



**Minutes of Thirsk Community Primary School  
Governing Board  
on Monday 9<sup>th</sup> May 2022 at 6:15pm**

**Present:** Richard Chandler – Head (RC), Lucy Minican - Vice Chair (LAM), Jenny Buck (JB), Jane Grainger (JG), Gemma Wall (GW), Lesley Miller (LM), Lisa Garthwaite (LG), Rachael Pearce (RP)

**Apologies:** Stuart Mountford (SM), Charlotte Pearson (CP)

**In attendance:** Jane Jackson – clerk (JJ), Sarah Kirkman – staff (SK), Becki Kaufman – staff (BK)

No 21/22	Item	Action
<b>PART 'A' – Governance</b>		
9.1	<b>Welcome</b> The meeting was chaired by Vice Chair, Lucy Minican and was opened at 6:17pm.	
9.2	<b>Apologies and determine whether absences should be consented to</b> Apologies had been received and consented to from SM and CP.	
9.3	<b>Declaration of business interest</b> JG works for a virtual school.	
9.4	<b>Notification of any urgent business</b> There was no urgent business.	
<b>9.14</b>	<p><b>Data</b></p> <p>Data was brought forward on the agenda to allow staff to leave the meeting once reports had been delivered.</p> <p>Governors received verbal reports on data from members of staff.</p> <p>GW reported on <u>Early years</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress in Reception was judged as outstanding however this was partly due to a very low baseline in the cohort at the start of the year.</li> <li>• Reading, communication and language were particular strengths.</li> <li>• 37% of children would achieve a good level of development (GLD), however some children would not achieve this due to fine motor skills and writing which were holding some children back, in particular summer-born boys.</li> <li>• The percentage of children not currently achieving GLD was due to a number of factors, including a high level of SEN children, and movement of children with higher ability out of the school and some lower ability pupils joining.</li> <li>• Nursery progress was measured in different strands which were mostly Good or Outstanding however there were two SEN children who really struggled with the “Managing Self and Making Relationships” strand, where progress was Requires Improvement.</li> <li>• Children who had attended the nursery at Thirsk CP tended to perform better.</li> </ul> <p><b>GQ – Had the other children attended a private nursery prior to Thirsk CP?</b></p> <p>A – Yes, mostly. Very few had not attended any setting before.</p>	

Signed:

Date:

1

GW continued to report on Reading across KS1 and KS2:

- A healthy number in KS1 were on track for Age Related Expectations (ARE). There had been a dip in progress compared to the Autumn term which may have been down to a different method of assessment as well as a high level of absence after Christmas.
- 70% of Y1 and 61% of Y2 had reached expected levels of attainment.
- In KS2 Years 6, 5 and 3 had made good or outstanding progress in reading.
- Year 4 reading was an area for concern as there was a high level of SEN children and fewer volunteers coming in to help with reading.
- KS2 reading SATS were to take place in Year 6 the following morning and it was unknown where the benchmark would be set this year, after a two year gap. The last data for Thirsk CP was 79% achieving ARE. Results would be back in the first week of July.

The head explained that PUMA (Progress in Understanding Mathematics Assessment) and PIRA (Progress in Reading Assessment) tests were given in Years 3-5, and SATS were taken in Years 2 and 6. This was the first year the PUMA and PIRA tests had been used in the Spring term, and had historically been a challenging term in other schools.

GW continued to report on Writing:

- Writing had been showing weaker progress, so this term teachers had returned to modelling writing in lessons. This had resulted in fewer pieces of independent writing to assess.
- Year 1 to Year 5 had achieved Inadequate or Requires Improvement progress for similar reasons to those for reading data.
- In Year 1, 75% children were on track to achieve ARE with 50% having achieved it already. In Year 2, 67% were on track with 38% having achieved ARE. The groups would need steep progress to achieve ARE in end of year assessments.
- Teachers had been asked to identify individual children who were not on track for leaders to track and analyse. The reduction in independent pieces of writing to assess was one factor in progress, with another being spelling, which had to be accurate to achieve ARE. This was a difficulty for a number of children.
- Training had been taking place and more rigorous monitoring was planned.

#### **GQ – Had the “marking in the minute” affected spelling progress?**

A – This was currently being looked at and teachers were moving towards correcting spellings in all written work. Previously, when following the McKie programme, teachers were only marking to the learning objective and children would then edit their work for spelling and grammar.

#### **GQ – How was spelling taught?**

A – It was taught as a discrete part of a literacy lesson and included common exception word lists for each year group, grammar, phonics and wow word walls.

Signed:

Date:

2

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individual pupil plans were being developed for all pupils who were on-track but had not yet achieved ARE.</li> <li>Writing was the greatest concern at present, however Pupil Voice had been very strong for writing. Children all enjoyed it, knew their targets and next steps, and knew how to get help e.g. asking a partner, using word mats etc.</li> </ul> <p><b>GQ – Were spellings still going home as homework?</b> A – This varied from class to class. The English action plan was in the process of being updated and decisions would be made about this.</p> <p><b>GQ – Was writing assessed in topic work or just English?</b> A – Both were used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Writing in KS2 had made Outstanding progress, but had low levels of pupils at ARE: Year 3 - 21%, Year 4 - 43%, Year 5 - 27%, Year 6 - 56%.</li> <li>As in KS1, children not currently at ARE were being monitored and more time was being allowed for writing in lessons.</li> </ul> <p>Governors thanked Gemma for her report and requested a copy of the data summary sheets. <b>Action – staff to pass data summaries to governors – Clerk to circulate.</b></p>	<b>GW/BK/SK and Clerk</b>
<b>JJ left the meeting. Minutes were continued by RP.</b>		
9.14 ctd	<p>SK reported on <u>Maths</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comparable national data in maths was only available from 2019, when 76% of Year 2 children reached expected standard.</li> <li>Progress had been most affected in younger year groups and disadvantaged groups.</li> <li>In Year 1, 57% of pupils were on track, with 46% in Year 2. There was a 50% gap between Pupil Premium (PP) and non-PP children in Year 2.</li> <li>Staff training was being delivered on bar models which was to be embedded in KS1.</li> <li>PUMA tests had raised some concern and showed some inconsistency between what was being taught and what was assessed, with a focus on fundamentals.</li> <li>Senior Leadership were meeting regularly to discuss maths and were looking closely at PP and rigorous assessment in KS1.</li> <li>The discrete nature of different areas in maths also made it difficult to track progress at times – the current term had a fractions focus which was historically challenging.</li> <li>Year 6 were on track with 78% at ARE. Year 4 were 71% on track but with 57% meeting expected levels. Year 5 had a wide range of results and were in McKie groups to support this.</li> </ul> <p>BK reported on disadvantaged groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Those children struggling to read at home were receiving support in school.</li> <li>PP and SEN children working in different year groups were a focus in the Feedback Policy. This number had been reduced from 22 children to 14 due to children moving up McKie groups.</li> </ul>	

- Individual plans were now in place to target these children and allow teachers an understanding of their whole day of teaching and learning. More responsibility was being placed on all teachers for these children.
- The number of maths groups had increased and SEN children were making progress but in small steps which were not reflected in the evidence.
- Some children had moved from working at expected levels to working below due to illness, covid absence and staff absence.

**GQ – Were the individual plans online and annotated by staff?**

A – Yes, they were a live document which staff could annotate in different colours. Parents had also been contacted.

- The number of SEN pupils at Thirsk CP had increased to 25% with an increase in EHCPs as well.

**GQ – What was the percentage of Pupil Premium pupils at Thirsk CP and nationally?**

A – 36-40% including some new children. Nationally 27%.

**GQ – Did children seem to “give up” when working in lower McKie groups?**

A – There was no feeling of this. Children were not told which level they were working at and were still challenged in these groups. Movement of groups was reviewed on a pupil by pupil basis.

**GQ – How many pupils were in the Sunshine Room?**

A – Five full time and four of these would be moving to SEN schools in September. Other numbers varied by subject with an additional four children in maths and three children in English. The majority had EHCPs.

**GQ – Which schools would these children be moving to and at what age?**

A – Three to Wellburn and one to Mowbray. Two at Year 3, one at Year 4 and one at Year 5.

A governor commented on the impressive work being done and congratulated staff. It was also noted that a Social Worked had commented on the high quality of provision and care for SEN children at Thirsk CP.

SK and BK left the meeting

**9.5**

**Approve the minutes from 4 April 2022**

The minutes of the Full Governing Board (FGB) meeting held on 4 April 2022 were circulated to all governors prior to the meeting.

Approval - The minutes were deemed as a true record.

**9.6**

**Matters arising**

8.9 - Correspondence

**GQ - Had the two days planned for SLT to work on the new curriculum been set aside?**

Signed:

Date:

4

	<p>A – Yes, this would be taking place in the summer.</p> <p>8.7 Budget – School meals would have to increase to £3.00 from £2.63 from September however funding for free school meals was £2.34. The families of 30 children were currently paying for their own meals.</p> <p><b>GQ – Would school be paying the shortfall for FSM and would this be a debt?</b> A – Yes, school were potentially looking to explore other providers and other options when contracts were renewed in 2023.</p> <p><b>GQ – Was the figure provided the same for school meals in KS1 and how many children were taking these?</b> A – Yes this was also £2.34 and RC would look up the numbers of pupils.</p> <p><b>Action – RC to look at numbers and inform families.</b></p> <p><b>GQ – Was the school meal the only meal some children would have in a day?</b> A – It was believed that this was certainly the case for some children. Packed lunches were also a concern with regards to nutrition, allergies etc.</p>	<b>RC</b>
9.7	<p><b>Start Budget</b></p> <p>The start budget had been circulated to governors prior to the meeting. It was slightly lower than the draft budget but not significantly different.</p> <p><b>Agreed - The start budget was agreed by governors.</b></p> <p><b>Agreed - The lunch price increase was agreed by governors.</b></p>	
9.8	<p><b>Correspondence</b></p> <p>There had been no correspondence</p>	
9.9	<p><b>Parent Governor Vacancy</b></p> <p>Charlotte Pearson had completed an induction process. <b>Agreed - As there were no other candidates for the role to be elected by parents, Charlotte was appointed by governors as Parent Governor.</b></p>	
9.10	<p><b>Governor Training</b></p> <p>LAM attended “Governor duties in relation to exclusion and attendance” on 26/04/22</p> <p>There was a discussion about exclusions. RC reported that in a period of 8 years there had been long periods of no exclusions as well as periods of some in quick succession. There had been no permanent exclusions, just fixed term exclusions with the last being in December 2020. The behaviour policy of Ready, Respectful and Safe along with Team Around Family (TAF) meetings and use of the Sunshine Room were proving effective.</p> <p>When making exclusions, children’s safety at home was the first consideration and sometimes internal exclusion was used as a tool.</p>	

Signed:

Date:

5

	<p><b>GQ – Who attended TAF meetings?</b>  A – Parents, learning mentor, head teacher, and class teacher. Different services really help.</p>	
<b>PART ‘B’ - School Improvement</b>		
9.11	<p><b>External reports</b>  There had been no recent reports.  A Local Authority safeguarding audit would be taking place on 24/05/22 with scrutiny of the single central record, staff and governors.  There would be an English hub meeting on 12/05/22</p>	
9.12	<p><b>Link Governor Reports</b>  LG had met with GW regarding data which had been shared earlier in the meeting.    JG had met with RC regarding CP and went through Senior Leadership meetings and changes. She commented on the positive work with the secondary school. NYCC now had a major safeguarding visit once a year which was a welcome change.</p>	
9.13	<p><b>Staffing</b>  Two staff were due to be leaving: one at the end of May and one at the end of the school year. Both were leaving for new positions, one HLTA was moving to another school.    There was a discussion about staffing, including reasons for leaving. Staffing for EYFS would need to be considered and the other role would most likely be internally covered with restructured office and admin roles.</p>	
9.14	<b>Data was covered previously</b>	
9.15	<p><b>Academy Schools</b>  This was discussed and recorded at the end of the meeting as confidential.</p>	
<b>PART ‘C’ – Other</b>		
9.16	<p><b>Premises</b>  There was nothing to report.</p>	
9.17	<p><b>Health and Safety</b>  There would be a visit from the Health and Safety advisor within the next few weeks.</p>	
9.18	<p><b>Policies</b>  The following policies had been circulated to governors prior to the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EYFS Key Person Policy</li> <li>• Governors’ Disciplinary Policy – date to be adjusted.</li> <li>• Restrictive Physical Intervention</li> </ul> <p>With the changes noted, the above policies were agreed by governors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information Security</li> </ul> <p>The above policy needed further discussion and would be added to the next meeting.  <b>Action</b> – Clerk to add to the next agenda</p>	Clerk
9.19	<b>Safeguarding/Child Protection</b>	

Signed:

Date:

6

	The head reported on safeguarding issues including two referrals to the Healthy Child Team, one referral to early help and social care, and one resolved case of missing from education. Two children were currently under child protection, one child at child in need, and one child working with the healthy child team. There were two TAF families getting support from the children's family worker. One child was working with early help.	
9.20	<b>How has this meeting impacted on the welfare and progress of our pupils?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data had been shared and discussed.</li> <li>• Areas for improvement had been identified and next steps for writing had been discussed</li> <li>• The start budget had been agreed.</li> </ul>	
8.23	<b>AOB</b> There had been a letter from the PTA regarding the summer fair on 8 <sup>th</sup> July 5:30-7:30pm inviting governors to contact them if they wished to have a stand. The PTA also passed on their thanks for supporting the Colour Run.	
8.24	<b>Confidential staffing/school updates</b> These were minuted accordingly.	
8.25	<b>Date of next meeting</b> Monday 13 <sup>th</sup> June 2022	
Please note: The colour coding above links to the three key roles of governance questioning; <b>RED</b> for 'setting strategic direction', <b>BLUE</b> for 'holding Headteacher to account for educational performance' <b>GREEN</b> for 'ensuring financial health, probity and value for money'.		

There being no other business the Chair closed the meeting at 8:52pm.

Signed:

Date:

7