

NAME	Abrv.	DESIGNATION	Present	NAME	Abrv.	DESIGNATION	Present
Rob Barker	RB	Parent Elected	✓	Mike Ormond	MO	LA Appointed (Chair)	✓
Liz Cannock	LC	Staff	✓	Natalia Sanders	NS	Parent Elected	✓
Helen Doggart	HD	Foundation	✓	Paul Smith	PS	Executive Headteacher	✓
Adele Farrow	AF	Parent Elected	✓				
Russell McAulay	RM	Parent Elected	√				
Olwen Murray	OM	Foundation	Α	Clare Trayler	СТ	Clerk to Governors	✓

 $\checkmark$  = Attended, **A** = Absent with Apologies, **X** = absent no apology O/L = joined meeting on-line

#### Meeting Opened: 18:03 hrs

	Discussion	Actions
1	Welcome         Attendees were welcomed to the meeting. Governors introduced themselves to NS who has joined as a parent governor         Opening Prayer         • HD said a welcome prayer         Apologies         • Apologies received and accepted from OM         Quorum         • The meeting was quorate	
2	<ul> <li>Declaration of Pecuniary Interests</li> <li>No Interests declared for this meeting</li> </ul>	
3	<ul> <li>Minutes of Previous Meeting</li> <li>Minutes from meetings held on 9<sup>th</sup> March circulated in advance of meeting</li> <li>All governors agreed to accept the minutes as true and accurate record</li> </ul>	
4	<ul> <li>Matters Arising</li> <li>Governors to do/repeat online Prevent training module. Download certificate at the end and send copy to CT. Several governors still to complete</li> <li>MO still to arrange for advert to be placed in In View magazine for new governors Methodist circuit approved, Anglican meeting 24 May</li> <li>Once re-constitution approved by Diocese/Circuit CT to send details &amp; evidence of decision/approval to Governor Services</li> <li>HD still to arrange another Foundation committee meeting with Nic B-M/Laura Cox</li> <li>All other actions complete</li> </ul>	Governors to do/repeat Prevent training module MO to arrange for advert for new governors to be placed in In View CT to send details of re-constitution to Gov Services HD to arrange Foundation committee meeting



5	<ul> <li>Chairs Report</li> <li>MO reported the following:-</li> <li>Attended briefing by Andrew Best last week and met with Chairs of</li> </ul>	
	other schools regarding how to approach the government's agenda and white paper on school reforms. Biggest thing for consideration is our partnership with Almondsbury is no longer going to be big enough and should we join something bigger	
	<ul> <li>Feeling is that we need to be much bigger again, without doubt big changes are coming, how we manage our way through this and how to take parents through these changes needs to be our focus</li> <li>Sometime parents think that smaller school can look out for children more closely but in terms of financial arrangements this isn't always</li> </ul>	
	viable Q: Did you come away from this meeting feeling positive or bamboozled? A: Neither, MO advised he likes to be in control but is quite accepting in this instance that control is beyond us and the only way to have any form of control at all is that we should try to get ahead to have some choices before things are pushed upon us. The biggest thing from Andrew Best is that he indicated a move to an academy in one hop would be better than	
	going through the federation route however MO doesn't necessarily agree with this	
6	<ul> <li>Feedback from Sub-Committees</li> <li>Minutes from T&amp;L and Resources committee meetings circulated in advance</li> <li>Foundation Committee</li> <li>Committee have not met since last FGB meeting</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Partnership Steering Group</li> <li>Met on 14<sup>th</sup> March</li> <li>Reviewed usual documents and discussed extending partnership for another year</li> <li>Group meeting again this Wednesday</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Teaching &amp; Learning Committee</li> <li>Met on 7<sup>th</sup> April</li> <li>Looked at pedagogy, several subject policies, work of oracy and writing mederation</li> </ul>	
	moderation Q: The feedback from last governor visit day was circulated for governors to add comments – where is it now? A: MO is collating and will circulate	MO to circulate feedback from last governor visit
	<ul> <li>Resources Committee</li> <li>Met last week</li> <li>Discussed staffing, professional growth review meetings, financial year out-turn and new budget</li> <li>Q: If we fail to appoint for EYFS/KS1 leader position, what is the plan?</li> <li>A: PS has a plan B but we will see how the interviews next week go</li> </ul>	

Signed by Chair:



7	Llaadtaasharia Daxart	
7	Headteacher's Report	
	Reports (including Insight data) circulated in advance	
	Assessments:-	
	<ul> <li>EYFS – pretty static, is going through as we would expect</li> </ul>	
	Q: Is 7% one child?	
	A: Yes	
	<ul> <li>Both children who are well below have SEND issues and issues</li> </ul>	
	with speech and language which is holding them back in terms	
	of phonics	
	<ul> <li>Most areas are moving up at least one child per term</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Consistent progress is being made, as we go through the year,</li> </ul>	
	expectations rise	
	$\circ$ We know that there are probably going to be 3 children who do	
	not meet their early learning goals by the end of the year as	
	they have to achieve all 7 areas	
	Q: EYFS looks good - but are we having enough impact for those lowest	
	performing children? We have moved just 1 child from just below to	
	expected (each child being 7%) across the board?	
	A: The children with SEND impacts the overall results hugely	
	<ul> <li>Rest of school: - reading – positive picture</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Greater depth – we wouldn't usually give this until final</li> </ul>	
	assessment of the year has been done. The children would still	
	be given the access to the work to gather evidence, unless	
	completely secure with everything they wouldn't show on the	
	Insight data as 'above'. There are very few children currently	
	however hopefully this will look different in July. The children	
	haven't been taught all objectives yet. Not possible to give it too	
	early	
	Q: So the greater depth doesn't start early in the year and then grow like	
	expected standard?	
	A: It's possible to give greater depth activities from the beginning of the	
	year however you need to cover the whole range before recording	
	<ul> <li>If children are making more than 1 point progress over a term they are</li> </ul>	
	making good/more than expected progress	
	Q: How is this number calculated?	
	A: It is the average of the score being achieved across the cohort	
	<i>Q: What is the maximum?</i>	
	A: 2 and minimum 1	
	<ul> <li>Y6 have now completed the curriculum which had to be done before</li> </ul>	
	their SATS, we will repeat and consolidate certain aspects for prep for	
	Y7 which will be covered next term so progress should increase	
	<ul> <li>Current Y1 is the lowest attaining cohort, they've just completed</li> </ul>	
	phonics catch up but they haven't had enough time (particularly the	
	lower ability) to consolidate and apply learning on screening yet as if	
	we had started this teaching in September. 55% are already on track to	
	reach target, another 4 children are being targeted. The highest result	
	will probably be 75%	
	Q: What kind of percentage would you expect?	
	A: Last year we achieved 84%, historically in this school it was more like	
	60-70%. Nationally (last result 2019) was 83%, government have set 95%	
L		

Signed by Chair:



threshold from 2020. We have seen a rise in achievement since the	
threshold from 2030. We have seen a rise in achievement since the	
introduction of ELS. We have a group of 6 children who are achieving very	
high results, 4 very low and the rest in the middle	
Q: Do current Reception have that scheme too?	
A: Yes it's across the school and we have recently introduced new spelling	
scheme from Y2 upwards which is showing good early signs	
<ul> <li>Progress across 3 core subjects is improving across the year</li> </ul>	
Q: Yr 1 - Reading and Maths - Covid impact most keenly felt here? One	
child moved from just below to expected; writing better - I'm still struggling	
with how can you close the gap at writing but not at reading?	
A: Yes, this is currently the lowest achieving cohort	
Q: Y5 - maths going backwards – is this due to long term staff absence?	
More honest assessment? Combination of the two?	
A: It's a combination of both really. We are still doing the assessments in	
writing	
Q: Can we do anything else?	
A: We are doing all we can with the current resources	
Governors commented on their appreciation of the presentation of data	
and consistency of information	
<ul> <li>Y2 currently doing SATs. Tests are only an indication of what end of</li> </ul>	
Y2 results will look like	
Y6 SATs took place last week, we will receive results on 5 <sup>th</sup> July	
Q: Have we heard about moderation?	
A: We should have been advised of any external moderation by Friday so	
no we don't think so. We've done moderation as Bridge hub and as SLT	
for Y2 & 6	
Q: Are the KS1 SATS marked externally?	
A: No, just Y6	
New revised planning formats are working well and you can see that in	
the children's books. Some slight variations, apart from few areas, this	
has improved due to staff having input in all of the pedagogy	
Teachers are now really focussing on input for lowest 20% in classes	
Attendance 93.1% although this has gone up slightly over last couple	
of weeks. SAM (statutory attendance meetings) have been taking	
place which has resulted in the majority starting to improve, those who	
are not improving moving towards panel meetings when EWO gets	
involved. There was a section in latest newsletter regarding term time	
holidays as we have been receiving a lot of notifications of these of	
recent	
Q: What qualifies as persistent absence?	
A: Below 90%	
<ul> <li>We have not included Covid absences in those considered as under</li> </ul>	
90%	
<ul> <li>We have a couple of children down as low as high 70/low 80%</li> </ul>	
· · ·	
We have continued to plug away at each item on the improvement	
plans, we've done a lot again in the last 2 terms which is showing	
results	
Q: If we view this as a year of putting in new systems and methods can we	
expect our current strategies to bear fruit next year with tweaks, or do we	
need to change direction? I'm not sure what else we could do?	
Signed by Chair: FGB Minutes 16 <sup>th</sup> May 2022	



	<ul> <li>A: Yes, they are already starting to show results however we should continue to see more going forward. There is no drive to change anything big, we need to embed all the changes that have already been put in place and need to see consistent delivery of all of this to see the consistent progress being made and confidence for teachers in their delivery</li> <li>We are going to be looking at assessments a bit more and the moderation of them. Insight was introduced last summer, then there were changes within that due to some objectives not being correct</li> </ul>	
8	Review of LA Review Recommendations and Rapid School Improvement Plans Plans circulated in advance	
	No questions raised	
9	<ul> <li>Proposed Extension of Partnership Agreement</li> <li>It was proposed that the partnership agreement with Almondsbury be continued for another year with the existing senior leadership arrangements</li> <li>Decision – governors unanimously agreed to extend agreement</li> <li>As a hub of schools (Bridge hub) we have decided to leave the Alliance</li> <li>We were members of the Alliance which was set up by the LA several years ago. It was an umbrella organisation which decided on which CSP we would have and we had to pay for it. We subsequently formed our own hub within the Alliance – The Bridge. There is a lot of CPD and character education development going on within our hub – lots that we set up and will continue and we work together under the new banner of a 'family of schools'</li> <li>Q: Why are we changing the terminology?</li> <li>A: The hub was an Alliance term, in the white paper the government refers to families of schools so we have already started on moving in this direction</li> <li>The white paper says 'All schools will be part of a 'strong family of schools' i.e. a MAT by 2030</li> <li>How MATs are being created going forward is changing, there will be no lead school, all schools Commissioner (RSC)</li> <li>Q: Does that mean we will not be linked with a secondary school?</li> <li>A: Yes, that is part of our plan. Most current MATs in South Glos are run by secondaries. The MAB (maintained architecture board) which PS is a member of is looking at all options. The LA is putting feelers out as LA's can set up MATs now too. We want to maintain and retain our own autonomy and school identities, we do not want a curriculum imposed on us from elsewhere, we don't want to be just a number in a large chain. We want to strengthen as a group/family of schools with a view to working towards a more formal arrangement</li> </ul>	

Signed by Chair:



	<ul> <li>Q: What about leaders/working together in partnership re Maths and other subjects?</li> <li>A: We have worked together in subject areas as a hub already anyway, this will continue</li> <li>Q: We are still a local authority maintained school, with central functions such as HR, payroll etc. provided by the LA?</li> <li>A: Yes, that's correct</li> <li>Decision – it was agreed that the school would continue working with the 'Bridge family of schools' (previously known as 'the Bridge hub') under a more formalised partnership agreement (as detailed in supporting documents).</li> </ul>	
10	<ul> <li>Approval of Budget for 2022/23 Budget forecast report and dashboard circulated in advance</li> <li>Resources committee met last week and discussed the budget</li> <li>We are not out of the woods by a long way yet but we are not in a position to make many changes, the way out of the current situation is to grow the number of pupils in the school</li> <li>We've got a higher number coming in this year than last and equal amount to Severn Beach</li> <li>We hope the improvements in the school will attract even more pupils</li> <li>We need more young families in the area</li> <li>PS met with Richard Edwards from local town planning last week and said that we need more housing and ways to attract more young families to the area</li> <li>There are new businesses moving into business park, PS has asked for school to be promoted to them</li> <li>Public transport links need to be improved particularly to help with staffing</li> <li><i>Q: What are the intake numbers this year</i>?</li> <li><i>A: 18 but we have 30 going out and next year</i></li> <li>We are stuck in limbo with the number of classes</li> <li><i>Q: Our average teacher cost is £60k, is that correct</i>?</li> <li><i>A: That is correct including on costs</i></li> <li>The Resources committee recommend the budget for approval Decision – governors agreed to approve budget (proposed by HD, seconded by LC)</li> </ul>	CT to arrange for MO to sign the budget and submit to LA



11	<ul> <li>Policies and Other Documents</li> <li>Policies circulated in advance of meeting</li> <li>Admissions – this policy states the current arrangements which are all</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>in line with Admissions code and the LA will continue to co-ordinate our admissions, it is point 10 regarding the placing of children in mixed age group classes which needs consideration</li> <li>Q: Would we make exceptions for a More Able child to go to higher age</li> </ul>	
	<i>class?</i> <i>A:</i> No, we would only consider an exception for a lower ability/SEND child to go into the class most suitable for them based on their diagnosis/need <i>Q:</i> At Almondsbury, do you use this system?	
	A: Yes, and it does work. We receive requests each year from parents to deviate but don't grant them apart from in circumstances listed i.e. SEND, twins etc. Q: If you had complete autonomy, and didn't have to speak to another	
	parent ever again - would you do it this way? Would you not group similar ability children together?	
	A: Yes, I would do it this way. We streamed children at Almondsbury in the past and it perpetuated where children were in terms of abilities, the lower ability children stayed where they were and didn't progress due to lack of opportunities to work with higher ability children, we saw an acceleration of progress by mixing the children not separating them	
	Q: How does that match with this current cohort that you are going to have to split? A: There is a real mix of abilities across the year groups so this will work. YR/1 will be in one classroom and Y1/2 will be in other classroom. Y1's will come together for phonics teaching only	
	<ul> <li>It will be important to develop a language amongst staff of how classes are referred so there are no references of being 'kept back' or 'put up' etc.</li> <li>O: Deep the wording in the policy need to be storner i.e. executional.</li> </ul>	
	Q: Does the wording in the policy need to be sterner i.e. exceptional circumstances? A: Yes, wording changed	
	<ul> <li>The Admissions policy was agreed &amp; ratified</li> <li>Art – agreed &amp; ratified</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>History – agreed &amp; ratified</li> <li>P.E - agreed &amp; ratified</li> <li>Q: An observation regarding the subject policies is that it would be helpful if they followed the same format and used the same headings?</li> <li>A: We can look at introducing a set format in due course, consistency of titles, i.e. resources, inclusion, mixed age classes</li> <li>Health &amp; Safety – recommended by Resources committee for approval</li> </ul>	PS to facilitate move towards consistency for all subject policies to use the same headings
	- agreed & ratified	
12	<ul> <li>Terms of Office/Governor Recruitment/Re-constitution update</li> <li>Methodist circuit have given approval to new constitution</li> <li>Bristol Diocese meeting on 24 May and hopefully approval will be made</li> <li>Recruitment of community and foundation governors to take place</li> </ul>	

Signed by Chair:



13	<ul> <li>Reflective Question 'Where have we made a difference today?'</li> <li>It was good to get an update of progress data</li> <li>We can see evidence of new processes being embedded now</li> <li>Agreed partnership for another year</li> <li>New governor was impressed with the amount of timely pre-reading received for meeting</li> </ul>	
14	<ul> <li>Any Other Business <ul> <li>Q: Would it be worth getting members of FOSP to come to this meeting so we know what they have planned?</li> <li>A: They are planning a Summer fayre on Friday 8<sup>th</sup> July 3.20-4.30pm. They have also been asked to serve strawberries &amp; cream at sports day. This is not the correct forum to invite FOSP to, it would be better for governors to attend their meetings</li> <li>Date for next governors visit is 22<sup>nd</sup> June AM. Focus is to check areas in Maths &amp; English previously introduced have been embedded and there is evidence of this</li> <li>Decision needs to be made as to which committee NS to sit on</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	MO to discuss committee membership with NS and agree which to sit on
	<ul> <li>Date of Next Meeting</li> <li>Tuesday 12<sup>th</sup> July 2022 at 5pm</li> </ul>	

Meeting Closed: 18.46hrs

#### Action Checklist

WHO	ACTION	WHEN
All	Governors to do/repeat Prevent online training module and send certificate to CT	31 May
MO	Arrange advert for governors in In View magazine (if required after reconstitution)	31 May
СТ	Send details of re-constitution and evidence of approval to Gov Services	As soon as received
HD	Contact Nic B-M & Laura Cox to arrange another Foundation committee meeting	31 May
MO	Circulate feedback from last governor visit	31 May
CT	Arrange for MO to sign the budget and submit to LA	31 May
PS	Facilitate move towards consistency for all subject policies to use the same headings	As soon as practical
MO	Discuss committee membership with NS and agree which to sit on	31 May

#### List of Associated Documents

Minutes of FGB meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> March Minutes of Teaching & Learning committee meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> April 2022 Minutes of Resources committee meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> May 2022 Headteacher's Report 16<sup>th</sup> May Insight Attainment comparison end of Autumn 21 to Spring 22 Signed by Chair: FGB Minutes



Insight Attainment comparison EYFS Autumn 21 to Spring 22 LA Review recommendation plan February 22 review end of March Rapid School Improvement Action Plan 2021-22 (RAP) review March 22 St Peters SDP Plan 2021 22 review April 22 Bridge family of schools partnership agreement Bridge family of schools partnership agreement glossary of terms Service level agreement Bridge family of schools partnership Sept 22 SPT Income & Expenditure Report 26.04.22 Budget Dashboard Admissions Policy Art Policy Health & Safety Policy History Policy P.E. Policy

FGB Minutes 16<sup>th</sup> May 2022

Page 9 of 9