



Minutes of Thirsk Community Primary School Governing Board on Monday 9th January 2023 at 6:15pm

Present: Stuart Mountford – chair (SM), Richard Chandler – head (RC), Jane Grainger (JG), Jenny Buck (JB), Lucy Minican (LAM), Lisa Garthwaite (LG), Sally Burton (SB), Kate Wimpory (KW)

Apologies: Lesley Miller (LM)

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

No 22/23	Item	Action
PART 'A' – Governance		
4.1	Welcome The chair opened the meeting at 6:19pm and welcomed two new governors, Sally Burton and Kate Wimpory.	
4.2	Apologies and determine whether absences should be consented to Apologies had been received from CP and LM and were consented to.	
4.3	Declaration of business interests JG worked for a virtual school.	
4.4	Approve minutes of meeting on 12 December 2022 The minutes of the Full Governing Board (FGB) meeting held on 12 December 2022 were circulated to all governors prior to the meeting. Amendments: 3.4 remove “The SIP had been updated with what governors should be looking for”. 3.1 LG had been missed from the apologies in error – to be added. Approval - with the above amendments, the minutes were deemed as a true record.	
4.5	Matters arising: 3.8 questionnaire regarding after school club still to be done. Clerk to add to next agenda. 3.8 Premises costs action – to carry forward. Governors requested more information before the next meeting with the Bursar on 18/01/23. Clerk to add to next agenda. KCSIE – remaining governors to sign to say they have read the document.	Clerk
4.9 – covered early to allow staff to leave the meeting	Progress against SIP Becki Kaufman updated governors about progress with children awarded Pupil Premium funding (PPG), and children with Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND). Year 2 and Year 6 children had completed SATs papers, Year 1 had received teacher assessments, and years 3-5 had completed PIRA and PUMA tests. It was worth noting that 41% of PPG children also had SEND.	

Signed:

Date:

1

There had been more movement in progress with SEND children than in previous half terms. Children were still working below expected, but were getting closer to working towards. Some pupils from the sunshine room had moved into mainstream classrooms.

In reading there had been some improvements in Year 2 and some movement from below to on-track in year 3. The rest of the school had either stayed the same or dropped slightly. In writing there had been little movement across the school and this was still the biggest target. The whole school had just begun working with a different weekly format to ensure that there was a series of consecutive lessons with a writing focus, rather than being broken up with reading focus lessons. Maths showed the biggest improvement for children with SEND and the Concrete-Pictorial-Abstract (CPA) approach was being followed with CLIC maths being used every morning.

Pupils receiving PPG had shown improvement in reading in Year 2 and Year 3. Other year groups were the same or lower. Writing was improving in Year 5 and 6 however was still a challenge with boys. Year 2 and 3 also showed improved progress in maths.

Next steps would be to continue to support the Early Career Teachers (ECTs) and HLTAs with planning to ensure that groups were adequately challenged.

Sarah Kirkman then talked to governors about maths progress. There was outstanding or good progress in maths in every year group. Progress was good in Year 6 but levels of attainment (45%) were still behind the national average of 71%. However in terms of value-added, some children were now accessing the curriculum in year 6 and had been unable to access it at Year 1.

Year 1 had the lowest percentage on track as there was a significant jump from EYFS to Year 1 expectations in curriculum, in particular recording number work. Existing issues with writing and fine motor skills were having an effect. Year 2 and 5 were strong in maths with 81% of Year 2 on track and 86% expected to reach age related expectations (ARE) by the end of the year. 74% of Year 5 were on track, Year 4 were 70% on track with 48% working at ARE, and Year 3 were 91% on track with 68% working at ARE. There was focus on pupils who would need accelerated progress to reach working at ARE by the end of the year.

White Rose Maths was a good resource especially for ECTs and HLTAs to support planning. Mental arithmetic and times tables would be given a boost with a relaunch of times table rock stars. Pupil passports would be used to track those needing accelerated progress.

Year 6 groups were working for the best possible outcomes and consideration was being given to the best use of staffing in order to achieve this.

GQ – Greater depth was a focus on the SIP, how was this being addressed?

A – White Rose maths provides good quality resources for those working towards greater depth and use of this was a good model and CPD for staff.

GQ – Was there any data to share about greater depth?

Signed:

Date:

2

	<p>A – This was not all to-hand but Year 2 was 15%. Mixing of Year 5 and Year 6 was also helping to develop Year 5 greater depth.</p> <p>Gemma Wall was unable to attend to report on English, however RC shared that reading was strong with good on track and at numbers. Writing was still the most significant issue and the most recent staff meeting had been spent considering this. The key group and therefore key focus was disadvantaged boys. The structure of the week was being adjusted and staff were being asked to focus on ensuring that all children knew what was needed to improve their writing, and that staff had high expectations every time a child wrote, for example expecting correct punctuation in all written work etc.</p> <p>GQ – Could there be an issue of motivation to write, especially for SEND children. Writing was a complex activity combining many skills – would high expectations on punctuation affect the motivation of SEND children?</p> <p>A – Children received in-the-moment feedback as they worked so this expectation would be framed as a positive thing and part of working hard. It was key that children were interested in what they were writing and took pride in their published pieces.</p> <p>GQ – How many children used a device for writing in school?</p> <p>A – one child used a device and another child was working to learn to type.</p>	
6:55pm Sarah Kirkman left the meeting.		
4.8	<p>Plan for Pupil Premium Spend</p> <p>Becky Kaufman updated governors on the PPG spending.</p> <p>Last year's spend had been £80,330 and this year was providing similar issues. In terms of Quality of Teaching for all, the Super Scholars programme had been initiated in English and maths and was being extended to foundation subjects. There were two new additional staff to support smaller groups out of the large class setting but at an appropriate stage for their age. PIRA and PUMA tests had been purchased to ensure that PPG children were tested according to the year group that they were working at, not the year group they were in. The costs of the staffing and tests totalled £24,402.</p> <p>Targeted reading and phonics support for disadvantaged pupils was being provided by the phonics scheme Little Wandle, and funds covered the purchase of books, the phonics scheme, support and intervention in afternoon catch-up groups. Some Year 2 children who were receiving interventions had now caught up. Costs were £14,505.</p> <p>Attendance for disadvantaged pupils was being supported through subsidised places at the breakfast club and enhancing the curriculum to encourage attendance, e.g. enrichment weeks. Costs were £2000 with a possible increase for breakfast club.</p> <p>For enrichment activities, £91 per child went towards the residential trip, milk was provided, and access to free music lessons was being considered. A safe space for vulnerable children was being provided as part of the nurture provision and this included lunch club which was a quiet space for children to eat. This helped children to regulate their feelings which then impacted on learning. PPG funds were also</p>	

Signed:

Date:

3

	<p>covering the gap between the cost of free school meals (FSM) and the funding: £2.47 funded for meal cost of £3.26. This was for the main school and did not include the nursery. These costs totalled £41,422.</p> <p>GQ – Was there an opportunity for extended writing after the enrichment weeks? A – Yes this usually happened, although Christmas had been a bit different.</p>	
7:08pm Becky Kaufman left the meeting.		
4.6	<p>Correspondence There had been no correspondence.</p>	
4.7	<p>Governor training It was confirmed that JG, LG and SM had all completed Safer Recruitment training in the last two years.</p>	
PART 'B' - School Improvement		
4.10	<p>4.8 and 4.9 had been covered previously. Link Governor Reports There had been no visits.</p>	
4.11	<p>External Reports There had been no external reports.</p>	
4.12	<p>Health and Wellbeing Questionnaire This had been drafted and was being passed to staff in the next two weeks.</p>	
4.13	<p>Resources to consider There were no issues to consider.</p>	
PART 'C' – Other		
4.14	<p>Policies for review There were no policies for review.</p>	
4.15	<p>Safeguarding and Child Protection There had been no change since the last headteacher's report in terms of numbers. There had been no referrals since the last meeting. There was one referral to Early Help in progress.</p>	
4.17	<p>AOB This was moved forward in the meeting in order to discuss the cost of school meals. The school had been made aware with minimal notice that there would be an increase in school dinner costs to £3.26. Parents were currently paying £3.00 and an increase had already been made in September. Governors discussed the issue and the possibility of a further increase to costs for parents. It became apparent that other schools had lower school meal costs and it was unclear why this might be. The cost increase had high implications for the school in terms of possible drop in uptake for school lunches, and increased costs to cover for FSM. Governors agreed that more information was needed before any changes to charges were made. Action – RC to make enquiries regarding costs in other schools. Meals to be added to the agenda for the next meeting.</p>	Head, Clerk

Signed:

Date:

4

	<p>Governors then discussed the possibility of moving which evening meetings were held on. It was not possible for all governors to attend any other evening apart from Monday, and the dates for the meetings had been set for the year. Governors fed back that they were unable to change evenings to accommodate a new clerk. Action – Clerk to feed this back to Governor Support.</p> <p>The head updated governors regarding ongoing issues with the kitchen floor, which had resulted in some closure of the kitchen during the first two weeks of term.</p>	Clerk
4.16	<p>How has this meeting impacted on the welfare and progress of our pupils?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress data had been reviewed. • School meal figures had been interrogated. • PPG spend had been reviewed. 	
4.18	<p>Confidential staffing/school updates</p> <p>There were no issues to discuss.</p>	
4.19	<p>Date of the next meeting</p> <p>Monday 6th February 6:15pm</p> <p>The meeting scheduled for Monday 8th May was now a bank holiday, and would be rescheduled for Monday 15th May.</p>	
<p>Please note: The colour coding above links to the three key roles of governance questioning; RED for 'setting strategic direction', BLUE for 'holding Headteacher to account for educational performance' GREEN for 'ensuring financial health, probity and value for money'.</p>		

There being no other business the Chair closed the meeting at 7:37pm.

Signed:

Date:

5

OFFICIAL