	
6.00	REVIEW ACTIONS AND MATTERS ARISING	
6.01	Music – monitoring visits (minute 6.06 refers): Action closed. The DHT updated governors on recent monitoring which included self-monitoring of teachers in PE and Music plus Art Forms had completed extra monitoring with an effective intervention plan in place to assist a staff member and enhance music lesson delivery.	
6.02	Music – website update (minute 6.07 refers): Action closed. The DHT had updated the website to celebrate what school did well in Music. Governors were pleased to hear how enthusiastically Y6 had talked about learning music when they had showed new parents around at an open evening that day.	
6.03	Mindmate and PSHE - Sheryll Carter assessment report 07 February 2023 (minute 6.08 refers): Action closed. The DHT had updated the school website to highlight the report and evidence all the fantastic work and achievements in music within school.	

6.04 **Art update (minute 6.06 refers):** The Chair confirmed that an art update was an agenda item for this meeting, refer item 11.00.

6.05 **EAL children support (minute 7.10 refers):** Action ongoing.
A contact at Blenheim primary for EAL had left the school however the DHT explained at the last training day a recent school advisor visit had concentrated on EAL. The session had made staff think about what it felt like to be an EAL learner. A working party set up across school staff would work together to decide what next steps might be.

DHT

7.00 **QUESTIONS FROM GOVERNORS ON TEACHING AND LEARNING (TOR 7.04)**

7.01 The DHT gave a thorough presentation on data referring to the following reports which governors had received prior to the meeting.

- Key group data
- Performance by cohort
- CAPS (Chapel Allerton Primary school) and National data – standards and achievements
- Ian Stokes visit report

7.02 **Q:** What were the reasons for lower greater depth attainment in KS1 and would there be children who could be challenged as they developed the Chair enquired?

A: KS1 were a SEND heavy cohort where the focus had to be on bringing them back to pre-pandemic levels. Now gaps were being closed, as the data demonstrated the cohort were above national in all subjects, school would work towards nurturing children showing potential for greater depth.

7.03 The Ian Stokes report confirmed outcomes of vulnerable groups within school were generally in line with National data. The intention to close this attainment gap further was outlined and governors discussed ways to look at poverty in relation to attainment.

Q: In respect of FSM, BME EAL, and disadvantaged groups, what works in other schools or is best practice we could adopt? There was further discussion on this question at point 7.09.

Q: The Chair asked what was it that made SATS results better? Would you continue to adopt the same practices, Do the same intense changes for Y6 SATS preparation filter down to KS1?

To answer the above questions, the DHT explained.

- Excellent teaching and reflection of what worked. School were flexible and responsive, as a result changed groups and teaching strategies responding to pupil needs to ensure pupil centred and tailored teaching.
- The DHT had looked at setting, children had worked in sets

based on their ability. SEN children had been separated to receive effective and targeted support with a teacher.

- Setting as a strategy would continue though it was emphasised always based on children's needs and abilities. A governor commented setting had clearly worked and school should be proud of their SATS achievements.
- An Easter school had been held in the mornings of the Easter school holidays and staff had been pleased with how many children had participated.
- The above strategies happen lower down school except for the Easter school. Extra staffing in Y6 enables more concentrated focused teaching and setting for SAT preparation.

There was more discussion around Y6 SATS results, governors observed that Easter school and setting were embedded practices alongside excellent teaching. The difference had been tracking children more closely and focusing on individual needs. There had also been changes to the curriculum with work on Rose and Shine structures in place. Governors thanked the DHT for the information which enabled them to understand what had worked and how pupil ability was tracked from day one.

- 7.04 **Q:** Why was the current Y6 reading attainment lower?
A: It's a mixed ability cohort with a high SEND population and where some pupils are working towards target. Staff were trying to close the attainment gap wherever they could.
- 7.05 **Q:** Is there sufficient accuracy in assessment and target setting?
A: Assessment is a triangulation process which involved formative and summative methods. School had recently worked with a consultant looking at grammar and how it's taught to focus and help both EAL and other children with staff from F2, Y2 and Y6 having attended extra moderation sessions. School would continue with Y2 assessments even though these were not statutory. It was highlighted to governors end of phase group moderation assessments were accurate for writing and that school used PIRA and PUMA tests for reading and maths assessment.
- 7.06 **Q:** Is greater depth and more able the same assessment process? Why don't we have greater depth in any of these figures?
A: Yes, it was the same assessment process the DHT clarified and greater depth assessment was normally at the end of each key stage. School had changed the way greater depth would be assessed going forward.
- Q:** How do children who achieve greater depth feel about their achievements?
A: It was explained children are not notified or know they are working at or towards greater depth. The challenge and satisfaction of achievement would be within a piece of work given in lessons.

7.07 **Q:** In Y4 Is there any reason why writing outcomes are lower than reading?

A: During the pandemic it had been difficult to see writing homework and for children to complete at home with parents unsure of school writing expectations. This was also a cohort with complexity of needs children. School had increased the number of grammar and reading slots each day.

Q: With this increase what was coming out of the curriculum?

A: Nothing had been omitted, short bursts of reading and grammar were happening in the morning. Learning behaviours work had been introduced for example lollipop sticks where any child in the class could be asked to answer a question as all their names were on a lollipop stick which the teacher then used to pick one at random and ask that child the question, encouraging more active participation. EAL children identified in the cohort were being supported to have a better understanding of the lesson. There were eighteen EAL children within this year group three of which were very new to English. Persistent attendance issues with two children were improving. The year group were not disruptive just talkative.

Governors were reassured this did not correlate to teacher experience. Within the year group there was unavoidable staff absence and changes due to long term health issues. Staff were supporting this year group from other areas in school and a permanent TA appointment had been made. If a broader criterion of disadvantaged pupils was applied, 23 out of the 60 pupils within the year group could be classed as disadvantaged.

Amy W left the meeting at this point.

7.08 A full breakdown of the make-up of each cohort was given in respect of BME, SEND, PP, and EAL which the DHT felt was vital for governors to understand the challenge school faced.

Gender comparisons were explained plus the gap between FSM and non-FSM children.

Emma Heatley left the room at this point.

Q: Which subjects are the highest performing and why?

A: Reading and phonics were the highest performing subjects Learning behaviours in these were embedded and it was explained to governors how resolute children had been when the Y6 SATS paper nationally had been deemed hard.

Q: Why are reading results so strong?

A: The DHT showed a slide to demonstrate the following in detail,

- In summary, strong phonics teaching
- Reading for pleasure built into the school day.
- Structure of reading lesson and routine

Q: What was being done to support the lowest 20% performing pupils?

A: Individual pupil needs were assessed regularly and discussed during pupil progress meetings. This was also discussed and referred to at point 7.09.

Emma Heatley re-joined the meeting.

Q: How is feedback of strong teaching performance given?

A: Strengths and what was going well were always outlined in ongoing teacher feedback.

7.09

Disadvantaged children

Q: How do we define disadvantaged children?

A The Government definition was explained in detail to governors including the difference between FSM and pupil premium, Free school meals (FSM) included armed forces children and any child who had claimed FSM in the last six years. Pupil premium children were groups of disadvantaged pupils in receipt of funding to improve education outcomes for example Looked after children (LAC), English as an additional language (EAL) and black minority and ethnic (BME).

Q: What factors at Chapel Allerton influenced disadvantaged children? What's effective at successful schools? (This question was covered in more depth than when first raised at point 7.03.)

A: Barriers to learning such as low-income poor speech and language were discussed and the DHT showed a slide to explain effective outcomes within other schools.

Governors were mindful the top three impact and successful outcomes for comparison within other schools all involved expensive teacher time and interaction and were,

- Paired or small group teaching
- One to one tuition
- Improved feedback

Governors noted TA's within school started at 8.30am and led interventions which was not widely done across other schools. There was an element of caution with comparison and challenge or question against the data discussed as it was pointed out it was self-reported data.

Q: A governor asked what extra school did in addition to the comparison list discussed?

A: The DHT outlined several initiatives which included, Mindmate links, working with parents, working with sleep and anxiety issues.

In summary after the presentation governors thanked the DHT for an extremely detailed and useful presentation and follow up actions agreed were,

- Governors were keen to ensure all children who could be classed as disadvantaged were identified. It was clarified Zara helped where a need was identified, and school sent information on benefits out to all parents at regular intervals. The DHT would follow up with Zara to see if any more could be done.

DHT

- Next steps would be identifying barriers and what governors could do to focus on closing attainment gaps for disadvantaged children. The Chair would meet with the DHT in the new year to discuss, in conjunction with the Helen Davey and Ian Stokes reports which highlighted an understanding of where children lived and any deprivation they lived in to fully understand any impact school could potentially have.

CHAIR/DHT

8.00 STRATEGIC PLANNING

Q: The Chair wanted to know, whilst recent NOVAC reports received were extremely positive, how school assessed and reviewed future development points and NOVAC outcomes?

A: The DHT answered that she regularly met with Alicia and looked at existing action plans to review where to focus following each NOVAC.

Governors commented it would be useful to have an example of a NOVAC to review follow up actions at the next meeting. The Chair and the DHT would liaise which NOVAC subject would be suitable.

DHT

Sam Todd left the meeting at this point

9.00 THE NATIONAL CURRICULUM

The clerk informed governors that in addition to receiving evidence of how school implemented the statutory national curriculum by subject content and year group, that this should also be available to parents on the school website. The DHT asked if this involved a link to the national curriculum for parents to follow or for clarity if more was needed on the website. The clerk would forward more information to assist.

Clerk

Post meeting update – the clerk emailed what was required on the website in respect of the national curriculum.

Additionally, governors were made aware subject leaders cross checked and ensured curriculum delivery was compliant and that moments of reflection or collective worship happened weekly.

Sam Todd re-joined the meeting.

10.00 THE IMPACT OF GOVERNMENT GRANT FUNDING

Governors had scrutinised each of the following reports and were satisfied school had reflected learnings from the previous year in

plans for the allocation of funding for the coming year.

- Pupil premium
- PE and sports premium
- (SEND) top up funding (Funding for Inclusion, FFI)

A governor requested that page four of the PP report included more individual and specific evidence of teaching EAL and other disadvantaged groups. Following further discussion, that this included numbers rather than percentages to equate what there was to celebrate within the school community in actual numbers. Governors wanted the PP statement to reflect the outstanding work school undertook and offered to assist the DHT with the wording. The DHT would action this.

DHT

There were no questions and no changes to the PE and sports premium and (SEND) top up funding (Funding for Inclusion, FFI) reports and governors were happy for these to be published on the website.

11.00 ART UPDATE – QTLA 02 May 2023 – (Minute 6.10 refers)

The DHT explained she was now the Art and design and technology leader. A new scheme, “Access Art” had been introduced which was more process driven. There was a new long-term Access Art plan.

The scheme involved children learning art for half a term then design and technology (DT) for the other half term. A thorough overview of the progression of skills document was given with examples of the curriculum building on each previous stage knowledge shown and clear progression from Y1 to Y6.

Q: How does this document link to the long-term Art and DT plan?

A: In addition to the above term by term progression shown, curriculum links and a Y1 to Y6 spirals example was explained and demonstrated with children’s books on the table for governors to look at.

Governors additionally heard how enthusiastically Y6 Pupil voice pupils had talked about learning about the first black woman to win the Turner prize and the vocabulary they had used for instance referring to themselves as artists. The staff governor explained how she was much more confident to teach and support children with Art and DT as a teacher now due to the excellent videos and support, that the new scheme was clear and supportive for both staff and children alike.

Governors were pleased to hear; the Friday star of the week now included an Art and design certificate celebrating artwork and a gallery display of recent work in school was on the website.

Q: Were there any artists who could visit school?

A: Governors discussed and suggested names of known creative

parents who may visit.

DHT

Q: Within Art and DT was there a noticeable difference between BME and non BME or PP children, was there a visible attainment gap?

DHT

A: The DHT stated school had not unpicked any data to quantify either way and she would attempt to identify and nurture PP children within the arts subjects and report her findings.

12.00 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

FGB

Thursday 07 March 2024

Thursday 16 May 2024

Thursday 04 July 2024

QTLA

Thursday 01 February 2024

Thursday 02 May 2024

PDBW

Thursday 29 February 2024

Thursday 06 June 2024

L&M

Wednesday 24 January 2024

Thursday 25 April 2024

The Chair closed the meeting at 8.30pm