

Hazeldown School Governing Body

School Improvement Committee Meeting (Autumn Term) – Part 1 Minutes					
Date/Time	4 December 2024 at 6:00pm				
Location	Hazeldown Primary School				
Chaired by	Ruth Walters				
Attendees		Role	Attendees	Init	Role
Dave Dawson	DD	LA Chair	Paul Hamilton	PH	Parent
Ruth Walters	RW	Co-opted Vice Chair	Kelly Harnett	KHtt	Parent
Stuart Ludford	SL	Headteacher			
Samantha Atkinson	SA	Co-opted			
Jasmine Garswood	JG	Staff Governor			

In Attendance	Initials	Role
Kit Hardee	KHee	Associate Member
Tim Synge	TS	Clerk

Minutes to
Attendees
School website

Apologies	Initials	Role	Absent without apology	Initials	Role
Ruth Doughty	RD	Co-opted			
Matt Hallett	MH	Parent			
Cloudi Lewis	CL	Parent			
Tony Leney	TL	Parent			

	Agenda	Led by
1	Apologies	Clerk
2	Declarations of Interest	Chair
3	Minutes of previous meeting: 23 October 2024	Chair
4	Matters arising from previous meeting: 23 October 2024	Chair
5	Headteacher's Report on July 2024 data drop	SL
6	School Improvement Plan 2024/25	SL
7	School Self Evaluation	SL
8	Impact from this meeting	Chair
9	SI Committee focus for the next meeting	Chair
10	Next meeting	Chair
11	AOB	Clerk

Item	Details of discussion		
1	Apologies There were apologies received from RD, CL, MH and TL. DD chaired the meeting.		
2	Declarations of Interest None declared.		
3	Minutes of previous meeting: 23 October 2024 The minutes of the previous meeting held on 23 October 2024 were confirmed as a fair record of that meeting. A set was signed by the Chair.		
4	Matters arising from previous minutes: 23 October 2024 There were two matters arising from the last meeting.		
	SI 24/01	Clerk to follow up outstanding declarations of interest for 2024/25	Done on 19 November 2024
	SI 24/02	Clerk to write to all Governors to notify them of the status of pay arrangements in preparation for the activation of the Pay Committee.	Done on 11 October 2024
5	Headteacher's Report on the July 2024 data drop DD introduced SL's report on the July 2024 data drop. A detailed review of this had been deferred from the 23 October meeting on account of the timing of the Ofsted inspection. <i>DD noted SL's assessment of the Phonics Screening scores as disappointing. What was the School doing to improve this?</i> JG described actions taken including a meeting to agree measures to be adopted; these included development of an action plan, mocks, interventions, and catch-up and keep-up sessions. SL reflected on a possible contributory factor: the scheme had been a new one for Year 1 and some schools report an initial drop in outcomes when a scheme is changed. The use of Little Wandle again in the following year would bring consistency. <i>DD asked whether Little Wandle was considered to be the right package to use.</i> SL and JG both felt that it was and added that it incorporated some effective assessment tools. <i>DD asked for comment on the approach taken to Multiplication Tables Checks.</i> SL explained that some children with additional needs who were not expected to score particularly well had wanted to be involved and had been permitted to take the test; he considered this to be a positive reflection of the Hazeldown mindset.		

5	<p>Headteacher's Report on the July 2024 data drop (continued)</p> <p>SL reported on a challenge raised by the Ofsted inspectors for the Senior Leadership Team to consider. There was a movement at County to reduce the number of pupils on the SEND Register, however if such children were still judged by the School to have a need, it was important that the School felt confident to act on this.</p> <p>A number of questions had been added to the report; these are reproduced below.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="341 517 703 869"> <p><i>SA: In previous reports you explained that children often got to Greater Depth in 2 of the 3 categories but not always all 3. It looks like you have had some progress with this – what do you think the difference has been?</i></p> </td><td data-bbox="703 517 1353 869"> <p>This still needs to be a focus – any increases are potentially down to cohort differences rather than being able to say we are on the way with this. Our high-flying mathematicians, for example, do not always show the same prowess in their literacy.</p> </td></tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="341 869 703 1151"> <p><i>RD: It would be useful to see data on above ARE vulnerable pupils since this was a focus of the 2019 inspection.</i></p> </td><td data-bbox="703 869 1353 1151"> <p>The inspection team were not interested in the key areas left by the inspection team and there was a comment that the foci were not particularly useful. We look at this through the Analyse School Performance (ASP) data each year and feel this provides enough of a steer. Our data analysis and subsequent actions are very much focused on individuals and their needs.</p> </td></tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="341 1151 703 1433"> <p><i>RD: What is the wider plan for improving success in writing since the gap between ARE in reading and writing is in all year groups except Y1 and GD in all year groups?</i></p> </td><td data-bbox="703 1151 1353 1433"> <p>At the moment, a focus on early writing, particularly the transition from foundation stage to year one, a focus on SPAG, cross curricular writing and vocabulary are in the SIP under 'writing'. Key work on modelling and scaffolding will further support writing as these have been identified as areas for CPD at all levels across the school.</p> </td></tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="341 1433 703 1608"> <p><i>RD: Does everyone understand school performance data? Do we need to improve this area as a GB?</i></p> </td><td data-bbox="703 1433 1353 1608"> <p>This could be an area for further development – we probably need to ask everyone to identify foci for a governors CPD session? Do we need to go back to a data session focused on the IDSR and ASP?</p> </td></tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="341 1608 703 2000"> <p><i>RD: Without wanting to overload the data report, it would be useful to see a gender breakdown in headline data particularly as boys' writing was an Ofsted focus in the 2019 inspection.</i></p> </td><td data-bbox="703 1608 1353 2000"> <p>It would be useful to have clarity about whether Governors want this to be added to the data analysis process and what the impact will be overall. We already have a very individualised focus with analysing the data and also with subsequent actions. Time spent creating additional group statistics at the different data drops can sometimes detract from this – they are often just produced to be able to state a figure....and then we go back to focusing on the individual child and what they need to move forwards.</p> </td></tr> </table>	<p><i>SA: In previous reports you explained that children often got to Greater Depth in 2 of the 3 categories but not always all 3. It looks like you have had some progress with this – what do you think the difference has been?</i></p>	<p>This still needs to be a focus – any increases are potentially down to cohort differences rather than being able to say we are on the way with this. Our high-flying mathematicians, for example, do not always show the same prowess in their literacy.</p>	<p><i>RD: It would be useful to see data on above ARE vulnerable pupils since this was a focus of the 2019 inspection.</i></p>	<p>The inspection team were not interested in the key areas left by the inspection team and there was a comment that the foci were not particularly useful. We look at this through the Analyse School Performance (ASP) data each year and feel this provides enough of a steer. Our data analysis and subsequent actions are very much focused on individuals and their needs.</p>	<p><i>RD: What is the wider plan for improving success in writing since the gap between ARE in reading and writing is in all year groups except Y1 and GD in all year groups?</i></p>	<p>At the moment, a focus on early writing, particularly the transition from foundation stage to year one, a focus on SPAG, cross curricular writing and vocabulary are in the SIP under 'writing'. Key work on modelling and scaffolding will further support writing as these have been identified as areas for CPD at all levels across the school.</p>	<p><i>RD: Does everyone understand school performance data? Do we need to improve this area as a GB?</i></p>	<p>This could be an area for further development – we probably need to ask everyone to identify foci for a governors CPD session? Do we need to go back to a data session focused on the IDSR and ASP?</p>	<p><i>RD: Without wanting to overload the data report, it would be useful to see a gender breakdown in headline data particularly as boys' writing was an Ofsted focus in the 2019 inspection.</i></p>	<p>It would be useful to have clarity about whether Governors want this to be added to the data analysis process and what the impact will be overall. We already have a very individualised focus with analysing the data and also with subsequent actions. Time spent creating additional group statistics at the different data drops can sometimes detract from this – they are often just produced to be able to state a figure....and then we go back to focusing on the individual child and what they need to move forwards.</p>
<p><i>SA: In previous reports you explained that children often got to Greater Depth in 2 of the 3 categories but not always all 3. It looks like you have had some progress with this – what do you think the difference has been?</i></p>	<p>This still needs to be a focus – any increases are potentially down to cohort differences rather than being able to say we are on the way with this. Our high-flying mathematicians, for example, do not always show the same prowess in their literacy.</p>										
<p><i>RD: It would be useful to see data on above ARE vulnerable pupils since this was a focus of the 2019 inspection.</i></p>	<p>The inspection team were not interested in the key areas left by the inspection team and there was a comment that the foci were not particularly useful. We look at this through the Analyse School Performance (ASP) data each year and feel this provides enough of a steer. Our data analysis and subsequent actions are very much focused on individuals and their needs.</p>										
<p><i>RD: What is the wider plan for improving success in writing since the gap between ARE in reading and writing is in all year groups except Y1 and GD in all year groups?</i></p>	<p>At the moment, a focus on early writing, particularly the transition from foundation stage to year one, a focus on SPAG, cross curricular writing and vocabulary are in the SIP under 'writing'. Key work on modelling and scaffolding will further support writing as these have been identified as areas for CPD at all levels across the school.</p>										
<p><i>RD: Does everyone understand school performance data? Do we need to improve this area as a GB?</i></p>	<p>This could be an area for further development – we probably need to ask everyone to identify foci for a governors CPD session? Do we need to go back to a data session focused on the IDSR and ASP?</p>										
<p><i>RD: Without wanting to overload the data report, it would be useful to see a gender breakdown in headline data particularly as boys' writing was an Ofsted focus in the 2019 inspection.</i></p>	<p>It would be useful to have clarity about whether Governors want this to be added to the data analysis process and what the impact will be overall. We already have a very individualised focus with analysing the data and also with subsequent actions. Time spent creating additional group statistics at the different data drops can sometimes detract from this – they are often just produced to be able to state a figure....and then we go back to focusing on the individual child and what they need to move forwards.</p>										

5	<p>Headteacher’s Report on the July 2024 data drop (continued)</p> <p>In response to the fourth question, Governors considered their collective understanding of school performance data. They agreed that a CPD session would be useful.</p> <p>Action: Clerk to timetable a session on performance data (including Analyse School Performance (“ASP”) data in addition to the IDSR) for the spare Spring Term SIC meeting slot.</p> <p><i>DD commented that various Team Leaders had mentioned discrepancies in performance between classes in the same yeargroup. Was this an issue for the School Improvement Plan?</i> SL did not view this as an issue for the SIP and felt that it should be picked up by the Team Leaders. Re-allocations between classes were not usually made for reasons of statistical outcomes alone.</p> <p>SL highlighted some of the contents of his report. Since the preparation of the original report earlier in the term, he had added the National GD statistics which were now available; Hazeldown compared quite favourably in these. For GLD, the School was at 71% (against 67% nationally).</p> <p>SL explained to Governors that Ofsted did not pay much attention to internal school data as different schools used different systems, however the inspection team had evidently been satisfied that the School knew where its pupils were and what it needed to do for each of them.</p> <p>DD thanked SL for his report.</p>
6	<p>School Improvement Plan 2024/25</p> <p>DD introduced the School Improvement Plan 2024/25 and SL’s progress report. He reflected that the benefits of the appointment of the new Curriculum Lead were apparent from the progress made already against the Plan. SL agreed and said that the Curriculum Lead’s work was contributing to the development of Subject Leads; KHee added some examples of the impact of this and SL reported on staff approaches to scaffolding which he anticipated would lead to improvements in writing.</p> <p>DD reported on the Governance section of the Plan. The newly circulated extract included amendments based on the feedback from RD. Governors discussed the changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Governors’ understanding of performance data would be addressed at the additional SIC meeting in the Spring Term (see above). - The regular sessions on preparing for Ofsted would be retained. SL suggested that the focus might usefully change from training to briefings and updates and Governors agreed that this would be useful. - Research on possible academisation might now assume a slightly lower priority in line with the reduced focus from Government on this; the process was involved and expensive and would require a lot of resource which could usefully be expended elsewhere.

6	<p>School Improvement Plan 2024/25 (continued)</p> <p>SL advised Governors of a purchase which would have a small implication on the budget. A licence for Provision Map Writer software had been purchased; this carried a cost of ca £1,000 per annum and would provide support for staff engaged in writing IEPs.</p>
7	<p>Self Evaluation</p> <p>It was agreed that a detailed session on the Self Evaluation Form ("SEF") would not be the best use of Governor time following the inspection, however the report which had been shared with the inspection team earlier in the term had been made available for review prior to this meeting. DD commented that there was a high degree of overlap between the Self Evaluation Summary and the feedback from the Ofsted team.</p> <p>DD asked about parental interaction with the School and KHee noted that the School Spider platform which the School used to manage parental communication had proved its worth. DD noted in relation to Safeguarding that there might have been a fuller mention of the role of Governors, for example in relation to their scrutiny when in School and their regular training updates. SL assured him that Ofsted had acknowledged these factors. He reported that the Self Evaluation Framework document had proved to be a good source of triangulation for the Ofsted team and had provided useful evidence for them in conjunction with FGB minutes and the pre-inspection telephone call. RW felt that it was very much a living document and this enhanced its usefulness.</p>
9	<p>Impact from this meeting</p> <p>DD summarised the substance of the meeting by saying that it was evident in the course of the meeting that the School was always ready to adapt and develop in response to data and findings. This was a strength which FGB recognised.</p>
10	<p>SI Committee focus for the next meeting</p> <p>The next meeting of SIC will cover the normal termly business of this Committee and will include a review of the December data drop and an update on progress against the School Improvement Plan 2024/25.</p>

11	Next Meeting(s) The next meeting of FGB is on Wednesday 18 December. The following meetings are scheduled for the Spring Term: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SIC: 29 Jan 2025 • FGB: 12 Feb 2025 • <i>FGB (one-off – provisional): 19 Mar 2025</i> • FGB: Weds 2 April 2025
12	AOB None
	The meeting ended at 07:30pm.

Summary of proposed actions		
SI 24/03	Clerk to timetable a session on performance data (including Analyse School Performance (“ASP”) data in addition to the IDSR) for the spare Spring Term SIC meeting slot.	Clerk

Summary of decisions		

These minutes are agreed by those present as being a true record.	
Signed (Chair of Committee) Name:	Date: