



# New Hinksey CE Primary School

Vicarage Road Oxford OX1 4RQ

Tel: 01865 242169 Fax: 01865 242169

Email: [office.3213@new-hinksey.oxon.sch.uk](mailto:office.3213@new-hinksey.oxon.sch.uk)

Website: [www.new-hinksey.oxon.sch.uk](http://www.new-hinksey.oxon.sch.uk)

Headteacher: Mrs Charlotte Haynes

## Minutes of the meeting of the Full Governing Body held at the school on Thursday 13<sup>th</sup> July 2017, 6pm

<b>Present:</b>	Harm-Jan Fricke (HJF)	LA Governor, Chair of Governors
	Tracey Haslam (TH)	Co-opted Governor
	Charlotte Haynes (CH)	Headteacher
	Christine Hill (CHi)	Co-opted Governor
	Miriam Jackson (M)	Foundation Governor
	Jean Kirkley (JK)	Foundation Governor
	Harmonie Limb (HL)	Parent Governor
	Ollie Raikes (OR)	Parent Governor (departed 7.05 pm)
	Olivia Selinger (OS)	Parent Governor
	Jasper Smith (JS)	Parent Governor (arrived 6.22pm)
	Louise Sumser (LS)	Staff Governor
	Catherine Unia (CU)	Co-opted Governor
	Fr James Wilkinson (JW)	Foundation Governor (arrived 6.24pm)
	James Webber (JWe)	Parent Governor

**In attendance:** Leila Brown (Clerk)

	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
1.	<b>Welcome and apologies/confirmation of quorum</b> HJF welcomed everyone to the meeting. <b>Apologies</b> were received and accepted from Bob Price (BP). The meeting was quorate.	
2.	<b>Notification of any urgent business not on the agenda</b> HJF had circulated 2 letters he had received from parents – would be covered under Item 12.	
3.	<b>Declarations of interest</b> None.	
4.	<b>Approval of the minutes of the meeting of Friday 28<sup>th</sup> April 2017</b> Correction to the spelling of JK's name in Item 1. The minutes were duly annotated, signed by HJF and passed to CH for filing within the school.	
5.	<b>Matters arising from the minutes not covered elsewhere on the agenda</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Item 4: BP to sign minutes</b> – unsure whether this was done. Needed following-up.</li> <li>• <b>5a)</b> OS to follow up governor photos.</li> <li>• <b>5b)</b> HJF to follow up whereabouts of confidential January FGB minutes.</li> <li>• <b>5c)</b> HJF not yet created wishlist.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>8) Parent communication of new class arrangements – see item 12 below.</b></li> </ul>	
6.	<p><b>School finance: update and approval of revised budget</b></p> <p>HJF circulated a paper to the FGB entitled <i>Revenue Financial Forecast</i>. The previously agreed budget had not been accepted by the Local Authority (LA). The Resources Committee had met again today. The Local Authority finance officer and met with TH. TH had been through the budget line by line and made changes that could be seen on the handout. The revised budget needed to be submitted to the LA. TH highlighted the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More Pupil Premium (PP) children were in the school than expected, but not enough allowance had been made for building repairs and consumables, so the LA considered the reduced costings were not realistic.</li> <li>• Based on anticipated pupil numbers the carry forward over the 3 year period covered by the budget was slightly larger than in the rejected budget.</li> </ul> <p>CH noted that in-year spend consistently being higher than in-year income was unsustainable. TH said the LA officer's notes of caution should not stop the budget being validated this time.</p> <p>Governors <b>AGREED</b> to accept the revised budget and submit it to the LA.</p>	
7.	<p><b>Headteacher's report</b></p> <p>CH circulated a handout entitled <i>Assessment Information 2017</i>. She noted that the data was currently unvalidated. KS2 headlines included above national SPAG results in pupils working at Expected Standard, an improvement on last year. Reading and Writing results had also improved from last year, but not in Maths. Though still awaiting national data for those working at Greater Depth, CH anticipated the school's results should be comfortably above in Reading and Writing.</p> <p>LS noted that the change in the threshold this year meant 4 or 5 children had just missed out on reaching Expected Standard – sometimes by 1 mark. Within a small cohort (18 children) 39% were SEND, 3 of them with EHCPs. This was a high percentage.</p> <p><i>Governors asked if the school was concerned with Maths results being lower than national average and lower than the previous year.</i> LS noted that in a cohort of 18 one child's results represented a lot as a percentage figure.</p> <p>(JS arrived at 6.22pm.)</p> <p>EHCP children were entitled to more time in the tests. The school could apply for additional time for other children where required. LS cited the example of a child who was dyslexic and noted that in this instance the extra time had served to distress the child rather than support them. CH said that in general the school had supported all children well through the SATs process maintaining a broad, balanced curriculum.</p> <p>(JW arrived at 6.24pm.)</p>	

LS also noted that one child had not come in on one day of the SATs due to illness. This too had affected results. The school did not start “teaching to the test” months ahead of SATs as other schools did. They preferred to keep a breadth of activities as this was in the best interests of Year 6 pupils.

CH noted that thorough moderation of the Year 2 SATs had taken place. Because of this she was confident that the data in the report was right. National data was still to be seen by the school, but looking at last year’s CH thought the school should be above average in Writing and Maths. Again the cohort was small with 18 children.

*Governors asked about the Year 2 difference in achievement between boys and girls.* CH said she was not sure whether this was separate from EAL, as there were more EAL boys than girls. Pleasing progress from Foundation had been made by some children. Several had moved from Emerging to Expected, and from Expected to Greater Depth.

Year 1 Phonics results were inline if not slightly above national results (looking at last year’s national data). 1 PP child had not been in school, absent for nearly 2 weeks. The child had been tested since their return and these results had been kept as evidence. It was important to have a narrative for Ofsted for children like this.

CH drew governors’ attention to the Year 2 Cumulative Phonics Screen results on page 3 of the handout: these were 100% for the first time in the school. Governors were pleased to note this.

EYFS GLD (Good Level of Development): a child had to meet 12 different areas in order to reach GLD. 78% of the cohort had reached GLD – again, this was likely to be above the national average.

Raiseonline was being replaced by ASP (Analyse School Performance). CH had done some tracking calculations of the progress of Year 1-6 SEND children. These were included at the bottom of page 3 of the handout.

*Governors asked if there was any pattern to SEND children who had not met Expected Standard such as prolonged absence.* LS said absence was certainly an issue for some groups of children, for example 3 GRT (Gypsy, Roma, Traveller) children.

CH encouraged all governors to continue to look at the data contained within her report outside of the meeting and ask further questions if desired.

*Governors asked how the current Year 5 cohort was looking for next year’s SATs.* LS said historically GRT children did not reach Expected Standard. Five were currently on roll in this class, although absence was an issue for some. There were also plenty within the cohort doing very well too, particularly in maths assessments at the end of the year. CH said next year’s results were likely to be similar to this year’s: lowish in levels overall, but good Greater Depth. She noted

	<p>that one SEN child in that class was achieving very well.</p> <p><i>Governors asked what happened if the school had a pattern of below national average SATs results.</i> CH said this flagged up LA support through the allocation of a Systems Leader. CH did not anticipate the school being a coasting school. LS noted the high turnover of children within the school meant it was relatively hard to track progress of an entire cohort from EYFS to Year 6. In LS's current Year 6 class only 8 children had been on roll in the school since EYFS.</p> <p>HJF noted that the Performance and Standards Committee would be looking over the data contained within the HT's report again once ASP was released.</p>	
8.	<p><b>Governance, including academisation investigations</b></p> <p>A working group consisting of BP, OS, CHi and HJF had met to discuss the pros and cons of being part of a MAT (Multi-Academy Trust). Their findings had been circulated in advance to governors in a report written by HJF entitled <i>New Hinksey School: Exploring Academisation</i>. HJF said governors needed to discuss what should happen next, specifically the risks if the school decided not to go for academy status, and the risks if they did. Also if governors wanted to have an informal meeting with staff or to meet with parents at the start of the new academic year and involve them in discussions at this stage.</p> <p>MJ asked if there was any further information regarding the possibility that the LA might be interested in developing some form of LA MAT. HJF referred governors to the consultation on this issue currently taking place by the LA. He would complete the questionnaire, circulate his response to the working group and FGB before submitting it.</p> <p>CHi had attended an Oxfordshire Governors' meeting at which Lucy Butler (LB) (Director of Children's Services for OCC) had spoken, reiterating the LA's commitment to working with schools that were not academies. CH said she felt LB was good at listening to the concerns of schools that were not academies. This included 70% of primary schools and the LA recognised they needed to change their strategy. CH noted though, that there was no extra money available from the LA to support these schools.</p> <p>HJF drew governors' attention to the meeting taking place at the school tomorrow at 11.30am with the ODBE (Oxford Diocesan Board of Education) Adviser, Karen Metcalfe, to explore the issues around academisation. The ODBE's MAT (the ODST) was currently oversubscribed, telling interested schools to get in touch in 2019. HJF would explore which other MAT might be interested in having the school, and vice versa.</p> <p>HL commented that having read the SWOTs contained in HJF's report, was it the right time to talk to parents? What form would this take? A consultation or sharing thoughts? HJF said at this stage governors would not be recommending a course of action to parents and any meeting with them would be informal. CH noted that the process of formal consultation with parents was slightly peculiar in that it took place after a FGB had decided to convert to academy status, not before.</p>	

	<p>Governors discussed some of the pros and cons surrounding potential academisation, including the requirement to become an academy should the school fall into a particular Ofsted rating after an inspection. Ofsted had last been in the school in 2015 and would not return for at least 3 years from that date. Governors agreed the time was not right to talk to parents. The working group had been convened as the FGB had deemed it prudent to look at the issues.</p> <p>Governors agreed that HJF and the working group would talk to staff informally about their research to date and gauge opinion, and that a meeting with parents would be considered by governors at a later date.</p>	HJF & working group
9.	<p><b>Policies to be ratified</b> None.</p>	
10.	<p><b>Health and Safety Report</b> CH had no incidents to report. Lots of trips and taking children out had occurred during the term. Teachers were rigorous about doing appropriate risk-assessments.</p>	
11.	<p><b>Committee reports</b> <b>a) Resources Committee</b> HJF had 3 action points to report from the meeting: 1. BP would contact 'knowledgeable persons' to explore opportunities for fundraising from trusts and charities for specific areas of the school's work (both curricular and extra-curricular) 2. OS would also use her contacts to obtain information about fundraising approaches used by another school 3. Resources Committee members would also explore with parents with young children what they expected and wanted from a nursery and primary school. This to be done through one-to-one contacts with parents currently using for instance Lake Street and Donnington Doorstep. That information could then be used in a New Hinksey school leaflet to be delivered to all houses in the area in the early part of the new school year</p> <p>Discussion of this points led to questions about the marketing of the school to prospective parents? HL had met with parents who were concerned about the move to mixed year classes in the school thinking it might deter prospective parents. The lack of before-school provision was also a possible deterrent. People did not necessarily know the school existed due to its secluded physical location. HL agreed to cost breakfast club provision, look at other school models and talk to Lake Street Playgroup about a possible joint venture. OS made the point that it was important to canvas prospective parents about breakfast club provision – existing parents had already made their decision.</p> <p>The new school website would be online at the start of September. CH was to be trained in updating and maintaining the content. Governors suggested additional people also be trained. CH would try to ensure that website content did not require constant updates, but school news and activities and the school calendar would be updated as necessary.</p> <p><b>b) Performance &amp; Standards Committee</b></p>	<p>BP</p> <p>OS Resources Comm members</p> <p>HL</p>

	<p>The committee had met twice since the last FGB meeting, in May and in June. Minutes of both these meetings had been circulated in advance to all governors. JK had done a maths learning walk. She would write up a report and circulate to governors. JS noted the value of governors undertaking learning walks. A high level of governors visited the school in this way and this had been noted as a positive by Ofsted. CHi said at the meeting with LB she had spoken of the increased emphasis on the importance of governance within schools.</p>	
12.	<p><b>Any other urgent business</b></p> <p>HJF had received 2 letters from parents voicing their concerns about the potential impact that the new mixed year classes at the school could have on SEND children. He had responded to the first letter but had not yet replied to the second. He had circulated both letters plus his response to all governors ahead of the meeting.</p> <p>HJF summarized the main issue that parents were concerned about and governors discussed at length the concerns raised by parents in the two letters. LS said many non-SEND children had barriers to learning, including asylum seekers, struggling families, PP children etc. The language of children “moving up” or “moving down” into mixed classes was not helpful. Data showed that SEND children at the school were doing well. It was not right to imply some classrooms provided an optimum education setting for some SEND children and others did not.</p> <p>Governors tried to frame their discussion around specific hypothetical examples where parents’ concerns might be justified. They discussed if the issue was more a communication one between school and parents, the range of pupil profiles in the school and how it would be wrong to prioritise those who were more articulate at presenting a case.</p> <p>Governors agreed they had been asked by parents to look at the issues in question and were confident they had done so. LS had made a strong case in pointing out the many barriers to learning that different children had. PP children made less progress at the school than SEND children. HJF would draft a reply to the second letter and share it with the Parent Governors before sending it to the parents in question. HJF was also happy to meet with these parents if they wanted a meeting.</p>	HJF
13.	<p><b>Date(s) of next meetings</b></p> <p>Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> September 6.30pm</p> <p>HJF noted it was JS’s last meeting. He invited JS to attend the FGB meeting in September.</p>	

The meeting ended at 7.46pm

**Actions**

Action 1	HJF and academisation working group to meet informally with staff.	HJF, BP, OS, CHi
Action 2	Resources Committee members to explore fundraising approaches	BP, OS
Action 3	Resources Committee to informally explore what parents want	Resources

	from a nursery / primary school	Comm members
Action 4	HL to investigate and cost potential breakfast club options.	HL
Action 5	HJF to draft second letter to parents and share with Parent Governors.	HJF