



## Pilton Infants' School Full Governing Body Meeting 8<sup>th</sup> November 2022

### Minutes

**Date/Time:** 8<sup>th</sup> November 2022, 5.30pm    **Location:** School Hall

Governor Attendees	Initials	Governor Category
Brian Holme	BH	Foundation - Chair
Jess Holme (until 7.46pm)	JH	Co-Opted
John Mortimer	JM	Acting HT
Kate Nolan	KN (Vice-Chair)	Parent
Lindsay Tranter-Sharpe	LTS	Foundation
Ebon Daunton (until 7.46pm)	ED	Staff
James Crighton (absent 6.41pm-6.52pm)	JC	Parent

Other Attendees	Initials	Capacity
Verity Goss	VG	Clerk
Sue Featherstone (until 6.41pm)	SF	Business Manager
Nicky Ruddick (until 5.59pm)	NR	English Lead
Stacey Pye (attending virtually, from 6.00pm – 6.15pm)	SP	SENDSCO

Apologies	Initials	Governor Category	Absent w/o apology

1	<p><b>Presentation from staff leads on priorities for the year</b></p> <p><u>English</u> NR talked through the action plan which had been distributed to governors.</p> <p>Last year's visit from Neil Swaite had brought up some issues, which were mostly actioned and in place now. The English curriculum was secure, with</p>	
---	--	--

clear intent for reading, writing and phonics. Lots of work had happened for all teachers. One of the biggest changes was phonics – Pilton Infants had not previously been using an accredited scheme, and had not been using matched books with the phonics progression. The school was now using Little Wondel phonics, with the matched books. There were very clear benefits – the program was a lot more vigorous, and started phase two earlier. The improvement in results should also be seen in reading and phonics. This year there had been some challenging children in the cohort – next year there should be an improvement.

This year the school was looking in to developing the scheme for phonics reading in Y2. Staff had already been good at teaching phonics, so with the new scheme it was going well. JM explained that having bought into a rigorous scheme, it was also easy to find consistent training for new staff.

**Did staff feel comfortable with how they had had to adapt?** Yes – although it was a different scheme, the skills were transferable. **How were parents adapting to the reading at home needed?** There were varying degrees of engagement with the eBooks, which were matched to the phonics stage. Some work was needed to re-educate parents who had previously had children go through the school before the current scheme. Staff had been disappointed with the numbers attending the reading information event – staff would ensure that parents who weren't there had the documents. It had been a very useful session for those that had attended.

**How would the school do if Ofsted visited tomorrow?** NR stated they would see very good consistency across the school as all were following the same program, and assessments clearly showed where children were. There was a strong reading culture through the school, with children able to talk confidently about the stories they read, with good examples of Oracy. There were good levels of support for children with SEND. The team was very reflective, and the ongoing development of these teachers benefitted the children.

KS2 results had been low the previous year – this had been partly due to the particular cohort, and partly due to the effect of Covid. Progress had been good – 1/3 of the children who had not met the early learning goals at EYFS had reached the expected standard. NR showed graphs comparing the progress of individual children to typical progress made. This data could be used to show progress of individuals where needed to help evidence EHCP applications. NR explained how staff had developed a way of tracking children with SEND who were working below expected standard in writing – although they had not reached the expected standard, the school was able to show the progress made, where children were now working more independently, and what had been done to support the children and what had been effective.

NR had attended the English briefing – a lot of the recommendations at the briefing were already in place in the school.

**Was there any further investment for phonics needed in the future?** Training was accessed online, and SLT were monitoring this. As existing book stock wore out, the school would look to replace them with books tied in to the scheme. NR did not think buying physical books to take home was the best use of money, as the eBooks were available – each set was only used for a very short amount of time through the year. The school would invest in a small set of these books for those children who would not be able to access an eBook at home, and also in some core texts.

**How difficult should children find the books they are taking home to read?**

NR stated children should find these books easier – they were read three times in class before they were taken home. These books were matched to phonics sounds the children had already learnt. Parents of children who had older siblings were finding the scheme very different, as it was a different approach to books. ‘Sharing books’ were also used at home – these books had some words that would not be decodable by the children, and were intended for parents to share with their children. Once children finished phonics they moved on to general books.

Governors thanked NR for attending. NR left 5.59pm.

SP joined the meeting 6.00pm.

**SEND**

SP explained key points from her report.

Developing leaders’ understanding of SEND – this had come up from the conference that KN and SP had attended. The point raised had been that everyone should be a leader of SEND, not just the SENDCO. Last year the deep dives had not had a big SEND focus on non core subjects – this would be developed, ensuring SEND learners had a broad and balanced curriculum, with leaders able to speak about how they were ensuring this was happening.

The deep dive in geography had included SEND – it was clear in some books how the subject was being adapted.

Relational behaviour policy was being developed – this was more about developing the child as a whole, and how best to meet their needs. Staff needed to be clear and consistent. Use of zones of regulation had been discussed – staff identifying children at green/amber/red and using intervention if needed. Children would learn to identify and seek support if needed. This linked to Jigsaw. SP was working with the TEAM SENDCO on this – it was used in TEAM schools.

Interventions and monitoring – there were a lot of nurture groups in the school, where it was difficult to monitor the impact on the children. SP was looking at how this could be done – thinking of setting a target for the term, with discussion at the end of the term to see what progress had been made.

	<p>SP would meet with all TAs at the end of term to discuss the impact of the interventions, how beneficial these had been, whether to continue or change the interventions, and to monitor the impact of these on the children.</p> <p><b>What timescale was planned for the new policy?</b> SP stated she wanted to meet with the TEAM SENDCO at the end of the term, to get zones in place for the next term. She would also need to talk to the teachers. The plan was for this to be written in the spring term, and to be fully rolled out in the summer term. <b>Was the intention to have the policy agreed after some aspects were put into place in the classroom, to ensure these worked as intended?</b> Yes – this would help get experience of using them to ensure they were what was needed – it would make sure everyone was clear on what they needed to do and when to do it.</p> <p><b>What was pupil conferencing? (referred to in report)</b> SP explained that this was when a group of children were asked questions during a deep dive, and gave their opinions on things.</p> <p>Governors thanked SP for attending. SP left the meeting 6.15pm.</p> <p><b>Were children old enough to understand the temperature regulation?</b> JM stated it helped children to understand their emotional state – would look at how it was used in KS1 in TEAM.</p>	
5	<p><b>Budget and Finance</b></p> <p>Meeting agreed to move to item five.</p> <p>SF stated that governors would have seen news about funding in schools – hence why the budget information had been available late. There was still some estimating in the report – all percentages had been built in for staff pay increases, electric and gas rises – some of this had already been built in. The current best guess was there would be £5,000 more than anticipated spent in the next six months.</p> <p>Carry forward had been planned at £92,000 – this was now £60,000 as there was an additional £32,000 that could be anticipated for staffing costs. The school and governors needed to be mindful of cutting in to what was needed to balance next year.</p> <p>The government had stated that there was £4 billion being assigned to education – but had not stated where/what this would be.</p> <p>SF stated this version of the budget monitor would be submitted to Devon County Council, and expected to receive more questions. SF were aware that there would be many schools with severe problems. There were some aspects that had not been fully decided on – there was talk of removing the lowest pay grade. Teacher pay increases would be backdated to September,</p>	

	<p>support staff pay increases backdated to April.</p> <p>New building – the school was aware that there would likely be some further works that would need to be funded after the project was completed. It was worth including in the budget now as an estimate – this could always be put back in reserves if not needed.</p> <p>Capital funding – it was preferred for this to be a project – the school had assigned a classroom needing improvements as they project. SF explained what improvements had taken place so far. It was possible that any finishing work on the new building could be included in capital.</p> <p>Covid catch up line – Covid catch up funding had been used, but SF needed to ensure payments were moved to the correct areas.</p> <p>PE budget – governors discussed how this was used, and what it was possible to use the PE grant for.</p> <p><b>What was being done to mitigate increased costs?</b> SF explained how heating worked in the building – the heating had not been needed to be turned on much so far. Ventilation was still needed. Were looking at timers for the heating.</p> <p>SF stated if governors had additional questions after the meeting she was happy for them to get in touch with her.</p> <p>Governors thanked SF. SF left the meeting 6.41pm.</p> <p>JC temporarily left the meeting 6.41pm.</p>	
1	<p><b>Presentation from staff leads on priorities for the year – resumed</b></p> <p><b><u>Maths</u></b></p> <p>JH described the strengths of maths in the school. Training this year had been on the mastery approach in maths – it was good to note that these things were in place. CPD had been built in to the plan. As maths lead JH also looked at research.</p> <p>The White Rose Curriculum was well established in the school. Children revisited and revised different aspects of maths.</p> <p>Development points – Y2 data had dropped due to the cohort and effect of Covid. Children needed to be good readers to access the curriculum – interventions were put in place where needed. Assessment was something to work on this year – staff were good at showing children could access skills at the moment in time, but needed to show children could do this at another time.</p>	

JH had been working with the maths curriculum team across TEAM, who had been looking at higher attainers, and creating 'dive deepers'. JH was also working with the Jurassic hub, which gave a lot of material to bring back in to school. There were a lot of things in place – JH was confident that there would be better data results this year.

Staff had been working on whole class lessons, giving children opportunities to practise their maths.

**How is SEND incorporated in to lessons?** JH explained that currently SEND children were supported within the classroom, although some may need to work separately. Stem sentences supported children to understand what maths concepts meant. All children should be in the classroom – sometimes staff support was needed, sometimes additional resources were needed to support them. All children had resources available, but which resources were used varied depending on their need. These were used to demonstrate understanding. JM explained research on older children showed they could struggle with a problem they could not visualise – if children were used to visualising when younger, they were able to abstract from this going forward.

JC returned to the meeting 6.52pm.

**Would staff be able to pick up what was a reading issue, rather than a numbers issue?** JH stated there was a program used where the focus was to pick up where children had an issue with number. There were also more assessments on out of context maths – staff had noticed children struggling with certain aspects.

Governors thanked JH.

### **EYFS**

ED explained that the action plan had been split into three main sections.

*Develop EYFS with the new staffing structure & embed assessment with a particular focus on reading and phonics* – this was a reaction to having new staff in EYFS, and unpicking the results from last year – reading and writing had had an impact on these. There was a focus on these areas of the curriculum, and on the new staff. EYFS was different to other year groups in the school – it took time to get used to the age group, which was a crucial part of learning. The target was to track progress through the revised early years curriculum, ensuring that all pupils were included. There was a focus on the lowest 10%, with a focus on reading and writing.

ED explained the training that had been arranged for staff new to EYFS.

**Was ED happy with the timescales for staff reaching the correct levels?** ED explained it took a while for staff to be completely embedded with a different

	<p>way of working – he expected it to be a year. The whole child approach was a very different way of working – ED explained how. New staff were doing well – structure helped, Little Wondel was very useful for this. ED explained the importance of oracy in Reception.</p> <p>Predictions made from Baseline assessment was that 78% of the cohort should be at expected standard at the end of the year, which was an improvement on last year’s results.</p> <p>ED explained the difficulties there were in this cohort, but there was a good team in place to support them. ED felt it was important to get the pre-school in place, as this would be of real benefit to the children as they came through the school.</p> <p>Governors thanked ED.</p>	
<b>Procedural Items</b>		
2	<p><b>Welcome and apologies for absence</b></p> <p>No apologies received.</p>	
3	<p><b>Declarations of pecuniary/non-pecuniary interest and confidentiality</b></p> <p>None declared.</p>	
4	<p><b>Agree minutes of meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> September, and actions arising</b></p> <p>Minutes agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.</p>	
<b>Strategic Items</b>		
	Item 5 discussed earlier in the meeting.	
6	<p><b>HT Report</b></p> <p>Governors had received the report.</p> <p>Attendance – three children currently had a reduced timetable. JM explained possible reasons a child may need a reduced timetable, and explained when concerns arose.</p> <p>Buildings – the contract had been awarded to Pearce construction. All bids received were over budget, so additional budget approval from Devon County Council had been needed. It was expected the work would be finished during the Easter holidays.</p> <p>Now the contractor had been appointed, the school could move forward with academisation with TEAM. The academisation application form had been started – TEAM would help with this. The aim was for academisation to take place on 1<sup>st</sup> September. Horwood and Newton Tracey school were also aiming for the same date – if both schools were at the same time it could help get the</p>	

process through quicker. There would now be a thorough consultation process giving all stakeholders a chance to have their say – it was expected that parents would support academisation, but it would need to be made clear that Pilton Infants and Pilton Bluecoat were still separate schools. There were some concerns from staff – JM stated they would continue to work with TEAM in sorting these as they had done before. The management partnership had been very beneficial. Stakeholder events happened early in the process – staff consultation was at the end. JM warned governors that there may be a few additional meetings needed.

## Monitoring and Accountability / Issues to Decide

- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| 7 | <p><b>Safeguarding</b></p> <p>ED distributed update sheet to governors, which included information on continual staff training.</p> <p>ED explained the outcomes and training identified following the Caroline Pinsent mentoring session – this would be shared with the safeguarding team and relevant staff.</p> <p>ED explained the AIM program was now used instead of Brooks Tools to risk assess incidents of sexualised behaviours.</p> <p>S175 audit – this was being worked through ready for the return in January.</p>   |  |
| 8 | <p><b>Policies:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>First Aid policy</u> – agreed</li> <li>b. <u>Behaviour</u> – JM initially thought the policy would remain the same, but there was a new model from The Key which would be looked at for the next meeting. This would then be developed as discussed by SP.<br/><b>Would the principles remain the same?</b> JM stated they would stay the same, but there was some new guidance on wording. PIPS training would be booked.</li> <li>c. <u>Pay Policy</u> – date for governing body to review salary to be changed to 30<sup>th</sup> November – to fit in with meeting dates. Item 3.2 to be removed as no deputy head. <b>Who would be in charge if the head was absent?</b> JM stated this would be a member of the SLT. Governors recommended to make sure staff knew who would take charge if JM was unavailable. Date in appendix 3 to be removed as incorrect. Agree with changes.</li> <li>d. <u>Information Security</u> – agreed. Section 8 referred to use of cameras – the school did not have cameras. Governors discussed whether a school mobile phone would be useful for trips – agreed it would be a good idea.</li> </ul> |  |



Governing Body Management		
9	<b>Governor Visits: Feedback and Planning</b> Some governors had been able to attend Deep Dives. Four governor leads would arrange visits. JM confirmed governors could attend Christmas Lunch again.	
10	<b>Chair's Business</b> None.	
11	<b>Teachers Pay Awards</b>  ED and JH left the meeting at 7.46pm. Meeting moved to Part II.  Meeting ended 7.59pm.	