

**CHAPEL ALLERTON PRIMARY SCHOOL GOVERNING BOARD
PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT, BEHAVIOUR AND WELFARE COMMITTEE**

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 3 March 2022 at 6.30 pm

PRESENT Gemma Dolden (Chair) Bobbie Gresser
 Amy Sanderson Sam Todd
 Emma Wilson

IN ATTENDANCE: Becca Pinder (Deputy Headteacher/(Associate Member)
 Louise Turnbull (SENDco)
 Hayley Bilclough (SENDco Assistant)
 Sharon Burn (Clerk – Governor Support Service)

		ACTION
1.00	APOLOGIES	
1.01	Apologies were received and accepted from Nahima Hussain.	
1.02	Tom Leech was not present at the meeting.	
2.00	DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS	
2.01	There were no new declarations of interest.	
3.00	MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING	
3.01	Resolved: That the minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 11 November 2021 were accepted as an accurate record and the Chair was authorised to sign the minutes.	
4.00	MATTERS ARISING	
4.01	School council (minute 5.01 refers): Action ongoing. The Chair had postponed attending a school council meeting due to the recent high rates of COVID infection. She would re-arrange to attend a meeting.	Chair
4.02	Lunchtime behaviour incidents (minute 5.06 refers): Nahima Hussain, who had said that she would visit school to observe lunchtime, was not present at this meeting. Bobbie Gresser noted that she had observed lunchtime and she had sent a report to governors. The Chair noted that she would be coming to see the Safeguarding and Welfare Officer (SWO) and she would look at lunchtime behaviour then	Chair
4.03	Relationship and Sex Education policy (RSE) minute 5.08 refers): It was confirmed that the policy was on the website. Parents had been consulted about the policy and the school business manager had reported that there had been no negative feedback. The Chair noted that it was a statutory requirement for the policy to be reviewed in the summer.	
4.04	Child with low attendance (minute 6.06 refers): Q: A governor asked if the Deputy Headteacher (DHT) had followed up the query about the school's response to the child with low attendance.	

A: The DHT had followed it up. The school had worked with the child's family, but it had been challenging. The monitoring process had been put in place, there had been some improvement, the process was stopped, attendance declined and so the process was restarted. BP noted that there had been a change in the rules around monitoring attendance and it would be more difficult now for families to manipulate the system.

4.05 **Meeting with SWO (minute 7.14 refers):** The Chair confirmed that she had met with the SWO, and she had circulated her report to governors.

4.06 **Training on attachment disorder (minute 10.03 refers): Q:** A governor asked if any more thought had been given to providing staff with training on attachment disorder.

A: The DHT said that school had given it some thought and was investigating options to access training. The Chair said that if she came across any information about training she would let school know.

5.00 **GOVERNOR MONITORING OF SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PRIORITIES**

5.01 The Chair noted that she had met with the SWO in December and had circulated her report. The SWO had been well prepared, and the meeting had been informative.

5.02 Amy Sanderson had met with the SENDco (special educational needs and disabilities co-ordinator) and she would send her report to governors. She noted that her meeting had been very positive, and she felt confident about SEND provision in school.

5.03 Bobbie Gresser reported that she and Nahima Hussain had both attended the visit the caretaker's brother had made to school. He had talked to the children about his experience of being the first black police officer in South Yorkshire. BG noted that it had been a powerful event and it was great that the school had organised it.

6.00 **ATTENDANCE, BEHAVIOUR AND ATTITUDES**

6.01 **Attendance Update**

Prior to the meeting the governors had received the following document:

- Attendance from September 2021 to date.

The DHT highlighted key points.

6.02 Whole school attendance at generally 96% was good. The picture was not good when attendance data was broken down. It was noted that COVID had made an impact and there had been an outbreak of chicken pox. School wanted to improve attendance and remove poor attendance as a barrier to learning and it had put strategies in place.

6.03 The DHT drew governors' attention to the data for the black, minority ethnic (BME) group of children. School had analysed the

data. BP pointed out that not all children with low attendance were off-track and not all children with regular attendance were on-track, but school had identified a trend of low attendance among children who were off-track.

6.03.01 School was using target setting meetings with parents to highlight the importance of good attendance. The Cluster had a new Attendance Officer (AO) and the school's SWO was working with her. Fast track interventions were now an ongoing process and not just introduced on a termly basis. After ten unauthorised absences over a 12 week period the AO was alerted.

6.03.02 **Q:** Was it one absence per session, morning or afternoon?
A: Yes. If children were not in school by 9.30am they would be marked as absent for the morning session. The DHT pointed out that if an absence was authorised, i.e. the parents gave illness as a reason for the child's absence, then it would not count towards the trigger point for monitoring. The SWO was ensuring that evidence was provided if parents gave a medical appointment as a reason for absence.

6.03.03 **Q:** Were parents actively preventing children from attending school?
A: In a minority of cases they were. The DHT said that there were different reasons for poor attendance. She pointed out that children with persistent absence were the hardest to reach.

6.03.04 School had drilled down into the data. Some Year 6 children had been significantly below 96% attendance all the way through school. She noted that school had worked with the families.

6.03.05 **Q:** Had any of these children been on an Early Help Plan (EHP)? Would it be significant to offer that?
A: The DHT said that it might be worth investigating. In response to a governor query she explained that an EHP was an early intervention plan to prevent more significant problems developing later. An EHP could be actioned by any professional working with the family. E.g. health visitor, teachers. They did involve a lot of work.

6.03.06 The DHT highlighted that fact that children were happy when they were in school. Some absenteeism was down to parenting. School was striving to engage with parents and make them aware of the importance of attendance. BP acknowledged that processes around ensuring attendance had slipped during the pandemic, but school was now focused on it.

6.03.07 **Q:** Did teachers flag up attendance issues to the SWO?
A: Yes. An attendance issue would be flagged up on the first day. The DHT told governors that the SWO had visited a child's house the previous day to find out why they were not in school. The SWO saw evidence to suggest that the family were home, but they did not respond to her attempts at communication.

6.03.07 Governors agreed on the importance of getting the message

across to parents. They pointed out that those children who had low attendance but were still on track might be able to achieve Greater Depth standard if their attendance improved. The DHT said the SWO was focused on building relationships with families and building trust but ultimately it was about parental responsibility.

6.04 **Behaviour and attitudes**

The behaviour summary report had been sent to governors prior to the meeting. There was discussion about key issues.

6.05 The DHT described how the school had responded to two incidents of bullying.

6.05.01 A parent had come in with a child and complained about bullying. School had investigated. It emerged as tensions within a friendship group and was not really bullying. School had addressed the issues with restorative practice. Staff were working with the group of children and were monitoring the situation.

6.05.02 There had been a disagreement between two children with SEND. They liked to be together in school but tended to fall out. School was working with the children and using restorative practice to enable them to recognise the trigger points. Tensions had reduced but there were still flare points and school was monitoring the issue.

6.05.02.01 **Q:** Did the tension between the children have a lasting impact?
A: No. It was an in the moment thing and the children came into school each day with a clean slate. The families were aware of the issue and were working with school.

6.06 There had been an incident of homophobic language. The DHT explained that school always began by addressing that issue with education and talking about the use of vocabulary. BP noted that she and the SWO were keen to ensure that there was a clear process to address this in the behaviour policy and gave examples of how the process might look.

- When it happened the first time school would begin by educating about vocabulary.
- If there was another incident with the same child a second time school would contact the parents.
- If there was a third incident with the same child school would involve the Safer Schools Police team.

BP noted that it was important that school had a clear strategy to address the issue and she assured governors that homophobic language was always taken seriously. Incidents were recorded on CPOMS (Child Protection Online Monitoring System).

6.07 There had been an LGBT incident. The DHT explained it had started as a joke which had erupted into an argument. Staff had a conversation with the children and school was monitoring the issue.

- 6.08 An incident of racism had been addressed with restorative practice.
- 6.09 An incident of theft had been dealt with and the parents had been notified.
- 6.10 **Q:** Did school monitor negative gender language. E.g. Boys calling other boys a girl in order to be derogatory.
A: School was always aware of equality and diversity and did not tolerate negative gender language. The DHT noted that in Year 5 this week the children had been learning about Vikings and female Viking warriors. This had generated discussion about sexism and gender stereotypes.
- 6.11 **Q:** Would it be useful to look at trends of behaviour at lunchtime?
A: The DHT had already looked at data for incidents in 2019 and made a comparison between then and now. She noted that she felt lunchtime was better now. There seemed fewer children being sent in from the playground or standing at the wall. BP felt that school was getting better at supporting children to self-regulate but she acknowledged that the current statistics for incidents were similar to 2019. They were not lower. It was suggested that this might be because staff had got better at using CPOMS and were doing more recording now. A governor pointed out that children were also currently getting used to being back in school together.
- 7.00 SAFEGUARDING**
- 7.01 The Chair confirmed that the Safeguarding report had been sent.
- 8.00 POLICY REVIEW**
- The RSE policy had been discussed (see item 4.03 of these minutes)
- 9.00 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT - STAFF**
- 9.01 The DHT reported that the staff survey would be sent out next week. Emma Wilson noted that she was going to be involved in looking at responses from the survey.
- 10.00 SCHOOL FOOD AND MILK**
- 10.01 The DHT confirmed that school continued to provide free school meals and school milk. Leeds City Council (LCC) continued to provide vouchers through the holidays and provided an additional 10% for school to purchase vouchers for refugee children. School could do this at its own discretion.
- 10.02 There was discussion about provision for refugee children. The DHT assured governors that procedures were in place in school for children new to English. It was agreed that the DHT would report on a case study on refugee children and how they had settled into school at the next meeting.
- 10.03 It was confirmed that paid for meals were available and there had been an increase in the uptake for those since the lockdown. The school used an outside catering agency, Chartwells, and they ensured that food met the required standard.

- 11.00 SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS AND DISABILITIES (SEND)**
- 11.01 Louise Turnbull, the special educational needs and disabilities co-ordinator (SENDco) gave governors a power point presentation to provide a SEND update. The following main points were highlighted.
- 11.02 There had been a whole school staff training day in the autumn term which had been well attended and had gone well. All staff had looked at statutory requirements, so teachers understood the reasons behind tasks they were asked to complete.
- 11.02.01 Staff had looked at clicker which was an ICT resource to meet the needs of children who could not write. It was resource which empowered children.
- 11.02.02 Staff had looked at Makaton. Some children communicated through signing, and it was important that staff had some knowledge of Makaton. A sign of the week was being used across school.
- 11.02.03 The training day had included workshops on Lego club and movement play. LT explained that movement play was about developing vestibular strength. She noted that modern societal norms e.g. using car seats, high chairs, inhibited movement in early childhood which was essential to development. E.g. children not doing enough spinning. This impacted on early reading and writing. Movement play aimed to give children more opportunities for those essential early childhood experiences.
- 11.03 LT explained that SEND support in school implemented the graduated approach, which was the cycle of plan, do, review and assess. Whenever school was applying for funding, it had to prove that it had implemented the graduated approach. It had to show that interventions had been planned, put in place, reviewed and progress assessed.
- 11.04 Governors were given examples of the Individual Support Plans (ISP) the school was using. LT noted that the ISPs included child and parent voice. The targets were written on the ISPs and the ISPs were reviewed four times a year. Teachers and teaching assistants could write comments on them, and they were monitored each half term. The support plans for those children with funding were reviewed with parents.
- 11.05 LT explained that the school had a SEND register and a monitoring register. She had written a clear definition of what the two registers should look like. Moving forward the SEND team would look at the children on the monitoring register. Look at their needs and if they needed to go onto the SEND register or if they could be supported and moved off monitoring. LT would look at those children who had been on the monitoring register for a lengthy period.
- 11.06 It was highlighted that a lot of work had gone into removing barriers

to learning and looking at how to make classrooms more inclusive to enable children with SEND to access the curriculum. E.g. implementing whole class visual timetables together with individual ones, writing wedges and pencil grips.

- 11.07 The DHT noted that practice for children with SEND had improved throughout school and teachers were really thinking about how to support children to access the curriculum. For example in Year 1 lots of children were having recuperation breaks which provided opportunities for movement.
- 11.08 Governors watched the Animal School video which illustrated the constraints placed on children by expectations and the importance of stepping back to reflect on ways to remove barriers. Governors noted that the video highlighted the need to see children as individuals.
- 11.09 The Accessibility Plan had been sent to governors prior to the meeting. It had been updated and was on the website.
- 11.09 The SEND annual report had been sent to governors and had been put onto the website.
- 11.10 LT reported that there were four children with an Education, Health, Care Plan (EHCP) in school. She explained that school was expected to provide some level of SEND support for children within its budget. When meeting additional needs was over and above what school could provide E.g. if a child needed 1:1 support, school could apply for top up funding. Not all children with top up funding needed an ECHP. Being allocated an ECHP would enable a child to access specialist provision. There was a lot of work involved in the application for an ECHP but that advantage of it was that everything the child needed was contained in one document.
- 11.10.01 It was reported that there was one ECHP new application this year and school had applied for one reassessment. There would be nine new funding applications. It was pointed out that funding applications involved a lot of work. School had to provide significant evidence to show that it had implemented the graduated approach.
- 11.11 **Q:** A governor asked if there had been any feedback from parents about the Individual Support Plans.
A: There had been lots and it had been mainly positive. Parents said that the review meetings made them feel more involved in their child's education. Children had said that they felt that teachers had a better understanding of their needs. Parents had noted that their children were excited about coming to school.
- 11.12 **Q:** Who recommended a child for the monitoring register. Who had that conversation with parents?
A: It was better if the child's teacher could have a face-to-face conversation with the parents as they would have a relationship

with the child and parents. Teachers would take advice from the SENDco prior to a conversation and if the conversation was going to be a difficult one, the SENDco would be involved.

11.13 **Q:** A governor noted that both the SENDco and the assistant SENDco were class based and, pointing to the work involved in funding applications, expressed concern about capacity. Were they getting the time and support they needed?

A: LT acknowledged that there was always a need for more time, and it had been difficult during COVID. There had been high staff absence and HB had needed to provide cover. Both LT and HB tried to be organised, to pre-think and pre-empt.

Q: Was the senior leadership team (SLT) providing support?

A: The SLT provided support whenever possible. There was lots of crossover between the DHT, LT and HB. It was acknowledged that it was not an easy job.

11.14 It was noted that school had specialist TAs in speech and language support. School was using them in a more flexible way and ensuring that knowledge was shared with teachers so teachers could do more themselves.

11.15 It was noted that a SEND coffee morning was planned. Bobbie Gresser said that she would try to attend that.

11.16 Governors thanked LT and HB for the presentation and their input and declared that they were impressed with the work they were doing.

12.00 SCHOOL SELF-EVALUATION (SEF)

12.01 The updated SEF for Behaviour and Attitudes and Personal Development had been sent to governors prior to the meeting.

12.02 **Q:** A governor noted the reference to pupil voice and asked for clarification.

A: It was down to consultation. Pupil voice was integral to the Magnificent 7. It was about tying up pupil voice with book work. The DHT assured governors that school did listen to children.

Q: Was pupil voice recorded?

A: It was recorded in the monitoring forms and fed back to teachers.

13.00 ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

13.01 The Behaviour Policy had been sent to governors for review prior to the meeting. It was noted that there was an amendment in the policy relating to peer on peer abuse.

13.02 The Medical Policy had been sent to governors prior to the meeting. An amendment was highlighted which related to nuts.

13.02.01 **Q:** Was there a process in place to ensure that epi-pens, inhalers etc were in date?

A: There was a process in place. Every year Individual Health Care

Plans were checked. Epi-pens, inhalers were checked and asthma cards and permission forms for medications were checked with parents.

13.03 Governors wanted more time to review the Behaviour and Medical policies, so it was agreed to defer approval until the full governing board meeting.

**FGB
agenda**

13.04 **Q:** A governor referred to the Ukraine crisis and asked how the school was providing support to children.

A: It was a sensitive issue. The school did not want to highlight the crisis and worry children. School was using Newsround as a resource for reporting on the war. The DHT acknowledged that it was important to be aware of and address any anxiety children might have.

14.00 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

- Thursday 9 June 2022 at 6.30pm

The Chair closed the meeting at 8.20pm