

Hove Learning Federation Full Governing Body Meeting
Tuesday 16th May 2023, 18:00-20:00 – Portland Road
MINUTES

GOVERNORS	Lisa Marshall (LM) - Co-Chair, Louise Wilkinson (LW) - Co-Chair Maddie Southern (MS) - Headteacher HJS Marie Benton (MB) – Parent Governor Jo Corbett (JC) – Co-opted Governor Lorna Cummings (LC) - Head of School HR, Staff Governor Nick Jefferson – Co-opted Governor David Karp (DK) – Co-opted Governor Ella Livingstone – Co-opted Governor Ben Massey (BM) – Head of School SR
OTHER PARTICIPANTS	Abby Hedger-Jones (AHJ) – Associate Member, Niamh O’Shea– Associate Member, Sam Ledger – Associate Member
CLERK	Chelle McCann
APOLOGIES	Anne-Marie Williamson – Parent Governor

#	AGENDA ITEM
1.	<p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome – the meeting opened at 6:06pm Apologies were noted and accepted from AMW Notification of Any Urgent Business Declarations of Interest – none noted
2.	<p>Minutes of Last Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The minutes of the meeting held on 21.3.23 were approved. The minutes of the meeting held on 18.4.23 were approved. Matters Arising – none noted Actions- all actions were completed
3.	<p>Head’s Reports</p> <p>3.1 WHIS – Spring Term - MS talked governors through the Headline points from the report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The phonics data analysis shows the progress made from September. Key Highlights are that 78% of children passing the phonics screener, only 7% lower than last year and 9% higher than 2021 data. Considerable improvement from first practise screener (25% to 78%) this progress is also reflected across all vulnerable groups. The year team has worked hard to implement Little Wandle and it is positive to see the attainment gap is closing. Phonics time has been carefully mapped out for next year and it is expected there will be further progress. MS shared the SPA visit highlighted the strengths of the work being done in Quality First Teaching and Subject leadership in geography and history. Subject leader teams are continuing to work well together. MS highlighted subject planning strengths and asked governors to refer to the SPA report. NO’S and SL are working on CUSP materials which they have researched (Alex Bedford) to supplement and support staff in identified subject areas in science, geography and history.

#	AGENDA ITEM
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are 5 members of staff working as part of the Mental Health working party, looking at the class environment through the children’s eyes. This has allowed triangulation with the teaching, children and environment reflecting Mental Health issues. Please evaluation section of the Head’s Report for further information. <p>GVO Questions and Commentary:</p> <p>Governors acknowledged that Language and Literacy Oracy Programme being rolled out across the authority – 29 schools in B&H – and felt that it is an incredible achievement to be proud of showing evidence of how impactful the school is right across the LA.</p> <p>Governors reflected that the engagement with EAL families is well supported by the evidence of a closing gap between EAL and non-EAL in EYFS and KS1 & KS2. This is an excellent foundation to build on given the continued focus on EAL (recognising number of summer-born children, SEN etc within this group). Governors expressed a well done to everyone involved with this work.</p> <p>Governors shared that they could see evidence of Little Wandle working, especially in regard to the impact on DA.</p> <p>Governors express congratulations on the reduction in ARE gap at HR. <i>It is interesting to see numbers for 22/23 show quite different profiles between HR and SR compared to previous years. i.e. ARE whole school 27%, HR 13%, SR 31%. Do you know why?</i></p> <p>A child at Holland Road in a smaller year group will be worth a higher percentage statistically. Apart from SEN, HR have a higher percentage of vulnerable groups than SR - particularly Summer born and EAL, which are our two lowest groups this year. Summer born HR - 38% and SR - 21%, EAL - HR - 22% and SR - 16%, DA HR - 22% and SR - 16%</p> <p>More children attended preschool provision at SR than HR. Fewer summer born than previous years (both sites) means more resilience and a better language acquisition when starting school. More HR children that are currently below were well below when starting. SR and overall results are better than the last two years due to nursery and preschool experience, which has led to better vocabulary and exposure to experiences. Last year on entry more at SR started well below ARE.</p> <p><i>How are the next steps identified in the deep dives (e.g. Maths and History in this report) followed up? Who follows them up?</i></p> <p>Next steps for all deep dives are shared with year leads and discussed in more detail. The subject leader of the deep dive adds the next steps to their action plan and will follow this up in further monitoring over the terms. The year leads feed back to their year teams and follow up specific year group actions e.g. planning requirements.</p> <p><i>The book study approach seems very promising overall. When and how do subject leads have the opportunity to look independently at a sample of workbooks (across all YGs), without pupils picking and choosing what to talk about? How does independent (i.e. non-pupil directed) workbook scrutiny feed into formal subject monitoring?</i></p> <p>Outside of the 'book study' element of shallow splashes and deep dives, subject leads can choose to do a 'book look' at any time and this will involve them choosing a selection of books from a year</p>

#	AGENDA ITEM
	<p>group, key stage or across the school. At the infants, staff meetings are given to this and each teacher will bring a range of books to a session set up for this purpose - the aim is for this to happen at least 2 to 3 times a year. At the juniors this is instigated by subject leads who will use their time out of class to review the learning in books at that time. Feedback is then collated and reported back to year leads so that actions can be agreed and fed into subject and year group action plans as appropriate. However, with the focus on deep dives and shallow splashes this year outlined in the monitoring overview there have been less informal opportunities for book looks as we have tried hard to maintain a balance of not monitoring too much.</p> <p>Each year group meeting should also start with a book look and the focus subject is either given in the year leader schedule or year leads can choose themselves based on their priority for teaching and learning at that time.</p> <p><i>In relation to the Staff Survey, I appreciate responses are anonymous - but have we been able to respond to some of the issues highlighted in the survey - such as P73. New initiative overload, P77. timetabling system and interventions cashes and P77. fairness around jobs being offered.</i></p> <p>All internal jobs are advertised across all of the sites and have always been to ensure equal access and opportunity The deputy head of schools look carefully at intervention timetables and map out the timetabling. There are occasionally clashes but generally class teachers and year leads quickly respond to this. Generally, we aim for pupils to only have one intervention ongoing at a time. With catch up some pupils have had more e.g. phonics and reading</p> <p><i>Please can you say more about persistent absence rates of 43% for DA pupils?</i></p> <p>The 43% noted for the autumn term 2022. This has now been reduced down to 17.8% for spring 2022. The higher percentage was evident in EYFS for P/C of pupils under statutory age of 5 years. This has been addressed through the absence policy and individual meetings with families to discuss the importance of attendance and identifying individual barriers where appropriate.</p> <p><i>The increase in behaviour incidents seems concerning especially at Holland Road. From the report, you seem to indicate that the increase is a result of increased staff awareness as a result of training and increased need and vulnerability. How concerned are you about the increase? Do you have any concerns that this might be an issue of resources, training, etc. How is this impacting on staff and other children at HR?</i></p> <p>During the autumn term we worked towards the Infant support staff & MDSAs being able to log and report behaviour incidents on CPOMs (they did not previously have access to CPOMs). We also provided support on what and how incidents should be logged through support staff meetings. This now means more incidents are being logged in line with the Junior practice. In addition, we do have a number of children at HR presenting with significantly challenging behaviour particularly in Reception and Year One. Although they are being incredibly well managed by our staff, it is placing a huge demand on our Inclusion team currently. Child A and Child B detailed in the report represent 2 of these children and there are others for whom RAs, behaviour plans and support are in place. I'm happy to give more detail about this at the meeting.</p> <p>Governor Questions:</p>

#	AGENDA ITEM
	<p><i>Can you say more about behaviour incidents in HR?</i></p> <p>There are 2 reasons – one was there was a disparity between how reporting is done between the WHIS and HJS site. This is due to access to CPOMs for some support staff. Autumn term this was realigned and a support staff meeting considered what and how reporting should be done. LC shared that there is a significant number of challenging children. There are a number of children with additional needs without EHCP. This has put a strain on inclusion staff. There are some children that require more time which can divert from support for others.</p> <p>The staff have been flexible to move where the needs require. It was felt that staff are working hard to ensure there is a system that works well for both recording and support. There are RA in place for the high needs children and there is a consistency in the approach to managing the more challenging behaviours.</p> <p><i>How will the support mean they will function well in school?</i></p> <p>We manage children really well and there is a track record to show this. There is a child that is not placed in the appropriate provision but there is not an EHCP in place.</p> <p><i>Governors asked about the change in practice with work book scrutiny and are you happy with the removal of the step to ensure the quality of the curriculum?</i></p> <p>Subject leaders are encouraged to do a ‘shallow splash’ and they have time to look at the books, get into lessons. It is less formal and more relaxed but there are 2 opportunities for book scrutiny and to review the action plans. This places ownership on subject leads.</p> <p>‘Shallow Splash’ is a more collaborative way of working and is very positive. This provides an open forum for review and open discussion.</p> <p>SL shared the collaborative way in how the Shallow Splash system works. There is space and time to review the quality of teaching however the model is working really well.</p> <p>NOS there will be some thought about subjects across a year group and teams.</p> <p><i>Does this mean the HOS and HT don’t participate?</i></p> <p>They do dip in to review but this is not structured. There has been a suggestion for SLT to join Year group meetings as a celebration. If there was an issue raised from a progress meeting this would be reviewed and ore in depth scrutiny would occur.</p> <p>Governors reflected that the staff feedback was very interesting, and it was fantastic to see so many really positive comments. Of concern, there are the number of staff, who feel that they are under pressure at work and unable to achieve a healthy work-life balance. Governors felt that it was clear there is still some settling-in of the school merger which is to be expected. The governing board remain conscious of the amount of change staff have been through and what could be to come, given the budget challenges. It was acknowledged that the negative comments seem to be impacted/caused/made worse by removal of support due to budget. Governors expressed thanks to the SLT for their obvious care and consideration of staff at (governor) meetings as well as day to day.</p>

#	AGENDA ITEM
	<p>Governors expressed thanks to JB for her fantastic work as Mental Health Lead, including the fund raising she has managed to secure.</p> <p>3.2 HJS – Spring Term – MS talked governors through the Headline points from the report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The COVID gap feels more noticeable in progress data this year • MS has shared the year leader action plans which show how personalised the work is within the cohorts • There has been close work on teaching vocabulary and this has enhanced lesson sequencing • MS shared examples of planning that have been refined and subject leaders have taken more ownership over their subjects • MS shared feedback from the SPA visit and how this is being reflected in planning and assessment <p>GVO Questions and commentary:</p> <p>It is very evident again that combination of increased SEN needs, reduced TA support, budget restraints etc is having a significant impact. However, it is encouraging to see how creative the school is able to be in response to this but the workload and pressure is concerning. It is brilliant to see some great results in spite of these challenges however, and as always, the forensic level of detail held about each year group and demographic, and strategies underway, remains impressive.</p> <p><i>How are the next steps identified in the deep dives (e.g. Maths and History in this report) followed up? Who follows them up? See previous answer for WHIS report that answered this question</i></p> <p><i>The book study approach seems very promising overall. When and how do subject leads have the opportunity to look independently at a sample of workbooks (across all YGs), without pupils picking and choosing what to talk about? How does independent (i.e. non-pupil directed) workbook scrutiny feed into formal subject monitoring?</i></p> <p>Outside of the 'book study' element of shallow splashes and deep dives, subject leads can choose to do a 'book look' at any time and this will involve them choosing a selection of books from a year group, key stage or across the school. At the infants, staff meetings are given to this and each teacher will bring a range of books to a session set up for this purpose - the aim is for this to happen at least 2 to 3 times a year. At the juniors this is instigated by subject leads who will use their time out of class to review the learning in books at that time. Feedback is then collated and reported back to year leads so that actions can be agreed and fed into subject and year group action plans as appropriate. However, with the focus on deep dives and shallow splashes this year outlined in the monitoring overview there have been less informal opportunities for book looks as we have tried hard to maintain a balance of not monitoring too much. Each year group meeting should also start with a book look and the focus subject is either given in the year leader schedule or year leads can choose themselves based on their priority for teaching and learning at that time.</p> <p>Governors Questions:</p> <p><i>Do lots of schools separate or join geography as Humanities? The SPA visit highlighted that there should be separate History and Geography books and this has been refined in the lesson sequence.</i></p> <p>BM shared the practice in the classroom when the class talk about a subject. SL expressed the school need to have a school definition of Geography that all children can understand from Year R to 6.</p>

#	AGENDA ITEM
	Governors thanked MS for the thorough reports submitted
4.	<p>Updates from Committees</p> <p>4.1 Chair of Committees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This meeting focussed on agendas The meeting also discussed the focus and strategy for the next academic year <p>4.2 Finance and Leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The meeting signed off the final outturns for 22-23 The focus was on the budget for 23-24 <p>GVO Questions:</p> <p><i>Do we have modelling available, which compares keeping HR as it is (with agreed mitigations but without vertical grouping) vs. reducing the PAN to 1 form?</i></p> <p>It has been explained before that 1 form sites are seen as non-viable, it seems that the status quo is also non-viable. It would be good to understand which is the 'least worst' option in the short term (or as an interim step before a potential site closure).</p> <p>The LA have not currently asked us to model this option. As an alternative this would take 7-year groups years to go through starting in September 2024. The LA have been clear that the schools need to show how they can model mitigating the deficit over a 5-year period. This option would not allow to mitigate the budget in that time period.</p>
5.	<p>Finance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The documentation and Finance minutes show the closing accounts 22-23 JC attended the Finance Briefing for Governors and this raised some interesting discussions The LA will not be supporting schools with additional funds There were a lot of questions raised by governors but most were in the context of the school Vertical Grouping was discussed at the briefing and this being an unpopular model with families and teachers. This option was felt as more appropriate for rural schools There was a recognition of the amount of work the WHIS/HJS SBMs have done on modelling Budget support area is now available on BEEM It was acknowledged that there are not enough comparative similarities to be able to compare other schools in BHCC The LA are expecting the majority of schools to submit a license deficit The local low pay and national pay awards were also raised and the impact of this across the city <p>Governor Questions:</p> <p><i>Have budget documents submitted had all the amendments for the approved changes from the EFGB?</i> Yes</p>
6.	<p>Budget Approval (please put questions on the GVO)</p> <p>6.1 WHIS Budget Approval – the budget for 23-24 was approved</p> <p>6.2 HJS Budget Approval – the budget for 23-24 was approved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The F&L Committee reviewed the draft and once the budget is submitted a license deficit will be applied for. JC summarised the modelling that is already approved following the EFGB.

#	AGENDA ITEM
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LA have said to submit the budgets and then the formal application for a license deficit will have to be submitted. These are then reviewed by the Finance team and Deb Austin. • Part of the discussions will be around the future clear financial plan over a 5-year period • The modelling has been reflected in the Finance and Leadership and EFGB minutes. <p>Governor Questions:</p> <p><i>How does the deficit compare to other schools?</i> It is not dissimilar to a local secondary. It cannot be compared to other primaries due to the split site costs.</p> <p>Governors reflected on the change of local administration and how schools can be part of conversations moving forward.</p> <p>Governors discussed the support (both financial and other) needed from the LA if there are site and school closures due to the city-wide falling PAN.</p> <p>Governors acknowledged that staffing costs are a high percentage of spend and this was over 100%. There is less movement in staff at WHIS and a lot of staff are on the higher pay scale.</p> <p><i>If the WHIS fully subscribed to would be still have a deficit and a surplus at HJS?</i> There are still low numbers in some HJS year groups. This is accumulative over time for WHIS and it isn't as comparable against HJS. If PAN was full this would mitigate the budget.</p> <p>Governors acknowledged that there will be a need for an EFGB to discuss modelling.</p>
7.	<p>General Governance and Monitoring</p> <p>7.1 Feedback from Governors on Training – EJG is in process of completing the governor induction, NJ has completed the governor induction</p> <p>7.2 Vacancies –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LM confirmed that NM has stepped down as governor • There are 4 vacancies, 1 LA governor, 3 co-opted and 1 parent governor • Parent election information will be sent out in Summer 2 <p>7.3 Curriculum and Inclusion Terms of Reference for approval – the changes were approved.</p> <p>7.4 SEND Monitoring Visits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LW talked governors through the SEND Monitoring visits that had taken place in March 2023. • There is an increase of needs in the school which is challenging to manage provision • LW shared that it is a concern that there may not be enough adult resources for the scale of the need required. This is evident in all schools across the LA. • The EHCPs are submitted to the LA EHCP panel which is an independent panel that reviews each stage of the process • Given the volume of demand there is a risk that there will be an increased level of complaints if the process isn't met. • MS shared the varied funding allocated for children with an EHCP • Governors discussed the length of time for referrals and the lag in funding allocated • Governors acknowledged the risks to school and how to monitor this as a governing board • MS shared the options in terms of supporting children with additional needs such as a nurture-based teaching room. These are being trialled at other local schools • The SEND team will present full progress data in Autumn Term

#	AGENDA ITEM
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The team shared case studies of students and this is helpful to understand the needs of the children • There was a recent SEND complaint and recommendations from the panel were reviewed. <p>Governor Questions:</p> <p><i>At the recent Governor SEND Conference the questions ‘Are the children with the most need spending time with the most qualified teachers?’ was raised.</i></p> <p><i>What is the predicted increase in SEND and will PAN affect the level of need? There have been more EHCP in Year R since COVID. There is a hope that it will improve. There are speech and language needs.</i></p> <p>Did the inclusion team feel supported by the governor’s recommendations from the panel? Yes, they felt supported and felt the recommendations were fair.</p>
8.	<p>Policies & Documents</p> <p>All policies were updated prior to the meeting based on governor comments placed on the GVO.</p> <p>8.1 ECT Induction – this is submitted pending an amend. This was approved.</p> <p>8.2 Anti-bullying – this was approved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governors reflected on the accessibility of the policy to parents and carers • Governors discussed the potential to use PING • Governors discussed bullying incidents outside of school and BM confirmed that this would be dealt with on a case by case basis • The next review will align to a federated policy <p>GVO Questions and Commentary:</p> <p><i>What steps do the school take to involve parents and carers in developing this policy? Is it just through the governors or does the school provide other opportunities for parents and carers to be involved in the actual formation/development of policy and procedure?</i></p> <p><i>Just a suggestion when formulating whole school policy alongside the websites useful links - an attachment with a list of Anti -Bullying books with appropriate ages for staff and parents/carers.</i></p> <p>The school involves representatives from the School Council to contribute to and input into the policy as well as using the SAWASS (Safe and Well at School Survey) and in KS2 'Bounce' Wellbeing Survey which is used to share pupils’ views on how pupils feels the school is keeping them safe.</p> <p>8.3 Lettings Policy – this has been benchmarked against other schools. MS shared the increase in lettings charges. This was approved by F&L and it was agreed to remove the TOCA from the appendix.</p> <p>8.4 Complaints – this was approved</p> <p>8.5 Security – this was approved</p>
9.	<p>AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next Meeting – Tuesday 11th July at School Road • Reminder for governors to respond to the governor survey • Reminder for governors to update the skills audit on GVO • Items for the next meeting: