



Standards and Effectiveness Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on
Wednesday 10th May 2023 at 18:00 in school

Present Ben Sutton (Headteacher) Anna Riach (Acting Chair)
Mark Newman Claire Scott-South (Deputy Headteacher)

In Attendance Lesley Irving (Governance Clerk)

		Action						
1	<p>WELCOME, APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE, CONSENTS AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>Everyone was welcomed to the meeting. Apologies, with consent, were received from Luke Zwalf and the Committee Chair, Dave Hardcastle.</p> <p>Anna Riach agreed to Chair the meeting in Dave's absence.</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p> <p>The Clerk advised that the meeting was quorate. She also explained that the appointment of a new co-opted governor was due to be ratified at the next FGB, on 24th May. As a new parent governor had also been recently appointed, it was hoped that both the Standards and Effectiveness and Resources Committees would each have one additional member shortly.</p>							
2	<p>MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD ON 16TH JANUARY 2023, MATTERS ARISING AND ACTION PLAN <i>Previously distributed</i></p> <p>The minutes of the meetings held on 16th January 2023 were agreed as true and accurate records and were duly approved.</p> <p>There were no matters arising.</p> <p>Action Plan</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th><th>Action</th><th>Update</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1.</td><td>Add colour index to Standards and Effectiveness Headline Report.</td><td>Carry forward. The Headteacher advised a key would be added at the start of the S&E agendas on Decision Time.</td></tr> </tbody> </table>		Action	Update	1.	Add colour index to Standards and Effectiveness Headline Report.	Carry forward. The Headteacher advised a key would be added at the start of the S&E agendas on Decision Time.	HT
	Action	Update						
1.	Add colour index to Standards and Effectiveness Headline Report.	Carry forward. The Headteacher advised a key would be added at the start of the S&E agendas on Decision Time.						
3	<p>SPRING DATA ANALYSIS <i>Previously distributed</i></p> <p>The Headteacher noted that individual focus group breakdowns had been previously distributed in respect of Pupil Premium, special educational needs and</p>							

disabilities (SEND) and Early Years pupils. He distributed paper copies of the individual focus group breakdowns in relation to all pupils to governors.

The Headteacher explained that collective questions and observations had been collated from the Special Educational Needs Coordinator (SENCo), Key Stage 2 Lead and Early Years and Key Stage 1 Lead in advance of the meeting. The Headteacher noted the points raised:

The success rate of Pupil Premium pupils in Year 5, was 75%. The question raised was whether they could explain the reason for this apparent success rate. The Headteacher explained that this was in relation to a small number of pupils and gave details about the varying level of need of those children. He pointed out that the gap between Pupil Premium and non-Pupil Premium children was difficult to shift, with the approach tending to be that the Pupil Premium funding and grants increased, however the successes did not. He confirmed that the school had started to introduce initiatives to support these children, much in relation to mindset, and that the school did not put limits on what they thought children could achieve. They needed to ensure the scaffolding was in place and that wave one teaching was right, in the first instance. He referenced a brief model example in the Essex report; a framework which looked at barriers, relationships, expectations and feedback, and stated that the school would need to ensure that they were applying these.

A governor commented that Pupil Premium became a 'catch all' for numerous issues and that the key was that barriers were being addressed. The Headteacher agreed, adding that the children all had very different stories.

A governor asked whether there were any examples of the successes they'd had. The Headteacher replied that Pupil Premium funding was not directly aimed at individuals, but at the school, so that the provision could be improved upon. The children at Dringhouses had all had access to intervention groups. The intervention group staffing was funded by Pupil Premium funding. For Teaching Assistants, there needed to be structured interventions in place for these to be funded.

The Headteacher explained that for service children, their offer was more focussed around emotional support; because they had found that when parents were deployed, there tended to be an emotional impact for children. He gave an example of a child in school who required emotional as opposed to academic support.

A governor asked whether the provision was targeted to the individual child's level of need. The Headteacher confirmed that they reviewed barriers, relationships and what they needed to do during teaching and learning reviews.

A governor queried whether each child would have a teaching and learning profile. The Deputy Headteacher confirmed that children would be within the teaching and learning profile. This was one of the reasons why it had been successful; they could ensure they were targeting children with questioning and marking.

A further question which had been raised prior to the meeting related to Writing in Year 2. The Headteacher stated that they were aware that 59% was a considerably lower result than for non-Pupil Premium children, however they knew that the trajectory was increasing. The Deputy Headteacher advised that regarding the expectations for the end of Year 2 results for Writing; there were many elements

needed to be deemed as working at the expected level and that they attended additional moderation sessions to ensure that their judgements had been accurate.

A governor questioned whether judgements were made from Key Stage 1 SATs results, to which the Deputy Headteacher responded that some were, however there were no SATs papers for Writing.

A governor queried whether the trajectory was due to the autumn data showing lower results than the spring data. The Headteacher confirmed this, adding that girls had outperformed boys in Reading and Writing, across the year groups. Girls had outperformed boys in Maths in Years 1, 4, 5 and 6, and boys had outperformed girls in Reception, Year 1 and Year 2. He added that these results were typical.

A governor asked whether girls outperforming boys was reflected in results nationally. The Headteacher confirmed this, adding that the data was always the same. He went on to say that the results were often the other way around for Maths; there were some boys who outperformed girls. The Maths Leads in Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 had identified that increasing girls' confidence in Maths needed to be worked upon. Referring to the School Development Plan (SDP), the Headteacher confirmed that they had focussed on Reading last year and that this was now a sustained target. Writing had then become the focus for this year. If Reading and Writing became secure, it could be that Maths became the focus.

A governor commented that the obvious issues were with Reading and Writing, not Maths. The Deputy Headteacher described some of the SEN need in the lower year groups, noting that the majority of those children were boys. She noted that staff were focussing on what they were doing for those children.

A governor pointed out that the gender gap in Reception was lower than in the following years and asked how they could capitalise on this. The Deputy Headteacher explained that part of the issue was that expectations increased over the years. She noted that it was their first year using the new phonics scheme and that it would be interesting, as they used this again next year, to see how this supported the transition from Early Years to Year 1. They had also introduced whole class phonic reading lessons this year. The Deputy Head said that she felt that the scheme they had bought into would support the development of reading fluency, however comprehension expectations were different. They had changed how they grouped children together in Year 1; pupils were grouped according to their ability and were then given support to catch up. There was also an intervention programme in place with several SEN Year 1 boys.

A governor queried whether they would like to extend the phonics scheme further. The Deputy Headteacher advised that this had only been released for Reception and Year 1 but would also be used for Year 2, next year. They would need to closely monitor the impacts over the next few years.

A governor questioned whether governors should consider whether additional resources were needed, in order to extend the programme. The Deputy Headteacher responded that they were working with it, at the moment. They'd had good support from the scheme's providers, changed how they taught phonics in school and had added in extra resource. This was something they could potentially

consider in the future however they would monitor results over the next few years.

The Headteacher summarised that, looking at the breakdown of Maths and English data in Early Years, boys still outperformed girls in Maths; in terms of number pattern and numerically. Girls were doing better than boys for word reading but boys were applying phonics for writing than girls. He added that this could be very cohort dependent, however.

Referring to feedback raised by the SENCo prior to the meeting, the Headteacher advised that she had said that the data from summer 2022 to spring 2023 was difficult to read, as they had moved from reporting on attainment to progress made. The Headteacher explained that they had changed their method of assessment. A final attainment judgement had been made last year, based on Greater Depth understanding, Expected level of understanding and whether children were Working Towards 2 (almost at expected) or Working Towards 1 (the child needed more help).

A governor asked what 'expected' progress was based on. The Headteacher confirmed that this was based on the standard of work. He explained that the school were now using a point in time assessment system, which showed whether children were making the expected levels of progress, working towards or exceeding these levels. This allowed staff to make judgements that children were not making the progress needed and that they would need to take steps to make improvements. Overall, the majority of children had reached the expected standard at the end of last year; based on judgements and their expected level of progress. They weren't able to compare progress scores from the end of last year, but this would be possible in autumn 2023/spring 2024.

In response to a question from a governor, the Headteacher confirmed that staff could see each pupil's individual progress results.

The Headteacher referred to a question asked previously in relation to why the SEN data in Year 2 and Year 6 would have dropped. He explained that the child who had suspensions; as discussed earlier in the meeting, was within this cohort. He advised that there were also two EAL (English as an additional language) pupils who had joined the school earlier in the year within this data. Year 4 Writing data had also reduced, due to a child joining the school from with very low levels of literacy.

The Headteacher explained that there was an increase in the number of children who were presenting in far more challenging ways, relating to social and emotional mental health issues. He explained that external alternative provision was in place for those pupils and described some of the individual need of the children and what support had been put into place.

A governor commented that the increased level of need seem to be nationwide. The Headteacher agreed. He explained that provision was not available within the school, however they had looked at repurposing spaces throughout the school. He added that the Local Authority were increasing their level of SEN support and had appointed a new Head of SEN. He noted that in every meeting with maintained Headteachers, there was a discussion about how they were supporting SEN children with how they were funding this.

A governor questioned whether the increased level of need had been due to the pandemic. The Headteacher replied that it was a contributory factor but not the only reason. He noted that the number of children in York who had been diagnosed with autism exceeded the national average, however unfortunately the provision in place did not. Although there were plans to address some of these shortfalls within the City, it was not known how many children would be able to access the new provision being built. In addition, a lower level of need did not trigger a multi-level response.

A governor asked for more information about the funding for lower need children. The Headteacher explained that there were different levels of banding. The school allocated the first £6k of support for children, which was equivalent to approximately 15 hours, then the Local Authority topped this up, according to the level of banding. In some cases, for example a Looked After Child, access to the Virtual School in York, who would oversee the provision, would be allowed. The school could then apply to the Virtual School for additional funding if necessary.

The Headteacher explained that the SENCo was doing a lot more now and that they planned to increase her non-contact time from three days to two days, from next year.

A governor asked whether this was enough time for the SENCo, to which the Headteacher responded that she had been happy with the proposal. It would allow her to be in classes supporting teachers. One of her targets was 'everybody is a teacher of SEN'. She could support with the coordination and development of this.

The Headteacher advised that the Assistant Headteacher had forwarded a comment relating to Key Stage 2 data prior to the meeting. She had asked what they could do to support the children with the lowest results in Writing. The Headteacher explained that Writing was a focus within their development plan; there were continuing to develop what writing looked like for the school and that this would be reviewed at the end of the year.

A further comment received from the Assistant Headteacher in advance of the meeting was in relation to Key Stage 2 greater depth results. She had pointed out that the number of children achieving greater depth standard was smaller, across all year groups, than Reading and Maths. The Assistant Headteacher explained that writing to a greater depth was about writing with flair, which was very hard to teach. It also depended on the child reading a lot at home and their ability to transfer this into their writing. She added that moderation sessions were useful to assess greater depth Writing.

A governor asked what the plans were for moderation. The Headteacher explained that moderation sessions took place annually and that a session had been scheduled for next week. Staff attended moderation sessions for end of key stage year groups.

A governor asked whether the gender gap impacted on greater depth Writing. The Assistant Headteacher confirmed this was correct, and that it was directly related to flair and confidence in writing. The Headteacher explained that over the last two years, they had carefully chosen the texts used in their curriculum units, which they hoped would be engaging for all readers, including boys.

	<p>Referring to the Year 5 Maths results, which showed that 51% of pupils had achieved a greater depth of understanding, the Headteacher explained that the Assistant Headteacher had forwarded a question prior to the meeting asking what had worked so well for them to achieve these results and how could this be replicated. The Headteacher explained that the Year 5 cohort was high performing across many factors. This would be discussed in teaching and learning reviews; whether particular members of staff have had a direct impact, or the different mixed classes in Maths lessons during the year had impacted the results. He added that it would be useful to scrutinise data further at the end of the year.</p> <p>The Headteacher noted that he had experienced some issues relating to rising stars and standardised testing, so this had been a late submission to the report.</p> <p>A governor commented that it would be helpful for the report to include the number of pupils in each cohort, to which the Headteacher agreed.</p> <p>Action: Headteacher to include the number of pupils in each cohort, in the data analysis reports.</p>	HT
4	<p>SCHOOL AIMS <i>Previously distributed</i></p> <p>The Headteacher explained that the school's Aims had been included on the agenda:</p> <p><i>To provide an exciting, inspiring, and safe environment, where a connected curriculum equips our learners for their future.</i></p> <p><i>To develop confident, capable, and resilient learners who recognise and celebrate their successes, and who recognise the value and potential in their setbacks.</i></p> <p><i>To support learners in developing kindness, gratitude and a sense of responsibility: to themselves, to others, and to their communities.</i></p> <p><i>To understand, value, and accept diversity, equality and inclusion. We want our learners and our community to feel empowered through understanding and through action.</i></p> <p><i>To build and maintain our sense of community - as individuals, as a school, and as part of the wider community.</i></p> <p>He had distributed a Vision document from another school, and suggested it would be useful for Dringhouses to implement something similar; a crib sheet to support the school's aims.</p> <p><i>A governor commented that it would be about how they measured against this, what this looked like in practice. A governor stated that KPIs were useful to evidence how they had performed, adding that Pupil voice would be a significant contributing factor.</i></p> <p>Governors confirmed that they were happy with the school's aims as a draft, and agreed that they would not need to measure themselves against each.</p> <p>The Clerk advised that another school she Clerked for had similar conversations</p>	

	<p>recently. They had referenced the NGA's '<i>Being Strategic</i>' guidance; which outlined the key definitions of a school's mission, vision, values and included guidance around creating a strategic plan which linked these together.</p> <p>Governors agreed that this matter should be discussed at the next FGB.</p>	FGB agenda
5	<p>SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN REVIEW</p> <p>The Headteacher explained that play, Writing, Pupil Premium and SEND were a focus on the school improvement plan.</p> <p>He explained that outdoor play and learning (OPAL) had been launched in part and was going very well. Playtimes had been transformed, with less break time behavioural incidents and less children needing first aid. The feedback from children had been very positive.</p> <p>The Headteacher advised that the parent teacher association (PTA) had funded OPAL, who facilitated the project over an 18 month period and ensured that it was sustainable. A working party within school was responsible for overseeing the project together with the facilitator. Staff had been asked to spend half an hour of their break times each week to facilitate the play, for which they were paid. It was noted that this was completely voluntary and would be reviewed at the end of the half term.</p> <p>Full midday supervisory assistant (MSA) training would take place in June, which would result in MSAs engaging with the children.</p> <p>The Headteacher explained than Writing focus groups were taking place and confirmed that this was another of the key areas for this year, covered in the school improvement plan.</p>	
6	<p>QUALITY OF TEACHING</p> <p>The Headteacher explained that a member of staff, who was previously being supported with their teaching and learning, had reverted back to the usual monitoring systems in place.</p> <p>He advised that the senior leadership team aimed to visit each class for five minutes, every half term, and that feedback/questions were then communicated to teachers via email.</p> <p>Responding to a question from a governor, the Headteacher confirmed that the monitoring visits were as informal as possible. The Deputy Headteacher added that they did not want to cause anxiety.</p> <p><i>A governor questioned whether five minutes every half term was enough. The Headteacher responded that feedback was provided in a formalised manner. Staff would then come and speak to the senior leadership team (SLT) or respond by email. He noted that the SLT were around school enough outside of those five minute snapshots, so they were aware what was happening. They also looked at data in teaching and learning reviews, Pupil voice, and looked in books regularly.</i></p> <p><i>A governor commented that it appeared that ceasing lesson observations had been beneficial. The Headteacher confirmed that it had. At the end of the last half term,</i></p>	

	<p>there had been fewer formalised SLT appearances and when they had returned to visit classes, there hadn't been a reduction in the quality of teaching. The approach was sustaining itself.</p> <p><i>A governor asked whether members of staff viewed the visits positively.</i> The Headteacher explained that members of staff did not fear accusations as a result of the visits. If there were issues around the expectations of teaching, a member of staff may not view this positively. In those cases, the SLT added team teaching with senior leaders into the process, which was very successful and could be scaled down.</p> <p>A governor asked when the next staff survey was due to be issued. The Headteacher confirmed that he thought it was due in Autumn. The Headteacher confirmed that he would issue the same staff survey questions but that it would be useful to include questions about the performance management system.</p> <p>Action: check when the next staff survey is due and issue to staff, including questions relating to the staff performance management system.</p>	HT
7	<p>INCLUSION</p> <p>7.1 Behaviour Data <i>Previously distributed</i></p> <p><i>A governor questioned whether the school were getting better at reporting incidents.</i> The Headteacher responded that the school were reporting more frequently and explained that various categories of behaviour were included within the data.</p> <p><i>A governor queried whether some behaviours may be double counted.</i> The Headteacher responded that there would be some reporting inconsistencies, for example whether staff selected verbal or aggressive behaviour against staff or a peer.</p> <p><i>A governor commented that, as a data set, it was confusing. He said that it would be useful to understand the number of sanctions and which behaviours fed into these. Also, how many pupils and/or what percentage of the cohort the data related to.</i></p> <p>Action: Revise the behaviour report to include the number of sanctions, which behaviours fed into these, and the number of pupils/percentage of cohort the data related to.</p> <p>In response to a question from a governor, the Headteacher said that he had no concerns with the data.</p> <p>7.2 Attendance Data <i>Previously distributed</i></p> <p>The Headteacher confirmed that persistent absentee data had been included within the attendance data and that children affected by social, emotional and mental health (SEMH) and some emotional school based avoidance issues had also been included in the figures.</p> <p>The Headteacher explained that multi-agency input was in place for one child and that they were expecting this to be extended to other children. He confirmed that the school tracked changes in attendance to identify where support was needed.</p>	HT

	<p>A brief discussion followed about children who had persistently low attendance and the steps which the school were taking to try and improve the situation.</p> <p><i>A governor commented that the school's attendance was good in comparison to the national average therefore the process must be working.</i></p>	
8	<p>POLICIES</p> <p>Data Protection (Information) Policy</p> <p>The Data Protection (Information) Policy was not yet available for review, so the approval of this Policy was carried forward to the next meeting.</p> <p><i>A governor asked what the mechanism was for reporting in terms of data protection.</i> The Headteacher explained that this was included in his Headteacher's Report and discussed at the FGB.</p>	S&E agenda
9	<p>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</p> <p>There was no other business to report.</p>	
10	<p>DETERMINATION OF CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS</p> <p>There were no items to be recorded as confidential.</p>	
11	<p>DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING</p> <p>Wednesday 19th July 2023 at 18:00 (in school).</p>	

The meeting ended at 19:35.

Minutes to be approved at the Standards and Effectiveness Committee meeting to be held on 19th July 2023.

**Action Plan following the Meeting of the Standards and Effectiveness Committee
held on 10th May 2023 at 18:00**

Action		Item No.	Person	Date
1.	Add colour index key in respect of the Standards and Effectiveness Headline Report, to the agenda on Decision Time.	2.1	Headteacher	5 th July 2023
2.	Include the number of pupils in each cohort, in the data analysis reports.	3	Headteacher	5 th July 2023
3.	Check when the next staff survey is due	6	Headteacher	19 th May 2023
4.	Distribute staff survey, including questions relating to the staff performance management system.	6	Headteacher	Autumn term
5.	Revise the behaviour report to include the number of sanctions, which behaviours fed into these and the number of pupils/percentage of cohort the data related to.	7.1	Headteacher	5 th July 2023

Items for next Committee meeting
Data Protection (Information) Policy

Items for next FGB
School Aims and Vision, linking this to a strategic plan

Awaiting Approval