



Bowhill Primary School

Personnel and Curriculum Meeting

Date of meeting	19 th April 2016	Present	Name of Governor	Initials	Category	Name of Governor	Initials	Category
			Time of meeting	6:00 p.m.	Caren Brooks	CB	STH	Reg Edwardson
Karen Cronin	KC				Foundation	Matthew Giles	MG	PAR
Caroline Havard	CH				PAR	Stephen Cousley	SC	Co-Op
Ruth O'Neale	RO				PAR	George Littlejohn	GL	Co-Op
Debra Ward	DW				STAFF	Lizzie Clough	LC	
Room	Year 6/2	Apologies	none					
		In Attendance	Li Wang	LW	Clerk			

	Minutes	Actions
	<p>Fire Alarm</p> <p>There is no fire test today. Fire Exits were outlined by SC. If the alarm sounds then make your way quickly and safely to the playground.</p> <p>Business Interests Register</p> <p>Governors were reminded that they must declare any conflict of interest which becomes apparent during the meeting. None Declared.</p>	
1	<p>To receive apologies for absence</p> <p>Apologies received as above and sanctioned.</p> <p>Governors welcomed Lizzie Clough, a qualified accountant, onto the Governing Body.</p>	
2	<p>To consider the minutes from the Personnel and Curriculum Committee meeting held on Tuesday 23rd February 2016</p> <p>Governors were reminded to forward any errors, inaccuracies or queries about the Minutes to the Clerk no later than 24 hours before the meeting.</p> <p>Minutes were approved as accurate record of meeting and signed by SC.</p>	
3	<p>To discuss matters arising from the last meeting (held on 23rd February 2016)</p> <p>SC announced that the review of policies which was to be conducted at this meeting will be postponed to the next P&C meeting as policy review will be reorganised based on the Governors Calendar which will be finalised at next Monday's APMC meeting. Workload will be rearranged between the P&C and the B&F.</p> <p>RO advised to set up a new position – Policy Lead- who is in charge of updating, revising and amending policies.</p> <p>SC suggested governors consider delegating policies to individual Governor so that</p>	

policies can be reviewed and updated before the meeting.

4

Questions to the Headteacher

Governors were reminded to send questions out related to the SMIP (specially teaching and learning) to the Headteacher or the Clerk before the meeting.

Following KC's questions about the SMIP sent out prior to the meeting, CB replied accordingly before the meeting. KC looked through those questions and answers, discussing them with Governors one by one.

1) We have a strong proactive strategy, but how many significant bullying incidents have been reported this school year? Have they been effectively managed?

CB replied: Incidents recorded this year 3. Effectively managed - yes - Previously paper files - (currently transferring historic incidents over to CPOMs) CPoms will then be the only system used enabling quick access to incident records and efficient cross-referencing.

2) SMIP Objective 1: performance indicators: do we have data from end of Spring term to insert here, e.g. % of F/S pupils at GLD; maths and English data? If not, when will governors receive it?

CB replied: Progress and Attainment data for English and Maths to be shared at meeting. % of F/S at GLD is reported at the end of June.

3) SMIP Objective 2.1: Was all teaching in English and Maths good by the end of the Spring term? If not, what action has been taken?

CB replied: Teaching now judged with overall monitoring sheets (will bring a copy to APMC) This gives complete picture of teaching performance not just a snapshot. Where there are amber/reds, feedback is given to teachers. E.g. if this is in lesson observation, what could be improved within the lesson, if it is in book monitoring, written feedback is given and next time the books are taken in, that point is looked at specifically. If there are concerns, a lesson observation /book monitoring will be done more frequently and a conversation with the teacher regarding expectations. Not all teachers are 'green' consistently. However, the area for development will determine the action - e.g. could be targeted improvement (support) i.e. one teacher sent on Improving Teacher Programme.

4) SMIP Objective 2.3: Have teachers understood the mastery curriculum by the end of the Spring term and are tracking measures in place to provide appropriate data?

CB replied: Yes -they understand - depth learning tasks expected on planning and this is an area we will continue to develop.

5) SMIP 4.2: Has the transition to mixed 3-4 achieved the required high level of teaching and learning? If not, what is required to achieve this? What is the target date as none is given on SMIP?

CB replied: Improvements are evident in maths and English but further development is required in writing. Since writing was brought up at the review, we have been in touch with literacy adviser Rebecca Cosgrave who is meeting Katherine Richards (in Sue Cashmore's absence) with KS2 teachers. Date being negotiated. But I anticipate this will be during May. This Q&A also relates to agenda item regarding staff structure.

6) SMIP 4.3: Ethos and values: update please as this is now red.

CB replied: Happy to discuss this but it's not for me to update alone - we need to select key words to sum up our ethos and values and governors should be contributing to those discussions. (I.E. at another local school the head and staff chose one set of words and the governors chose another - leaving them with the problem of combining 2 different sets).

7) SMIP 4.5: Joint moderation re maths and English: is the outcome to be reported to this P&C or the next?

CB replied: I can certainly report outcomes to P&C committee - the staff meetings or APMC next Monday are planned in for the summer term. This week the meeting is English

	<p>moderation, the next (maths focus) is May 17th. Both will result in a portfolio of evidence that demonstrates ARE.</p> <p>CH advised to circulate ‘Questions governors might ask about the quality of the curriculum’ prior to the next P&C meeting.</p> <p>CB confirmed: The school is running an online parent view to replace a former parent questionnaire. Respondents are asked to choose one out of Strongly Agree/Agree/Disagree/Strongly disagree/Don’t know/Yes/No for twelve questions. CB showed Governors the result of online parent view. There were altogether 18 responses up to 03-11-2015. The responses appear positive to the school’s operation.</p> <p>CB welcomed Governors to join the oncoming parents’ evenings and requested parent governors to complete the survey of online afterwards.</p>	<p>Clerk April 16</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>Community Values</p> <p>MG circulated the report of the SMSC visit to Bowhill School (14th March 2016) and the revised Religious Education & Collective Worship Policy prior to the meeting.</p> <p>CB will share MG’s report with staff during an early May meeting. Further monitoring visit will be arranged aiming at either looking at progress around the areas for development or focusing on one area more closely and meeting with an appropriate person to find out how they are working to develop their area.</p>	
<p>6</p>	<p>Well-being – exploring how to look after everyone in our school community</p> <p>To review TISP (Targeted Intervention and Support Programme) Evaluation of Progress</p> <p>Following the third evaluation visit, Gill Winston, Debbie Buckingham and Rebecca Cosgrave sent the Evaluation of Progress this morning. The judgement about the Headteacher, Caren Brooks, in Overall progress is :</p> <p>“The leadership of the headteacher is not sufficiently strategic and is not strongly focused on continuous improvement.”</p> <p>All Governors disagreed with this evaluation about the Headteacher.</p> <p>KC confirmed: CB is good at listening and has kept staff on board. She is proficient at formulating and integrating ideas and keeping her team together. Furthermore, CB is capable of dealing with difficulties.</p> <p>Governors expressed the same concerns about the methods of assessment and evaluation. The advice which has been given changes according to advisor.</p> <p>SC analysed: We need to maintain morale and set up the appropriate structures to help staff deal with pressure. We should focus on long-term strategy to achieve the school's aims and objectives knowing:</p> <p>What do we want for our school? → What are we now? → What do we need to put in place?</p> <p>→ How are we getting on? How well have we done? → What still needs to be done?</p> <p>All Governors agreed that RO will be responsible for drafting an official Governors’ Response to the Evaluation of Progress to take a stand for the Headteacher.</p>	

	<p>Governors are determined to collect evidence to prove that the Headteacher has been doing a good job and the improvements that CB's leadership has achieved with her team cannot and must not be ignored.</p> <p>It was suggested by KC and agreed by Governors that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Governors will talk to teachers over this half term to get more feedback about the development of the school. ➤ Teacher and Governors could arrange some events together to improve communication and understanding. 	<p>RO/other Governors</p>
<p>7</p>	<p>Consider Staffing Structure</p> <p>Considering the long-term strategy for the school, Governors discussed what type of staffing structure was best to benefit the school and analysed the advantages and disadvantages of promoting internal teachers and employing new teachers into the management team.</p> <p>Governors agreed to take actions to relieve pressure from senior management, in particular, from the Headteacher, and to spread the load more evenly. The following actions will be taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Consider having two deputy headteachers or two assistant heads; Consult Iris Browning –Senior Administrator- about the feasibility of recruiting an additional deputy head on a fixed term contract or a seconded post; ➤ Amend KS2 leader role so that responsibility is for years 5 and 6 (upper key stage 2); ➤ Appoint a leader for the year 3 / 4 team (lower key stage 2). 	
<p>8</p>	<p>Consider Class Structure</p> <p>The Governing Body received a letter from Year 5 and 6 teams on 19th April 2016 about setting the class structure of Years 5 and 6. Year 5 and 6 teachers would like these two years to remain separate.</p> <p>The letter was circulated to Governors at the meeting.</p> <p>Governors appreciated the Year 5 and 6 teams' contribution to expressing opinions about the school's class structure. Governors considered and assessed all concerns that teachers raised in the letter and had a discussion about the pros and cons of separate and combined/mixed year 5 and 6 year groups.</p> <p>Governors cast a vote on separating or combining year 5 and 6 as from September 2016. There were 9 Governors attending the meeting apart from the Headteacher.</p> <p>Seven Governors were in favour of combining year 5 and 6 and two abstentions.</p> <p>Other decisions made by Governors were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ SC-Chair of the P&C committee will draft a letter responding to the Year 5 and 6 teams' concerns; ➤ Further intervention will be implemented to support Year 5 and 6 teachers with less experience; ➤ Middle and senior management will get feedback from teachers every half a term to ensure the interventions are providing more efficient and effective support; ➤ Governors will visit the classes to monitor development and provide continuous 	

	support;	
9	Dates & Time of next P&C Committee meetings 6.00 p.m. Tuesdays B&F 26 April P&C 7 June B&F 14 June 10.00 a.m. Mondays APMC 25 th April, 23 rd May, 4 th July	

All related policies and documents to the meeting were circulated prior to the meeting.

There being no further items to discuss the meeting closed at 7.20 p.m.

Attachments:

- 1. SEF 2.SMIP 3.Maternity Policy 4.Sex Education Policy 5.Religious Education Policy 6.Collective Worship Policy 7. Food and Nutrition Policy 8.DCC Equality policy and guidance 9.Supporting Students with Medical Conditions policy 10. Anti-radicalisation policy

Signed Dated.....