



Gusford Primary School

The *Active Learning* Trust

"Promoting Achievement and Success"

**Meeting of Full Governing Body
held on 16th May 2016, 5.30pm**

Present:	Ms Marilyn Toft (Chair)	MT
	Mrs Patricia Dobson	PD
	Mr Roland Fothergill	RF
	Miss Trudy Stannard	TS
	Mrs Janet Shanks	JS
	Mr Colin Tapscott	CT
	Mrs Sally Wright	SW
Apologies:	Mr Daniel Bloomfield	DB
	Ms Donna Phillips	DP
In Attendance:	Mrs Toni Cornish (Clerk)	TC

No.	Item	Explanation	Who	Time
1.	Apologies:	Given and noted above. TC advised that a parent had written a letter to CT expressing interest in becoming a member of the Gusford Governing Body. The Governing Body is full at present and it was therefore agreed PD would contact the applicant to invite her to a future meeting, ensuring they were not present during any confidential discussions. This will provide the applicant with insight into the functions of the Governing Body should a vacancy arise in the future. TC provided PD with a paper copy of the applicant's letter.		
	<u>Actions Agreed</u>			
	▪ PD to contact parent and invite to a future meeting.		PD	
2.	Confirmation of previous minutes			
		The minutes of the previous meeting held on 21 st March 2016 were agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting. The following updates were noted:		
	Matters Arising from 21st March 2016			
		The below matters arising updates were noted. Membership – TC circulated an updated membership list with the minutes of the meeting held on 21 st March 2016. Backup Servers – Carry forward to next meeting. When is late, late – CT confirmed there had been no progress at this stage to agreeing any changes to the policy. MT explained she has been working with other primary schools on leaflets that outline responsibilities. MT agreed to email CT to explore whether this can be adapted for Gusford. Report to Governors on DT – Postponed to a future date due to LH's workload.		

	<p>Register of Prevent Training – Staff and Governors, with the exception of DB, have completed the training. Governors acknowledged the excellent training delivered by CT. Training is transferrable, within the three year timeframe. The Governors role is strategic however, it was noted it is good practice for them to receive training to provide them with an oversight. DB will be invited to the next scheduled training session.</p> <p>Uploading Minutes to Website – Carry forward to next meeting.</p> <p>Admission Appeal Members – TC has forwarded names to Karen Jarvis.</p> <p>Risk Register – To be discussed at the next meeting.</p> <p>School Visits – RF to provide ICT/Maths/Pupil Premium reports for the next meeting.</p> <p>Safeguarding visit to review Single Central Record – Carry forward to next meeting.</p> <p>Policies – Behaviour Management Policy to be discussed at next meeting. TC has updated the Policy Review Schedule with those policies approved.</p> <p>Governors Critical Friends – See item 13 below.</p> <p>Sweeping Stones/Quote for Grid - GF confirmed he had carried out an external H&S inspection that had been discussed with RM. It was noted the stones are a hazard however, by introducing a kerb to retain the stones could also cause a trip hazard. A suggested option could be to close the gate. RM agreed to explore further.</p>		
	<p><u>Items to be carried forward for future discussion/action</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Backup Servers - RM to provide update on quotes. ▪ Prevent Training – CT to invite DB to next session. ▪ When is late late? – MT to share leaflet from other primary schools with CT outlining responsibilities to explore whether this can be adapted for Gusford. ▪ Report on DT – CT to invite Louise Hughes to a future meeting. ▪ Uploading Minutes to Website – CT/TC to discuss. ▪ Risk Register – Discuss at the next meeting under heading Trust Business. ▪ School Visits – RF to provide ICT/Maths/Pupil Premium reports at next meeting. ▪ Safeguarding visit to review Single Central Record – Discuss at next meeting. ▪ Behaviour Management Policy – Discuss at next meeting. 	<p>RM CT MT CT CT/TC All RF DP All</p>	<p>04/07 Aut 16 04/07 Aut 16 Aut 16 04/07 04/07 04/07 04/07</p>
3.	<p>Pecuniary and other interests</p> <p>JS declared a non-pecuniary interest under item 5, Headteacher’s report and the section regarding behaviour, due to her role at Gusford. No further interests were declared.</p>		
4.	<p>Chair’s Actions</p> <p>There were no actions to note.</p>		
5.	<p>Headteacher’s Report [Standing Item]</p> <p>MT explained that following the hub meeting on 13th April, which focussed on questioning, ALT are piloting an approach to focus on one aspect of HT’s report. Behaviour felt the right area of focus for this meeting. CT circulated his report ahead of the meeting and Governors submitted questions in advance. The questions were put together in sequence for CT’s response.</p> <p>CT produced a detailed review of behaviour that accompanied his report (Appendix 1). CT reported there are 634 children on role; the number causing significant issues was under 20 and therefore a small proportion. This behaviour impacts on the FET team and has a significant impact on staff time.</p> <p>SW questioned whether CT gets drawn into behaviour issues CT confirmed he does and explained the system and levels of staff available for on call (1st, 2nd and 3rd call out)</p>		

	<p>CT being third. JS explained how they try to judge the levels of call out however, sometimes an incident will require a greater presence such as the Headteacher and also a change of person can help to re-focus and at times de-escalate a situation, particularly during restraint.</p>																																															
	<p>The questions submitted prior to the meeting were reported by CT as “the best set of questions ever sent”. The questions and CT’s responses are below.</p>																																															
	<p>Governor questions</p> <p>Questions re behaviour section of Head’s report for FGB meeting on 16 May 2016</p> <p>What statistical evidence is there of an improvement or a decline in the number of incidents of poor behaviour during the past three years? And what factors have contributed to any pattern in behaviours? Boys and pupil premium children appear to be disproportionately represented and increasing – how is the school responding and are strategies working? The number of inappropriate physical incidents of aggression is high – what form does this take and are staff responses working?</p> <p>Statistical evidence on behaviour has only been processed since September. The factors contributing to the rise in this are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition of new children from other schools whose behaviour has been poor • Introduction of the family homeless shelter has added some children with high need <p>The number of boys in years 4 and 5 presenting with challenging behaviours joining the school from outside has increased. The intense grouping of these boys has impacted on other children in the classes, whose behaviour, in some cases, has also deteriorated.</p> <p>Actions have included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPSF meetings, behaviour support plans, behaviour risk assessments, part time timetables, PRU placements, BSS referrals, external facilities (Brockford Barns), Lead Now programme - evidence of improvement can be seen from the use of some of these strategies – success variable. • Report Card - mixed success – some within 2 weeks, whilst others not improved even after 6-8 weeks. <p>What is the school’s trend over the last 3 years in relation to exclusion – fixed and permanent? Are we confident that exclusion is used only as a last resort?</p> <p>Exclusions are made by the headteacher and are most definitely the last resort. These are often as a result of extreme behaviours, e.g. throwing furniture, consistent disruption and not responding to other internal methods e.g. isolation, complete disregard for school rules and respect for staff and children. Exclusions are reported to governors in every report. They are as follows</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="193 1473 1214 1653"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">2013/14</th> <th colspan="3">2014/15</th> <th colspan="3">2015/16</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Aut</th> <th>Spr</th> <th>Sum</th> <th>Aut</th> <th>Spr</th> <th>Sum</th> <th>Aut</th> <th>Spr</th> <th>Sum</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>13</td> <td>14</td> <td>14</td> <td>14</td> <td>15</td> <td>15</td> <td>15</td> <td>16</td> <td>16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2.5</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>12.5</td> <td>5.5</td> <td>4.5</td> <td>9.5</td> <td>12</td> <td>11.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">4 days</td> <td colspan="3">22.5 days</td> <td colspan="3">33 days</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Some of these are highly troubled children and we are trying alternatives wherever possible. For example last Friday we met to discuss 3 high need pupils who had been excluded for 2.5 days each and are at extremely high risk of permanent exclusion. We reviewed the next steps and are adjusting a risk assessment to lower the incidents.</p> <p>How has the behaviour review considered the opportunity for pupils to identify and recognise their own behaviours? How are pupils taught to develop the skills to manage their own behaviours and to take responsibility for their own behaviour and attitudes?</p> <p>When a child is sent to detention they complete a behaviour journal. This allows them to record their thinking around why they made the poor choices and what they should have done instead. Children are taught in PSHE about behaviour</p>	2013/14			2014/15			2015/16			Aut	Spr	Sum	Aut	Spr	Sum	Aut	Spr	Sum	13	14	14	14	15	15	15	16	16	1	2.5	0.5	12.5	5.5	4.5	9.5	12	11.5	4 days			22.5 days			33 days				
2013/14			2014/15			2015/16																																										
Aut	Spr	Sum	Aut	Spr	Sum	Aut	Spr	Sum																																								
13	14	14	14	15	15	15	16	16																																								
1	2.5	0.5	12.5	5.5	4.5	9.5	12	11.5																																								
4 days			22.5 days			33 days																																										

<p>choices. This needs to be developed further which is why we introducing 'Lead Now'. The high need pupils that have resulted in the rise in behaviour issues and exclusions have poor skills in managing their behaviour as they lack the Early Years social and emotional learning goals, even at an older age. Therefore many of these (20) are involved in Passport where the focus is on teaching the EYs learning goals to develop skills to manage their own behaviours and take responsibility.</p>		
<p>How confident are you that staff model the behaviours you expect from pupils? How do you track this and provide feedback to staff?</p>		
<p>Learning walks and drop-ins and quality of provision reviews in class show good use of the behaviour policy and modeling high expectations. Feedback to staff is given individually. Where we see differentiation weaker so that children mis-behave we highlight this with staff and then monitor it improves. Staff of high need pupils have used consistently the agreed process with children showing challenging behaviours.</p>		
<p>In what forms does praise take place and how are these sufficiently flexible to meet pupils varied needs, expectations and motivations?</p>		
<p>Praise comes in stickers, star of the week, gold area in the pilot, lottery tickets for behaviour, knights of Gusford. Where children have high needs these are adapted and where a behaviour plan is needed it is integrated.</p>		
<p>An important part of developing positive behaviour for learning is through good teaching that promotes active pupil engagement – in this context, can you clarify the use and impact of ‘challenge-o-meters’?</p>		
<p>Teaching is monitored in learning walks, drop-ins and quality of provision. Teaching is seen as good and the books show impact, with learning improving. Green pen work shows that learning tasks are implemented. CT welcomed Governors to “spend a day” to develop their understanding.</p>		
<p>How are the primary edge learning behaviours integrated into teaching? How are you measuring impact?</p>		
<p>I have seen teachers using the learning behaviour focus in a lesson. e.g. a maths lesson where the resilience skills were integrated. We are not formally measuring impact at this time beyond the measures in the system of recording when we see them evident (Y3 in their booklet; Y1&2 in their charts).</p>		
<p>Personal experience has suggested at times that a teacher may make a threat to the whole class e.g. <i>If this behaviour continues you will all miss your break tomorrow.</i> In order to balance reward with discipline how do you ensure in this scenario that those children exhibiting good behaviour are not adversely impacted or demotivated by such a statement? And is this approach sufficient to encourage the class as a whole to support one another to improve behaviours?</p>		
<p>This method is not part of our behaviour policy. If children behave poorly then others should not be affected by a consequence. However there are rare occasions when many children behave poorly, particularly if a supply teacher is used. Sometimes then it is very difficult for a teacher to differentiate who the few are who have not behaved well. I spoke to staff after there was an issue of this nature before and to my knowledge typically we do not have this. If we do then please let me know so I can follow this up with the teacher.</p>		
<p>Page 8 - Gusford Trial Traffic Light System. This looks really good! Do pupils in "Passport" follow the same system in order to ensure a smooth return to class? If they are using Alderwood's 5 step system, how do they then cope once back in class where different systems may be in place? Is there an effective and gradual re-integration process?</p>		
<p>JS confirmed the school is not doing the traffic light system currently and instead is using a 5-step system which she used at a previous school that focuses on targets. Children have a change of target every fortnight that is referred to during each session. There are more behavioural and emotional targets as opposed to academic to reduce barriers to learning. Reintegration a key focus.</p>		
<p>The trial of the traffic light system appears to meet the aims of the review. How do teachers ensure that it does not become labour intensive to move pupils between</p>		

<p>the four areas (GGAR) throughout lessons and prevent disruption to learning?</p>		
<p>The reason for the trial is to make it workable. Feedback from staff is that the chart on the wall with velcro is workable. This was the feedback in a recent SLT meeting from those working on the project.</p>		
<p>"Lead Now' is clearly a very effective programme that is having a positive impact on pupil behaviour. By September 2016 how many staff do you expect to be fully trained and therefore able to implement it? Will these staff be deployed within a specific class from September and then withdrawn as a need arises in another class when, for instance, a new pupil joins the school?</p>		
<p>It is early days with the Lead Now pre-pilot. The impact data is positive and the material is very good. Some high need behaviour children still struggle to engage and share the time of the person leading it (me). The plan for training is Year 5 teachers; FET team; other teachers who have an interest. So far we have 6 teachers to be trained; 4 FET members; 3 TAs.</p>		
<p>NOR has risen by 28 pupils. It may be that the increase in pupil number is simply the result of families moving into the catchment area. But is there a proportion of these new pupils who were the result of a managed move from other schools and, if so, what steps were taken to induct them into their new classes with the least amount of upset to themselves or the other pupils in that class? Have they contributed to the general behaviour issues outlined?</p>		
<p>There have been no managed moves in the last year. Where children have come from other local schools it is because parents have moved them out and moved them here. We are therefore within a timescale to have them start (for no address move children this is by the next half term). Because some children were arriving with issues we now have a pre-start meeting with the parent and child to go through questions to place them well. Where there are issues we delay things until we can get support in place.</p> <p>Where a child has come from a PRU (from another school) we work with them on induction. 14/15 - 3 high need children; 15/16 - 1 high need child</p> <p>Children with significant issues who have joined are Started in 2013 4 Started in 2014 7 Started in 2015 1</p> <p>Added to this are issues where children have developed more issues as they have grown older or hit family difficulties Foetal alcohol and already with us 3 Moved into KS2 and issues 1 Had issues in KS1 & continued 6</p>		
<p>Page 9 - 6th bullet point. You mention that by Spring 2016 you intend to expand the FET team for behaviour support. Is it not the case that the FET team has been under huge pressure due to absence of its leader and therefore the team is now reduced? If the intention is to expand the team, how will this be achieved, given the strain put on existing resources both human and financial (increase in minimum wage resulting in additional resources needed for support staff across the school)?</p>		
<p>In January we added a behaviour support TA and a 0.4 Behaviour FET. Mrs Cridge was off poorly from late February. Without these additions we would have gone under in managing the high need children. We cannot afford to employ any more, although the need with current children is high.</p>		
<p>You mention that there is a low occurrence of discriminatory behaviour and yet racial incidents are slightly increasing – should we be concerned about this?</p>		
<p>Work is out per pupil and per day as a percentage and it is very low. It is a slight increase but numbers are still low. We will raise this with staff to follow up in</p>		

general input and then monitor it.

2013/14			2014/15			2015/16		
Aut 13	Spr 14	Sum 14	Aut 14	Spr 15	Sum 15	Aut 15	Spr 16	Sum 16
2	1	0	2	2	4	2	12	4
3			10			18		
			610 NOR			634 NOR		
There are 180 days. Therefore the per child per day ratio is								
2013/14			2014/15			2015/16		
			0.0000107			0.000158		
We can examine making this a higher priority e.g. bringing in someone to raise the profile e.g. 'kick it out' style. However in terms of priority - inappropriate verbal is 5 times higher and inappropriate physical behaviour is 13 times higher.								

Behaviour Categories 19/12/2015 – 24/03/2016								
	R	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
Bullying/Targeting a pupil	0	0	1	3	8	5	2	19
Homophobic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Racial	0	0	0	1	6	1	3	11
Inappropriate Verbal (staff or pupils)								
• Inapp verbal towards staff	0	0	1	1	8	5	0	15
• Swearing/bad language	0	2	1	0	3	0	0	6
• Inapp verbal	12	7	2	6	13	11	3	54
• Inapp beh towards staff	2	4	5	4	7	3	0	25
Inappropriate physical/Physical Aggression								
• Inapp physical	12	12	24	13	37	38	11	147
• Physical aggression	4	1	0	1	7	16	0	29
Disruption/Defiance								
• Defiance to staff member	2	2	7	7	25	19	0	62
• Defiance and physical to staff	3	2	3	3	1	2	0	14

Are persistent attendance "problems" spread across the school? If they are, maybe each week you can identify the best attendance from each year group/phase on a percentage basis. This class can then go into a draw and each half term/term, you draw one class from the collection and they get a treat. If you can persuade local companies to participate, you could give a family a free bowling session or maybe a swimming session? If local sponsorship is not on offer, then a free dress day for that class?

Every week the attendance is given in percentage in whole school assembly and the cup given. Phases have rewards for the highest attendance in each phase.

Catering - If there have been complaints about the quality of catering, why not invite Caterlink to do some taster sessions for parents that take place during parents' evenings? It's a chance for them to show what they are capable of and maybe even produce simple recipe cards so parents can have a go at home! It will also encourage parental attendance at parent evenings)

<p>We are doing a feedback with the children. I can mention this to Mr Marlow for parents evening. We normally have the catering staff doing some tasters for parents and open evening/parent evenings.</p>		
<p>To summarise, the questions from Governors are good. Behaviour is challenging at the moment, the impact on individuals' time/energy can be draining. The FET team are a great team and want to be proactive but there are many times when they called out to be re-active which impacts on their work.</p> <p>MT questioned if there was anything Governors could do to support the team. GF recognised many schools are in this position and felt it was about Governors being involved and having an awareness of the system, and how agencies can work together. JS explained the resources of outside agencies can be limited and quite time consuming, with frustrations around continuity and moving forward.</p> <p>GF spoke of the Countywide Poverty Strategy and how strands could fit around what is being done in schools.</p> <p>SW highlighted the importance of recognising there are some things beyond control of the school and with the effective work of the school, they should focus on those areas which are being done well and where the school can make a difference.</p> <p>MT questioned whether the school are recording where they make a difference. JS confirmed they were and how the pressure is how to quantify this. There are lots of successes and the school need to celebrate the good work that is going on each day in every classroom. The work of the FET team and those working on a day-to-day basis with issues can become oblivious to what is happening and the impact it is having.</p> <p>CT confirmed the school are recording more because of the need to gather more evidence. The recent DfE visit focussed on pupil premium with the school being judged good, providing everything the inspector asked for. She also spoke with PP pupils. No suggestions were forwarded on how to improve on any areas.</p> <p>GF questioned whether the school is capturing impact. JS confirmed they have many case studies that show improvements and progress.</p> <p>RF questioned what the ALT Trust and Governors can do to support the school. CT felt as a Governing Body it was important for Governors to have an awareness of rising challenging behaviour. Governors acknowledged how the school is dealing with challenging behaviour and the impact of the lack of PRU places. CT confirmed Gary Peile is aware of the issues the school is experiencing in securing PRU places. MT confirmed there is a senior leadership conference scheduled where this could be discussed further.</p>		
<p>Going forward, it was agreed to allow more time on the agenda for the heads report (one hour). Governors noted the time impact for CT to produce two reports each term. Governors agreed behaviour would continue to be the focus for the next meeting.</p>		
<p>6. Trust Business [Standing Item]</p>		
<p>It was agreed the Risk Register would be discussed at the next meeting.</p>		
<p><u>Actions Agreed</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Carry forward discussion to the next meeting. 	<p>All</p>	<p>04/07</p>
<p>7. Committee Meetings</p>		
<p>No committee meetings have been held since the last meeting. Further meetings scheduled are listed below.</p> <p>Personnel – 9th June 2016</p> <p>Finance and Property – 13th June 2016</p>		

8.	Schools Visits and Link Governor Reports		
	<p>SATs administration - PD attended school and witnessed the processes around the administration of SATs (i.e. opening, copying onto coloured paper etc). The process was reported as running very smoothly. The children were relaxed and behaved excellently. Pip Hedlam was excellent throughout. SW explained how there were ongoing reviews through the SATs and sensitivity towards children's needs.</p> <p>CT stated that the school ensured the SATs process worked well and were mindful to get the best out of the children, ensuring they were comfortable, providing a pre-breakfast club to relax. 74 children were eligible to sit SATs, 4 disapplied, 70 took test. There were no absences on the day.</p> <p>FET Team – Refer to Part B for discussion on this item.</p> <p>ICT/Maths/Pupil Premium – It was agreed to defer RF's reports to the next meeting.</p>		
	<p><u>Actions Agreed</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Carry forward RF's reports to the next meeting. 	RF	04/07
9.	Safeguarding		
	<p>Prevent Training – Training was held on 4th May 2016. Governors reported that this was delivered excellently by CT.</p> <p>Single Central Record – It was agreed to defer DP's reports to the next meeting. Governors noted training has been completed for new staff.</p> <p>Safeguarding Policy – Review completed following updates from ALT.</p>		
	<p><u>Actions Agreed</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Carry forward DP's report on SCR to the next meeting. 	DP	04/07
10.	Health and Safety [Standing Item]		
	GF will submit his report to the Finance and Property Committee on 13 th June 2016.		
11.	Policies and Papers for Approval		
	<p>Behaviour Management Policy (BMP) – work continues on review of this policy and will be discussed at the next meeting.</p>		
	<p><u>Actions Agreed</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discuss BMP at the next meeting. 	All	04/07
12.	Year Planner 2016/17		
	TC prepared a draft year planner for academic year 2016/17. A final draft will be submitted to the next meeting incorporating any changes.		
	<p><u>Actions Agreed</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TC to prepare final draft for next meeting. 	TC	04/07
13.	Governor Critical Friends		
	<p>PD agreed to send a card to Sarah Walker for providing cover within the FET team whilst Marie Cridge was absent.</p> <p>JS agreed to send a card to Anita Gray and Mike Davies for the History Day.</p> <p>JS agreed to send a card to Pip Hedlam and team for their part in the SATs/breakfast etc.</p> <p>JS will consider recipient names for those members of staff involved in after</p>		

	school clubs ready for the next meeting.		
14.	Any Other Business		
	<p>GF noted the recent case in the Isle of Wight where a father won his case in the High Court challenging a fine he had received for a term time holiday and questioned if there was anything the school should communicate to parents.</p> <p>CT confirmed the school does have an Absence Policy in place but that this is a wider issue to be considered not just by Gusford but also by the ALT. MT agreed to explore this further.</p>		
15.	Date and Time of next meeting		
	<p>Monday 4th July 2016, 17.30pm.</p> <p>SW gave apologies for the next FGB and Personnel meetings.</p>		

The meeting closed at 19:40

Minutes Agreed

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

PUBLIC COPY