

Ratified

St Andrew's C E Primary School

London Road, Headington,

Oxford, OX3 9ED

Telephone: 01865-762396

www.st-andrews-pri.oxon.sch.uk

governors@st-andrews-pri.oxon.sch.uk



We believe that 'Everyone is different. Everyone is special'. As Jesus taught us to love unconditionally, so we strive to nurture respect for all; to provide a rich and stimulating curriculum that considers the individual; and to care for the intellectual, social and spiritual well-being of our whole school community - encouraging positive engagement with the wider world, as affirmed through our school values and parable of the Good Samaritan.

Jesus said, "Love the Lord your God ...!" and, "Love your neighbour as yourself." Luke 10:27

Our inclusive values and ethos shape everything we do. Our school policies give structure to the community we are building, where diversity is celebrated and where children of all faiths, and none, benefit from the very best start in education.

**Meeting of the Full Governing Body
held on Thursday, 7th December 2023 at 7 pm at the school.**

Present:	Sam Callard (SC)	Staff Governor
	James Carter (JC)	Co-opted Governor
	Anneka Fisher (AF)	Co-opted Governor
	Jo Holmes (JH)	Staff Governor, Head
	Bruce Huggett (BH)	Foundation Governor
	Fr Darren McFarland (DM)	Foundation Governor, Chair
	Georgina Montgomery (GM)	Parent Governor
	Amanda Robertson (AR)	Parent Governor

In Attendance: Lucy Dickinson (**LD**) Clerk (attended via Teams)

The meeting was quorate (8 Governors were present out of 13 in post).

		ACTION
1.& 2.	Welcome and Apologies for absence DM welcomed Governors to the meeting. Apologies were received and accepted from Aarti Basnyat (AB : Parent Governor), Michael Dent (MD : Co-opted Governor), Sarah Haden (SH : Parent Governor), Elizabeth Hurran (EH : Parent Governor and Jennifer Strawbridge (JS : Foundation Governor). Ros Smith (RS : Local Authority Governor) has completed her current term of office. The meeting started at 7.00pm.	
3.	Notified Business: none.	
4.	Pecuniary interests and Declarations: none declared for this agenda. The Governor Hub records have been cleared ready for updating for the current academic year – SC, JC, MD, AF, SH, LH, AR, and JS to check that any declarations are up to date (click on the arrow to the right of the red 'not declared' button in your profile, add any new ones and click to confirm or click on the 'I have no interests to declare' button).	SC, JC, MD, AF, SH, LH, AR, and JS
5.	Minutes of meeting held on 12th October 2023	

Signed..... Dated.....

	DM went through the minutes of the meeting dated 12 th October 2023, which were agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting. DM signed and will pass to LD at the next meeting. LD to send ratified version to Jane Burd for uploading to website.	LD- done
6.	<p>Matters arising not covered elsewhere on the agenda</p> <p>Head teacher's appraisal panel met (DM, MD, and JS) with Karen Metcalfe (Diocesan advisor) and JH. They agreed that JH had met all the objectives from last year's appraisal and set objectives for the coming year. There will be an intermediate review meeting during next year.</p> <p>EH to attend meeting regarding the EYFS class move – carry forwards?</p>	<p>Panel</p> <p>EH</p>
7.	<p>Head teacher's report</p> <p>The report had been circulated, and JH took questions from Governors:</p> <p><i>Q. Governors had a long discussion about attendance at the last FGB meeting and talked about drawing up a letter to all parents from Governors. Are we now in a position to go ahead with this?</i></p> <p><i>A. Yes. It was also noted that the Parent Survey has also been completed, so it feels as though there is space for another letter from Governors. JH also noted that attendance figures were improved compared to this time last year, although there had still been a significant amount of illness. One anticipated long absence due to holiday had been cut short.</i></p> <p><i>Q. Is it also possible to see attendance figures for particular groups, such as pupils with SEND or PP?</i></p> <p><i>A. Yes, JH does get these figures weekly and could report them back to Governors. It was noted that the PP report (item 8) does mention attendance. JH agreed that attendance would have an impact on progress, and also noted that for some SEND pupils there are also medical problems which result in lower attendance. However, she didn't feel that PP attendance was significantly lower than that for the rest of the school.</i></p> <p><i>Q. Is there any additional funding for pupils with English as an Additional Language (EAL) and any information on how this might impact on identifying any SEN for these children?</i></p> <p><i>A. There is no additional funding for pupils with EAL. This is less of an issue for those joining lower down the school, as the nature of Reception is that there is lots of continuous provision and play through learning, so it is easier to tell if there is an additional need. It is more challenging for those joining higher up the school. We need to wait longer (until their linguistic capacity has developed) before we are able to test for SEN and apply for additional funding.</i></p> <p><i>Q. How many pupils arrive with little or no English?</i></p> <p><i>A. Not a huge number, but a steady trickle, usually by Year 5. There are relatively large numbers as a percentage of each class, but not really enough to take them out for separate intervention groups, and we feel that they adapt and pick up the language better by remaining in class and absorb the language there. Although we don't have a special program for EAL, it was noted that there are staff with relevant experience (e.g. started as TEFL teachers etc.) and some extra training for teachers is taking place this year to explore how to manage provision going forward.</i></p> <p><i>Q. Looking at the staffing information, could JH explain the high allocation of TAs for year 4?</i></p> <p><i>A. This is directly linked to the number of children with EHCPs in the class – in general the TAs are linked to specific pupils, although we are also looking at how</i></p>	

Signed..... Dated.....

	<p><i>to manage staffing even more creatively as there are high levels of need in this class, even beyond the pupils with EHCPs.</i></p> <p><i>Q. Could JH talk a little about the progress and attainment data from the IDSR on page 5?</i></p> <p><i>A. Highlights are that the school is significantly above National in progress in all areas. For this cohort (the Year 6 class who left in July) this means progress from KS1 (Year 2 SATs) was in at least the top 86th percentile in all subjects). The second table shows attainment, which is not significantly different to National (but still in the top 64th percentile or higher for all subjects in KS1 and KS2). JH also noted that even where the attainment figures were very high – e.g. Writing in KS1 which is in the 90th percentile, this is still in line with National – suggesting that there is not much of a spread nationally.</i></p> <p>The change in acronym from SPAG (spelling, punctuation, and grammar) to EGPS (English grammar, punctuation, and spelling) was noted.</p>	
<p>8.</p>	<p>Pupil Premium report and strategy</p> <p>The report had been circulated - this is statutory and requires Governor ratification for publication on the website. RS, as PP Link Governor, had met with JH to prepare the statement. The number of eligible children changes constantly (and has changed since this report was written), and the current 3-year plan finishes in 2024. The plan sets out the challenges, including that the percentage of pupils (12%) and therefore the grant received is relatively low compared to some schools. JH to check whether attendance is still an issue for any of the pupils in this cohort (see discussion in item 7).</p> <p>JH noted that page 4 included some initiatives which had been tried earlier in the three-year period, including the reading champion and oracy lead – updates were highlighted in blue to show how these initiatives had been adapted following changes in staffing. Some programs which had been trialled (such as the NELI phonics program) had been stopped as they were not felt to be successful and had detracted from the rest of the phonics program.</p> <p>The strategy will be revised from scratch next year when the school will lose the large Year 6 cohort which also has the largest number of PP pupils – this will cause a significant further decrease in funding. The challenge of getting parents to apply was noted – the office staff are very good at sensitively supporting parents who may have a change in circumstances and helping them to apply for the funding. However, JH also thinks that many families would be on the border of being eligible, but parents are working shifts in order to manage financially and share childcare.</p> <p><i>Q. What level of overlap is there between PP and those with EHCPs?</i></p> <p><i>A. Not a significant one – parents of children with EHCP can apply for any school and tend to choose St Andrew’s for its small size.</i></p> <p><i>Q. What is the process with regards to Children We Care For, and does this come under the PP report?</i></p> <p><i>A. Yes, that is included in this report. The PP funding follows the child, but if the placement breaks down and they subsequently move to another school (or have moved to St Andrew’s from elsewhere) and the PP money has already been spent, this is not generally clawed back if the school can evidence they have spent it (although SEN funding has been clawed back under these circumstances). Since the budget year is different to the academic year, the money is not clawed back then either. JH also noted that this cohort also includes children being cared for by special guardians.</i></p> <p>Page 6 onwards outlines the proposed spending for this year which links in with the SDP – supporting phonics training, purchase of Read Write Inc (RWI)</p>	<p>JH</p>

	<p>resources (which are expensive – but necessary in order to be consistent in the use of a system), after school tutoring by the HLTA, using experienced TAs and staff members and supporting the double Year 6 cohort many of whom will need financial support to go on the residential.</p> <p><i>Q. Do we have a feel for the percentage of the grant being spent on staffing?</i></p> <p><i>A. JH said almost half (£28,000)</i></p> <p><i>Q. What do you think makes the biggest difference?</i></p> <p><i>A. JH acknowledged that high quality staffing should benefit all the children, so that in terms of specific benefit for PP children, the extra-curricular activities and support for going on trips might make the biggest impact. There was a discussion about how much easier it is to evidence the impact of high-quality teaching through outcomes, whereas the wider experiences might be more difficult to quantify. The research on the national tutor funding had supported the approach of using existing school staff for the targeted catch-up and small group interventions as they already know the children and the school strategies.</i></p> <p><i>Q. Is there any way to measure the impact of wider strategies, for example, enabling a PP child to attend the residential?</i></p> <p><i>A. It is obviously easier to correlate number of tutoring hours and look at academic progress, but use of Pupil Voice to record the effect of participation in wider activities can also be seen through writing, encouraging staff to be reflective and not lose track of the ‘softer’ outcomes. Last year some of the grants used to support pupils going on the residential had required children to write up their experiences – these, along with emails from parents could also be collected.</i></p> <p>Governors approved the report for publication on the website.</p>	
<p>9.</p>	<p>SEND/Safeguarding presentation and discussion</p> <p>Following the discussion at the last FGB meeting, SH had been into school and given a helpful session on autism which was much appreciated by staff and which the school would like to be able to offer to TAs and parents. Governors asked about some of the other sessions which had covered some of the SEN areas. JH said various sessions had taken place including with the home school link worker, a parents/Family Links style training for parents of younger children and a Swift session specifically for parents of children with autism – this had been well received and led to supportive meetups and a WhatsApp group. JH said they are considering running this again.</p> <p>JC agreed to talk more about the links between SEND and Safeguarding and subsequently sent the slides which he used:</p> <p>https://app.governorhub.com/document/65730b26c5c06fc0290c53be/view</p> <p>JC outlined why children with SEND might be more vulnerable to Safeguarding concerns and at increased risk of abuse and neglect. He was not suggesting that all children with SEND were in danger but noted that as a cohort they tend to be more socially isolated, many need intimate care and are physically or emotionally dependent on caregivers. Due to their SEN they may have less ability to communicate, and less understanding to recognise that they are being abused.</p> <p>The dynamics with professionals can also be complicated as there may be long-term relationships and interactions with families which lead to greater empathy and make it harder for professionals to be objective about the home situations. There can also be complications due to assuming that the behaviour which might be manifested due to abuse is assumed to be part of the SEN condition, and if there are medical needs which include use of equipment, the physical impacts of abuse (bruising etc) might be attributed to the equipment (or the other way around).</p>	

Signed..... Dated.....

	<p>JC then reminded Governors about the outcome of the Ofsted inspection of the SEND partnership which took place earlier in the year and described a systemic leadership failure and high level of variability in experiences, as well as the feeling that families’ voices were not heard, and their concerns were not being adequately addressed. He outlined the priority action plan which is now publicly available https://news.oxfordshire.gov.uk/draft-priority-action-plan and explained that a re-inspection will occur within 18 months. The plan focuses on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making sure that any strategy is informed by children and families’ voices • Stronger connections between health and social care, including more effective sharing of information, but also more consistent use of language and greater consistency in approach (which might require workforce development). JC mentioned the issue with different groups of professionals using different approaches (restorative justice, trauma informed practise, mentalisation etc) and also having different understandings of what these mean. • Improved timelines and effectiveness for EHCPs – this is a very delayed process, and while it is taking place schools absorb all the cost for additional support and families feel frustrated and not supported. JH expressed concern that the pursuit of speed resulted in increased numbers of requests without associated need and support and delivery for young people. JC said that the push in the priority action plan was around early help and intervention and more inter-agency working. However he acknowledged that parents and carers did feel that the only way to get support was through an EHCP, so this is an area which will require particular focus. • Commissioning – are bought in services really meeting needs? • Transition – at all ages (nursery to primary, primary to secondary and then into adulthood) <p>JH discussed feedback from parents at the school and explained that as a result staff would be looking at the individual plans for pupils with SEN They would split the plans out into two different documents – one for the school with detailed data tracking, monitoring impact of interventions etc and the other pupil profile aimed at helping parents to understand progress and support learning outside school.</p> <p>JC mentioned the parent carers forum, and the fact that they are now involved at every level, but that the relationship between families and the County provision needs a lot of work. He also mentioned the many initiatives which have disappeared in the last decade (Sure Start etc) and feels that the national discussion has shifted to recognise the gaps in social care with the start of programs such as Pathfinder. He does feel that everyone is determined to get it right, but also frustration that so many services have been cut. The new assistant director and director are highly thought of. JH also mentioned a recent meeting with ODST and a local primary school within the Headington partnership looking at ideas for nurture rooms, how to meet needs and work together.</p>	
<p>10.</p>	<p>Budget monitoring</p> <p>BH had provided a written report and noted that this had been discussed at FPP and the picture was positive. The P6 figures included the all the finalised pay rises for teaching and support staff, which was one of the main areas of risk when setting the annual budget. The school is now £36k better off than anticipated in the original budget, so there should be a surplus to carry forward.</p> <p>The Capital Budget had £16,058 carried forward from 2022-23, and there is annual income of £6,700. It is projected that £6,500 of the capital budget will be spent this year, on ICT equipment.</p>	
<p>11.</p>	<p>Pay statement for Head and teachers at 1 September 2023 (after national pay review)</p>	

Signed..... Dated.....

	<p>All appraisals have been completed, and some merit awards have gone through and been included in recent pay packages.</p>	
<p>12.</p>	<p>Reports from committees and Governors with special responsibilities:</p> <p>12.1 Teaching Learning Inclusion and Safeguarding: draft minutes had been circulated and AF highlighted the main areas, including discussion of the positive feedback from the School Improvement Partner (included with the papers for this meeting).</p> <p>BH raised a query about the final line of the minutes regarding IT – this should read ‘it’ (in reference to history week and Black History month and not wanting to introduce areas in a tokenistic manner). There was a discussion about diversity in the curriculum and the good practise in looking at literacy books and key texts to ensure diversity. JH said this was easier in some areas of the curriculum than others, for instance the history curriculum being British History is relatively prescribed and more limited – goes from Stone Age to Vikings, however more diverse topics are covered elsewhere for example when considering values or other subject areas, such as Windrush in KS1. This will continue to be a focus and could be considered in assemblies and other ways.</p> <p>12.2 Finance Personnel Premises (including H&S and Well-being): draft minutes had been circulated.</p> <p>BH gave a verbal update on the boiler (there had been a problem with the control panel) but this has been replaced and is working. JH explained the cycles used for the heating and how use is timed to be effective but keep costs down. The windows have also been looked at, but replacement costs would be high – the use of sealant will be considered, but in fact all but one window is double glazed. The position of the new boiler may cause a noise issue so an acoustic survey will be carried out and double glazing considered for the nearby window. Installation of the boiler and heat pump expected in March 2024.</p> <p>Lighting in the alleyway – following the previous FPP meeting, OCC reversed their decision, and decided they could not afford the £22k cost of the solution their engineers had proposed. So the school are experimenting with the use of solar-powered motion-detected lights, costing £35. The results so far are encouraging although it is foreseen that these may need to be regularly replaced – the school will ask OCC for funding towards a solution the school has identified.</p> <p>Co-op redevelopment proposal – the appeal for the revised application is now open for comments on the National Planning Inspectorate cases portal (this will be included in a Parent Mail, and BH will draft a response from Governors). Governors encouraged to submit individual responses.</p> <p>H&S – Jane Burd is putting together some training for staff on simple areas (safe handling etc.) following the OCC inspection on 4 December.</p> <p>12.3 Safeguarding: the group had met, and minutes will be circulated when they have been checked by JH. The separate termly Safeguarding letters to parents have now stopped, with Safeguarding being incorporated into the regular newsletters. The Safer Recruitment policy has been updated to ensure it is in line with the 2023 version of KCSiE including addition of social media checks.</p> <p>An ESAT digital monitoring sheet will be added into the Safeguarding meetings and reviewed annually to look at recent initiatives to keep up to date with recent ICT changes to ensure compliance.</p> <p>JH discussed the Safeguarding audit and changes and actions for this year including Filtering and Monitoring of IT, additional training around Neglect and Voice of the Child, and an additional question raised with ESAT around Safeguarding of children coming from overseas. The CPOMS system has baseline requirements – completing these is more difficult for children moving to the school from abroad. Refugee families usually have a social worker, but other</p>	<p>BH</p> <p>JH/JC</p>

Signed..... Dated.....

	<p>children moving from overseas may have academic records but nothing on Safeguarding. The ESAT team said there was no documented advice on this area, schools were asked to do the best they can to get information. It was noted that even within the UK where arrangements are in place, thresholds may vary, and schools need to continue to alert to what they don't know – this is covered anyway by the established Safeguarding mindset. It was also noted that the total number of children with concerns remains similar to last year. JH feels that the number of strengths and needs assessment taking place with families means that things don't escalate to needing a referral and JC agreed that this was the case for St Andrew's compared with some other schools/areas where more referrals might be made which don't meet the threshold because the schools are less able to do the early work (such as that done on attendance with the home-school link worker) to lower the number of referrals which are made.</p> <p>LD asked Governors to check their confirmations for the Safeguarding Policy.</p> <p>12.4 Ethos committee: the group met (AF had joined) and approved their Terms of Reference (ToRs) – included in the meeting folder. There will be new SIAMs training in the New Year, after which Breeze Band will present to FGB. The school is not currently in the inspection window (but is likely to be in the 2024-25 academic year).</p> <p>12.5 Communications group: the results of the parent survey had been discussed at TLIS and JC had provided some written analysis which compared the results with those from 2021 (the same survey was not carried out last year, as this was done as part of the Ofsted inspection). It was felt that the results last time were affected by the fact that the school was still moving out of the lockdowns, but in any case there were no significant decreases this time, and some several significant improvements. Governors felt that many areas were really excellent and should be celebrated.</p> <p>The only result for which agreement was somewhat lower than the others was bullying – 63% said the school dealt with this quickly and effectively. No-one disagreed, but the other 37% (equating to 2 children of the 6 families who said there has been bullying) said they did not agree or disagree. This is still an improvement of 30% on 2021.</p> <p>Notable improvements included the increase in parents feeling that there was a good range of subjects (up 9% from 84% to 93%), opportunity to take part in clubs and societies (up 11% from 82% to 93%), support for SEND (up 16% to 94%). The proportion of people raising concerns did increase – this might be because there were more concerns, or because people felt more able to raise issues now. The response rate was similar to 2021 and there were less differences between year groups.</p> <p>JH is looking to respond to some of the written comments by addressing particular themes in upcoming newsletters and give some information about how the school might respond. She mentioned some specific concerns about healthiness of school lunches (inclusion of dessert – which JH said was partly due to trying to increase uptake), the move to electronic homework for some subjects. Governors also suggested the possibility of drop-in sessions for parents to raise concerns, as this might feel more accessible than making an appointment.</p> <p>12.6 HQFSS move to St Andrew's: an EYFS advisor had visited to look at the area to ensure that it was set up in an appropriate way for Reception age children and that the budget would be wisely used – this might include lower handles, soap dispensers etc.</p>	<p>Govs</p> <p>Agenda</p>
<p>13.</p>	<p>Chair's items: none</p>	

Signed..... Dated.....

14.	Head’s items including Health & Safety updates: none.	
15.	<p>Academy status: following the discussion at the last FGB meeting the school had a visit from Anne Dellar, the CEO of Oxford Diocesan Trust, who did a tour of the school and spoke with DM and JB about what it would involve to join the Trust. She will be invited to speak to Governors at a future meeting, and the River Learning Trust will also be approached as the other obvious possibility.</p> <p>Governors were encouraged to think about the kind of questions which they would need to ask and areas to explore – including the ‘top slice’ which is taken by different Trusts to fund central services (5% in the case of ODST), what this funding covers and how it compares to other Trusts (JH has also discussed this with the school bursar who also works with schools from other Trusts). JH and JB are also working out how much the school spends on buyback services from OCC in order to compare costs. There will also be differences in finance, HR, buildings and conditions checks (ODST do site checks on all schools every 5 years). There will be questions for the FGB about autonomy and what areas the Local Governing Body would continue to manage compared to what is controlled centrally by Trustees. SEN and PP funding would still come directly, but other funding might be managed by the Trust so that site improvements might not be at the top of the Trust’s priority list.</p> <p>Governors agreed that Anne should be invited to the next FGB meeting.</p> <p>The process would be for Governors to do the initial work then make a proposal which would go to public consultation with parents and other stakeholders while further due diligence takes place. If started now, the earliest the school might join would be around October 2024 (the LA doesn’t do conversions for September).</p> <p>JH to circulate electronic copy of the information on joining ODST left by AD and to see if a similar document is available for RLТ. Schemes of delegation which give some indication of the level of Governor autonomy will also be available from the Trust websites (e.g. https://riverlearningtrust.org/information/).</p> <p>Governors shared anecdotal information from interactions with both the proposed Trusts including flexibility for schools to develop their own curriculum, policies etc. Staff should also think about staffing opportunities/requirements. Governors were reminded that although the school is a Church school, they don’t have to join the ODST, and all reasons should be considered. It was noted that Academy status has always been a standing item on the agenda and this status and options are just being explored.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Agenda</p> <p style="text-align: center;">JH</p>
16.	Governor vacancies: there is now one co-opted governor vacancy and RS’s current term of office as LA governor has ended. DM had clarified with Governor Services the process for nomination (which is made by the County via the local Councillor) and appointment of LA governors (which is done by the Governing Body). He will now go back to RS to discuss her capacity for future involvement and the commitment required, particularly for the coming work on the potential joining of a Trust and given her involvement with other local schools.	
17.	Governor training: Governors were encouraged to keep an eye out for the Governor Services emails with upcoming courses and to sign up for anything relevant. AB needs to do the Governor Induction B course, and AF , GM , and AR have not taken or booked any induction courses. At least 3 governors have Safer Recruitment training. GM has done the Prevent training course. The OCC courses for 2024 can now be booked through Governor Hub.	
19.	Governor visits: reports have been uploaded by GM (looking at phonics and reading – with some suggestions made for funding for headphones in the library), JC (to discuss Safeguarding with the children, with a particular focus on vulnerable learners and children with SEND and felt that the student voice really	

Signed..... Dated.....

Ratified

	backed up the information given to Governors by SLT) and AF went to see Phonics in Reception and will submit a report once checked by Annie Arnold.	
20.	Headington Partnership: nothing to report	
21.	Discussion: what decisions have been made which further the aims and vision of the school? Examined and challenged on PP/disadvantaged Listened to Parent Voice, including on SEND Talked about diversity within the curriculum.	
17.	Review of items for next meeting (1 February 2024): visit from CEO of the ODST, sports funding report, SFVS, benchmarking.	

The meeting finished at 9.20 pm

Signed..... Dated.....