



**MINUTES OF THE LOCAL GOVERNING BODY MEETING  
AT MILTON PAROCHIAL PRIMARY SCHOOL  
PART OF PETERBOROUGH DIOCESE EDUCATION TRUST (PDET)  
WEDNESDAY MARCH 15<sup>th</sup>, 2017 AT 7.00 PM**

**Present:** Neil Goram (Vice Chair NG); Peter Heffron (PH); Pat Parker (**Chair** PP); Lisa Witheyman (LW); Steve Hollingshurst (**Headteacher** - HT); Sue McPherson (SM); Peter Jones (PJ);

**In Attendance:** Erica Wilson (Clerk to Governors); Nicola James (observer).

No	Subject	Action
1.	<p><b>Opening Prayer, welcome and apologies</b></p> <p>PH opened the meeting with a prayer.</p> <p>There were no apologies. Matt Oakley was absent.</p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, and introduced the proposed new Foundation Governor Nicola James (NJ). The Chair explained that the Diocese would not formally appoint NJ until she had undertaken the foundation governor training, so she had been invited to attend as an observer in the interim. It was clarified that NJ could not vote or make decisions but the governors invited her to contribute to the discussions.</p>	
2.	<p><b>Declarations of interest.</b> No interests were declared for any items on the agenda.</p>	
<b>FOR AGREEMENT</b>		
3.	<p><b>Public and confidential minutes of the previous meeting held on 25.01.17</b></p> <p>a. <b>Approval.</b> The public and confidential minutes of the meeting were <b>accepted</b> as a true and accurate record and signed by the Chair subject to the following amendment: <b>(10a) Academy policy review:</b> <i>it was PJ, not PH, who was undertaking this with NG.</i></p> <p>b. <b>Matters Arising</b> <b>(4) Pupil attendance.</b> <b>Action:</b> HT to make available the percentage breakdown of authorised and unauthorised attendance data. <b>(10c) Website.</b> <b>Action:</b> HT to remind MO about his action to check website compliance.</p>	<p>HT HT/MO</p>
4.	<p><b>Headteacher's Report to include a safeguarding update – questions and discussion from governors</b></p> <p>The report had been uploaded to the LP+ for governors to read. Additional comments and governor questions: <b>Pupil roll:</b> the HT clarified the pupil numbers in each year group (14 pupils in Years 3 and 6). <b>Staffing.</b> The HT explained the hours i.e. 0.2 was 1 day, 0.4 was 2 days etc.</p>	

No	Subject	Action
(6)	<p><b>SALT</b> 'Speech and Language Therapist'. The HT said the SALT was very knowledgeable and had shared information with staff earlier that day. He acknowledged the importance of schools sharing skills within and outside of PDET. The HT went through the staffing as in the report.</p> <p><b>Attendance.</b> Governors reviewed the attendance figures. Attendance in Brixworth was a concern and the HT advised that this was being monitored very closely. He said the children missing school to go on holiday were at the upper end of the school, and their parents had not submitted a request, they just informed the school. The HT put this down to the fact that the threat of legal action had diminished due to recent cases in the media. He said there were occasionally exceptional circumstances which he could authorise, but it was usually unauthorised. It was also noted that the parents of children higher up in the school knew the old system where they could request holiday, so were more likely to take it.</p> <p><b>Q. When pupils take time off for holidays, is the impact obvious?</b> The HT said it was, not only in their work, but also in their attitude to learning. He said this could be disruptive and the impact was very noticeable.</p> <p>The HT advised that all parents had received a mid-year attendance report and it would be on the end of year report. Attendance in Sywell had improved. Governors were assured that all attendance was monitored carefully, and any concerns were treated as individual cases.</p> <p><b>Accidents.</b> 72 incidents had been reported, of which 11 were included in the weekly report to Plumsun. The HT explained that he signed incidents off and highlighted which needed to be reported. <b>Q. The HT was asked how this was recorded.</b> He explained that it was recorded on hard copy forms in school and was input on to Plumsun if highlighted. He explained the system further including the follow up process.</p> <p><b>Safeguarding.</b> Concerns had increased from 4-5, but there was nothing of significant concern.</p> <p><b>Buildings.</b> This had taken lower priority as the school had just moved on to a new budget system. The HT noted the advantages in terms of decreased paperwork and direct payments from parents. Nearly all payments were electronic with no money coming into school, and the HT noted that the office staff had done a great job. The audit trail benefits of an electronic system were also noted.</p> <p><b>RAISEonline (ROL) training.</b> The HT reported that this training had been excellent and had really explained the information in the ROL report. <b>Action: HT to tweak the presentation for governors. Dates for governor training to be arranged.</b></p> <p><b>Q What is the inspection dashboard?</b> The HT said it was essentially a detailed summary of ROL.</p> <p><b>Q Do we have to be aware of ROL data before Ofsted?</b> The HT said all governors needed to know the data headlines but the curriculum committee needed to know the data in detail. The high level of challenge on the data in the curriculum minutes was referred to.</p> <p><b>Training.</b> The HT had attended the finance training which he said had been very useful, although he said it would have been helpful to have had this earlier. The planning tool software was being retained and PDET had said schools could re-forecast for this financial year, then PDET would update the software and ask schools to do a new 5-year plan. The HT said they had already gone ahead with this forecasting as they needed to be able to make staffing decisions, and knew the budget would be reduced by about 7.5%.</p> <p><b>Notable events.</b> As in the report, plus Year 2 and 6 moderation meetings on the 22.02.17.</p> <p><b>Agenda item 6, SEF/SIP update</b> was taken at this point.</p> <p>The HT advised that the SEF had gone back to the format used 18 months previously. He reported that he had spoken to the external advisor about how other schools do this and it was suggested it was kept as it is, with an appendix added as things changed. The SEF had been scrutinised by the curriculum committee and was quite static throughout the year. Comments:</p>	HT

No	Subject	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contextual information: changed due to two pupils without any English joining the school.</li> <li>• The HT went through the summary analysis of data. Green was on track and pink was accelerated progress.</li> <li>• ROL was the attainment made at the end of Year 2 and Year 6. Disadvantaged children were compared with the national PPF figures and Milton's data came out as exemplary.</li> <li>• Content was not always taught in a linear way.</li> <li>• There was a line of context over each table ie summer born, mobility, PPF etc.</li> <li>• The HT noted that Year 5 data had given a boost to both staff and pupils.</li> <li>• The pink demonstrated the impact on data of the increased staffing.</li> <li>• These were end of year projections; the school was on track now. With PDET, targets had been set for the whole school, not just years 2 and 6 and the impact of interventions would be questioned.</li> <li>• Governors needed to know issues flagged from ROL, what the issues were and what interventions were being put in place to address these.</li> <li>• Year 5 data had improved.</li> <li>• The school had met floor targets last year, so needed to do its best to ensure this was repeated this year.</li> </ul> <p><b>Q Lower down the school the percentages are better – why is this?</b> The HT said this was because lower down the school pupils only knew this curriculum, whereas older pupils has been subject to two sets of changes. Historic staff absence issues may also be a factor. Hence the need to prioritise upper end of the school, which the HT said many schools were doing.</p> <p><b>Year 1</b> Through Target Tracker, the school was working how to join up the Early Years (EY) data. As they did not have the full 6 terms in Year 1, they could not make the same amount of progress. If pupils had not achieved the EY goals they had room to make more progress, as all children started at the same point in Year 1. The HT said there was no concern about the Year 1 data as these were end of year targets. LW added that for the first term children were adapting to a whole new system so progress in the first term could be slower.</p> <p><b>Year 3</b> Maths: PPF children were amber so this was a focus. This group did not do as well as national the previous year.</p> <p>The HT said the school needed to be able to put the data into context and show what it was doing to address any issues. He explained that every time this data was done the point score was placed in a new column in Excel so they could see projections and where to put in interventions etc.</p> <p><b>Main focus</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PPF children in Year 3.</li> <li>• Children who were exceeding and working at greater depth.</li> </ul> <p>The HT said the bar would move up over the next few years so they would need to be aware of this.</p> <p><b>Q Do you record the other subjects that are taught?</b> The HT said they did, but not in so much detail. Some subjects were taught in modules so they were looking at how they could use Target Tracker to record this. The HT advised that the curriculum information for each class was on the website, and clarified that the report to parents included all subjects taught.</p> <p><b>SIP Year 1 – Key areas of improvement.</b></p> <p>HT noted that more actions had taken place and would be added when it was next reviewed. This was monitored by the committees and the HT said it was much where he would expect it to be for the time of the year.</p>	



No	Subject	Action
8.	<p><b>Governing Board matters</b></p> <p>a. <b>Clerk's items.</b> Nothing new to report from the clerk.</p> <p>b. <b>Training.</b> The Chair had attended training on 'Governor Monitoring'. She said all monitoring visits must be linked to the SEF and SIP. The HT said that for visits, governors must agree focus and questions needed to directly relate to school improvement. Governors could judge progress but not teaching. Governors should also do a book scrutiny The Chair was booked on to 'Being an Effective Governing Board' 30<sup>th</sup> March.</p> <p>c. <b>Key questions from PDET.</b> The Chair explained that PDET had sent her a new list of key questions for governors to answer. It was noted that was a PDET rather than an Ofsted document. The Chair suggested governors meet to go through this. <b>Action: HT to send a google date for this.</b></p>	HT
9.	<p><b>Any Other Business.</b></p> <p>a. <b>Parent Survey.</b> The HT tabled the summary and apologised that had not had a chance to circulate this earlier. There had been a slightly lower response rate as they had not been handed out personally. It was noted that it was predominantly positive feedback, although there was some negative feedback for questions 9 and 10. <b>Action: Chair to talk to the parent in question to follow up any issues and LW to try and see if the 'disagrees' were the same respondent.</b></p> <p>b. <b>Governor vacancies.</b> SM and PH were both waiting to hear from PDET about their reappointment. PJ clarified that he would not continue as a governor after end of the current school year. Co-opted vacancy: NG spoke about a potential candidate with the necessary HR management skills who had met with the HT. Governors agreed that the <b>HT could organise paperwork for their co-option with PDET. Action.</b></p> <p>c. <b>Parent Governor election.</b> The HT reported that there had been 3 nominees and parents had elected Gary Skilton as the new parent governor. <b>Action: HT to send GS details to the clerk.</b></p> <p>d. <b>Finance Meetings.</b> NG noted the meeting dates may need to change in line with finance deadlines.</p>	PP/LW  HT  HT
10.	<b>Items identified for the next agenda.</b> Any c/f items identified.	
11.	<b>Date of the next meeting:</b> Wednesday 17 <sup>th</sup> May 2017.	

The Chair thanked all Governors for attending. The meeting closed at 9.20 pm.

Minutes were approved at the Governing Board Meeting held on 17.05.17 and signed by the Chair