



St Paul's Church of England Primary School

MINUTES OF THE TEACHING AND LEARNING (T&L) COMMITTEE MEETING

held virtually by Zoom at 3.45pm on Tuesday 26th January 2021

Governors Present: Alex Smith – Chair, Sarah Abrey, Kate Barron, Andrew Blake (Associate Member), Suranga Chandratillake, Helen Darrell (Headteacher), Sharon Geva (Governor), Nick Giesler (Associate Member), Simon Jarvis, Virginia Weston.

Also in Attendance: Jacquie Watts (Clerk), Stephanie Florczyk (Deputy Headteacher).

(NB: Governor Challenge, Questions and Monitoring are highlighted in bold)

1. Apologies for Absence

NOTED: all committee members were present.

2. Declarations of Interest

NOTED: Kate Barron had a personal interest in relation to items in which PP was discussed.

AGREED: Kate Barron need not withdraw from any items in which PP was discussed.

3. Minutes of Previous Meeting – 1st December 2020

NOTED: the minutes as circulated with the agenda.

AGREED: the minutes of the meeting held on 1 December 2020 as a true and correct record, subject to the correction of the spelling of Andrew Blake's name on page 4. Once corrected, the minutes would be signed by the Chair and passed to the school for safekeeping when it was possible to do so.

NOTED: the following **matters arising** from the minutes:

Date	Min. Ref.	Action	Lead	Completed
1/12/20	3	the Headteacher would circulate the Quality of Education Section from the OFSTED handbook.	H. Darrell	Completed
	3	The Clerk would refer to the minutes of the original meeting and remind the Headteacher of the details of the action required.	Clerk	Completed
	3	Sarah Abrey would recirculate by email the CCC training links.	S. Abrey	Completed
	3	Stephanie Florczyk had circulated the feedback policy to committee members for information, but would circulate it again.	S Florczyk	Stephanie Florczyk had not yet recirculated the feedback policy to committee members



St Paul's Church of England Primary School

				for information, but would do so.
	3	Nick Giesler was willing to take on the role of Pupil Premium Link Governor. This to be recommended to the next FGB.	A. Smith	Completed
	3	Alex Smith had not yet written up his conversation regarding Sports Premium, but would do so when a further discussion took place.	A. Smith	Completed and on agenda
	9	the Headteacher would speak to Eleanor Carne regarding the outstanding cultural capital template document.	H. Darrell	Eleanor Carne had not provided a template but the Headteacher had developed one for the school. This matter was now completed.
	10	The School Behaviour Policy should be an item on the next agenda.	H. Darrell/ Clerk	On agenda but policy not yet available
	10	The Headteacher would share the meeting's thoughts about the Accessibility Plan with Paula Ray and ask her to further review the document for re-submission to the committee at the next meeting.	H. Darrell/ Clerk	On Agenda. Plan being reviewed but not yet available
	10	The Chair would highlight the approval of the Intimate Care Policy approval at the forthcoming FGB meeting.	A. Smith	Completed
	11	the Chair would contact all governors by email to see when the additional informal meeting could be convened.	A. Smith	Completed – the meeting took place before Christmas

- **EYFS Profile (Min. 5 refers)** – it had been anticipated that comparative data would be made available by the LA at the end of last term. **A governor asked if the data had been received?** The Headteacher confirmed that she had not yet received it, but would ask the LA when it would be available. **Action: H. Darrell**

4. Feedback From Informal T&L Discussion Meeting

NOTED: the informal and unminuted meeting had taken place before Christmas. It had been agreed that all link governors would produce their own monitoring plan to help frame monitoring visits and activities. The Chair had shared his plan under item 8 on the agenda. **He asked what committee members thought of it? The meeting discussed the plan format, how flexible it could be, whether it was too focused on the SIP and whether there was a risk of it becoming a monitoring record.** It was confirmed that governor visits



and monitoring needed to be broader than the SIP and there was no reason that individual plans could not be. Monitoring and visit reports still needed to be completed and submitted to either a committee or the FGB to form part of the formal record of governor monitoring activity.

NOTED: Some governors commented that the SIP was unwieldy and difficult for governors to understand. The Clerk advised this had been discussed at previous meetings, but that the current SIP was based on advice from the LA in terms of both content and structure and had been approved by the LA in its current format. The Headteacher said it was first and foremost a working document for school staff and secondly a way to feedback to governors. In future years it might become leaner, but when she had joined the school there had been many issues to move forward. She suggested governors might each like to agree a section of the SIP to take an overview on.

AGREED: to discuss the SIP and governor monitoring arrangements further, including a calendar of school data drops, at the Governor Away Day on Thursday, 28th January.

Action: A. Smith

5. School Data

NOTED: the data pack circulated with the agenda. Stephanie Florczyk explained the grading process. **Governors queried the acronyms ARE and GD.** It was clarified that they related to Age Related Expectation and Greater Depth. **Governors asked if the meaning of acronyms could be included in the document for ease of reading? There were a number of glossaries available to governors and they did not all include the same acronyms. Also the meaning of the various levels and a summary of how the system worked would be helpful within the document.** The school went on to explain how individual children were tracked. **Governors asked a range of questions regarding the tracking process, how the school used the data, how the school assessed individual pupils and what was done for high achieving pupils. Governors wanted the school to tell a story about where it was, what was good and what needed to improve, rather than just present them with the data.** The Headteacher confirmed that broadly the school was on track for meeting its own targets and National Standards. **Governors reiterated that a brief written commentary to this effect with the data would be helpful.**

NOTED: the data did not provide PP information, but the link governor could use it to inform his monitoring discussions. **Governors asked how the school set targets for individual pupils.** The school reiterated how it assessed individual pupils and set their targets accordingly. Targets were therefore pupil driven not created from a whole school perspective and then cascaded down to pupils.

NOTED: the reading age data in the data pack and the difference between reading age and reading curriculum. Reading data was collected at the start of the autumn term. The rest of the data in the pack related to end of term assessments.

6. School Improvement Plan

NOTED: the SIP as circulated with the agenda. As previously requested by the Vice Chair, the meeting focused on the data elements of the plan. The phonics data had risen from 40% when the Headteacher first joined the school to 90%, evidencing a



substantial improvement. **Governors asked how this had been achieved?** The school had provided greater consistency and rigour of approach, regular phonics meetings and intervention groups to provide extra support where needed. **Governors felt this improvement should be highlighted to parents. The Vice Chair welcomed the data provided in the SIP but felt that pupil numbers in certain sections would provide a greater sense of magnitude for governors.** The Headteacher commented that if the school achieved its targets it would be close to or above national levels. Overall, the situation was promising.

NOTED: Some governors felt they were still did not fully aware of the understand detail behind the the SIP and wondered if another governor could spend some time outside of the meeting explaining it to them. It was difficult to know what could be challenged and what was recommended by the LA. The Headteacher offered to provide a brief video session explaining the SIP in more detail to those who felt they needed it.

AGREED: The Headteacher would provide a brief video session explaining the SIP in more detail to those who felt they needed it.

Action:

H. Darrell

NOTED: The Headteacher reiterated her previous comments that the SIP was sizeable because of the number of issues the school had had to address, including those detailed in the recovery section. The LA had specifically requested the level of detail currently shown in the SIP because the school was expecting an OFSTED visit. She was hoping the SIP might reduce in size following the next inspection.

7. Curriculum Presentation – Distance Learning and Lockdown Arrangements

NOTED: Stephanie Florczyk explained current Google classroom practice, which included a combination of videos, shared screen work and pupil activities away from the screen. The aim was variety to keep children engaged with learning. Feedback could be given via Google classroom and children could chat with one another. Younger children required parental assistance for some activities. The school currently did not use live, Zoom-like sessions. Whilst some parents would prefer Zoom type lessons, the school felt that a Zoom environment could not mirror a real classroom setting, especially with younger children who all talked at the same time. **Some governors expressed concern that without Zoom sessions the pupils were missing out on social interaction, as this could not be provided by messaging.** The Headteacher was considering running a school assembly for the whole school in the next week or so via Zoom, but in terms of individual classes, live Zoom lessons were limited by the capacity of staff, who were already working above their contracted hours, the fact that some teachers were overseeing their own children while teaching online, individual pupil access to technology at the time of live events and the behaviour of young children. **Governors wanted to know how other primary schools were managing remote learning and what approach OFSTED recommended.** A range of methods were used and recommended. No schools were providing only live lessons, though the percentage varied depending on the needs of schools. The school's focus in the first three weeks had been delivering the curriculum. The school had reviewed parental feedback on remote learning and had made improvements where possible. Some parents clearly wanted live lessons, but the school had to consider the purpose of lessons and the limitations of Zoom. Live lessons did not mean that parents could cease supervising younger children. The Headteacher would assess the situation further after delivering the



first live assembly. **A governor felt strongly that the school should not be focusing on the curriculum, but on social interaction and the well-being of children. Christian love required personal interaction.** The Headteacher pointed out that parents had demonstrated conflicting views, with some wanting a focus on curriculum and others wanting more social development. **Governors asked if they could see the findings from the parent survey on remote learning?** The Headteacher advised that she would be feeding back the survey outcomes to parents and would share these with governors at the same time.
—Action H. Darrell

NOTED: that remote learning had improved since the first, sudden lockdown last year. Some governors recognised that it was impossible to please all parents all of the time given the disparity of views and a belief that something else was always better, when the whole pandemic lockdown meant that things were inevitably going to be less than ideal.

NOTED: a governor raised the perceived lack of social interaction as a safeguarding issue. The school described the steps it was taking to remain in contact with vulnerable children and families via regular phone calls.

NOTED: in response to questions from governors, the school explained why, for consistency, Reception pupils were using Tapestry and not Google classroom and what the school had done in response to children who did not have access to IT at home. The school had loaned laptops to families, although in some cases one laptop had to be shared between two pupils. The school was working with families who were not engaging with Google. The Headteacher stressed that best learning came from more than the use of IT. Pupils in KS1, for example, were being encouraged to do things using pen and paper and then share the results online afterwards. The school had used the first three weeks of the Spring Term to engage with online learning and it was hoping to hone best practice as the term continued. **Governors asked if teachers had freedom to be creative?** The Headteacher felt they did and that the school would review and build upon the experience of the first three weeks.

8. Governor Visits and Monitoring Activities

NOTED: the following reports had been submitted by governors and circulated with the agenda:

- Google Classrooms
- Communications With Parents
- PE and Sports Premium
- PE and Sports Premium Monitoring Plan

8.1 Google Classrooms – this was an old report from last term and was now out of date. It was noted that staff had had training on the technical aspects of Google Classroom, but not in video or online delivery.

8.2 PE and Sports Premium – the link governor pointed out that Sports Premium money that had not been spent in the summer because of lockdown had been carried over into the autumn term. The sports team were trying to increase the involvement of girls in sport leading to an increase in involvement from 25% to 35%. Boys' involvement was at 60%. The need for activity during lockdown was highlighted. Overall the school wanted children to be active at break times and this did not have to be part of organised sport.



8.3 PE and Sports Premium Monitoring Plan – this had been discussed as part of item 4 above.

Kate Barron left the meeting at this point

8.4 Communications with Parents – this was an old report from September/ October 2020. The findings were broadly positive. **Governors asked why the school did not use Parent View to gather feedback?** The school preferred Google forms because they provided greater flexibility and comments were not permanently displayed. The meeting went on to discuss whether Google forms could be used for governors and how the school should publicise survey results.

AGREED: to discuss surveys at the Governor Away Day on Thursday, 28th January.

Action: A. Smith

9. Pupil Attendance

NOTED: 20% of all pupils were attending school physically. 81% of pupils undertaking remote learning were fully accessing Google classrooms. 9% were partially accessing Google classrooms. 10% were not using Google classrooms, but that included Reception pupils who were using Tapestry, but then needed their parents to upload work for it to register. The school was in communication with the families where Google classrooms were not being accessed in order to explore why. In some cases laptops had been provided to the family. The school was also engaging with those who were only partially using Google classrooms. **Governors asked if there were any linking themes in relation to those children and families who were not engaging with remote learning?** The school had identified a number of issues. Some PP children were involved, but not all. Some families were not responding to phone calls and emails. Some had simply said they did not want to engage. In a number of cases, there had been issues with pupil engagement prior to lockdown.

NOTED: governors asked if children were making the same progress remotely as those who were classroom based. After only three weeks of remote learning, The Headteacher felt it was too early to say, but the school would be assessing the situation so progress could be evaluated. **Governors asked if there was an attendance policy in terms of Remote Learning?** Whilst there was no written policy, the school had identified vulnerable pupils and was making regular calls to the families. Where there was no response, this was being referred to the SENCO or Deputy Headteacher for follow up. **Governors asked if the process should be written down as a formal document?** The staff governor advised it was written down for staff and was very clear.

Suranga Chandratillake left the meeting at this point.

10. Cultural Capital

NOTED: the Headteacher explained the nature of Cultural Capital and how it was being considered for year groups, what was being delivered via the curriculum and what was extra-curricular. She had intended to share the initial findings with staff at the next training day, but this had been over-taken by lockdown. The aim was to expand on what had been captured and recorded so far and consider how to share and publicise



activity. The school was hoping to use Twitter, but was waiting on parental consent. **The link governor for this area had talked things through with the Headteacher and would be monitoring things once the document was finalised.**

11. Policies

11.1 School Behaviour Policy – was on the agenda as agreed at the previous meeting, but the document was still under review.

AGREED: that the School Behaviour Policy should be carried forward to the next meeting.

Action: H. Darrell/ Clerk

11.2 Accessibility Plan - was on the agenda as agreed at the previous meeting, but the document was still under review. Paula Ray was discussing the document with Nick Giesler and was hoping to have the document ready in time for the March meeting.

AGREED: that the Accessibility Plan should be carried forward to the next meeting.

Action: H. Darrell/ Clerk

11.3 Sex Education Policy – was on the agenda, in keeping with the current policy schedule, but the document was still under review.

AGREED: that the Sex Education Policy should be carried forward to the next meeting.

Action: H. Darrell/ Clerk

11.4 Attendance Policy – the document, as based on the EWO's recommendations, had been circulated with the agenda. The EWO was happy with the document as it stood, but **a number of governors had reservations. Governor concerns included: a lack of written policy aims, the fact that the document did not stress the importance and value of school attendance, the phrasing in relation to the target of 10% non-attendance making it sound as if it was a target that the school wanted to achieve whereas as it was a measure and attendance was the positive target, the reference to medical and religious days was vague and at the discretion of the Headteacher, the trigger for the three attendance letters was not clear, there was no reference to the different legal position of children under 5, whether the policy was for staff or parents. Not all governors shared concerns regarding all of the above.** After detailed discussion it was

AGREED: to endorse the policy in principle for use by the school with immediate effect. The Vice Chair would draft a top and tail to the policy, highlighting the aims of the policy and the importance of pupil attendance. He would share the proposed wording with the Headteacher for her approval or further editing. The Headteacher would review the section of the policy regarding children under 5 and make any changes she thought fit. The Headteacher would share the revised policy by email with all Committee members. If the majority of members were happy with it, it would stand. If more than half the committee was not prepared to accept the revised document, it would be brought back to the March meeting of the Committee for further consideration.

Action: H. Darrell/ S. Jarvis



NOTED: Governors were concerned that they could not tell which policies and procedures were based on LA advice or templates or which elements of previously agreed documents had been changed. They therefore did not know which ones they could rewrite. The Headteacher and Clerk both advised that very few documents were written from scratch and that most of those already in place had been deemed by the LA to be at least adequate. The Clerk stressed that it was not for individual governors or the committee to rewrite policy documents and warned against governors taking on the roles of school staff. She also stressed that any decisions regarding school policies should be taken collectively by the committee as a whole. It was not appropriate for individual governors to ask for changes to be made if they had not been discussed and agreed by a majority of committee members at a meeting.

AGREED: that, going forward, the Headteacher would highlight changes made to previously agreed policies when presenting revised versions to the committee so that governors would know which sections of the document to focus on. **Action: H. Darrell**

Andrew Blake left the meeting part way through the discussion of the above item.

12. AOB

12.1 Future Curriculum Presentations

NOTED: whilst it was envisaged that each meeting of the committee would receive a presentation on an aspect of the curriculum, it would be helpful to identify the topics in advance in order to give staff time to prepare. **Governors asked what the key curriculum areas scrutinised by an OFSTED inspection were likely to be?** Maths and Reading were usually subject to a deep dive and Science was also an area likely to be identified by the school.

AGREED: there should be a presentation on Science to the March meeting and a presentation on Maths to the May meeting of the committee. **Action: H. Darrell/Clerk**

12.2 OFSTED Preparations

NOTED: governors felt it would be valuable to start preparing for the OFSTED inspection that was due, but that preparation should involve the FGB, not just the committee.

AGREED: to discuss OFSTED preparation at the Governor Away Day on Thursday, 28th January. **Action: A. Smith**

13. Date and Time of Next Meeting

NOTED: the next scheduled meeting of the committee would take place on Tuesday, 9th March 2021 at 3.45pm via ZOOM.

NOTED: the Headteacher praised the hard work of all staff in response to lockdown. **This was echoed by governors.**



St Paul's Church of England Primary School

The meeting finished at approximately 6:42pm

Drafted by: Jacquie Watts

Clerk To The Governors

28th January 2021

Approved by The Teaching and Learning Committee on:

Date:

Signature (Chair):.....

T&L Action Summary Grid

Date	Min. Ref.	Action	Lead	Completed
1/12/20	3	Stephanie Florczyk had circulated the feedback policy to committee members for information, but would circulate it again.	S Florczyk	Stephanie Florczyk had not yet recirculated the feedback policy to committee members for information, but would do so
	10	The School Behaviour Policy should be an item on the next agenda.	H. Darrell/ Clerk	On agenda for 26/1/21 but policy not yet available
	10	The Headteacher would share the meeting's thoughts about the Accessibility Plan with Paula Ray and ask her to further review the document for re-submission to the committee at the next meeting.	H. Darrell/ Clerk	On Agenda for 26/1/21. Plan being reviewed but not yet available
26/1/21	3	The Headteacher confirmed that she had not yet received the comparative EYFS data, but would ask the LA when it would be available	H. Darrell	
	4	To discuss the SIP and governor monitoring arrangements further, including a calendar of school data drops, at the Governor Away Day on Thursday, 28 th January	A. Smith	
	6	The Headteacher would provide a brief video session explaining the SIP in more detail to	H. Darrell	



St Paul's Church of England Primary School

		governors who felt they needed it.		
	7	The Headteacher advised that she would be feeding back the survey on remote learning outcomes to parents and would share these with governors at the same time.	H. Darrell	
	8	To discuss surveys at the Governor Away Day on Thursday, 28 th January.	A. Smith	
	11	The School Behaviour Policy should be carried forward to the next meeting	H. Darrell/ Clerk	
	11	The Accessibility Plan should be carried forward to the next meeting	H. Darrell/ Clerk	
	11	The Sex Education Policy should be carried forward to the next meeting	H. Darrell/ Clerk	
	11	The Vice Chair would draft a top and tail to the Attendance policy, highlighting the aims of the policy and the importance of pupil attendance. He would share the proposed wording with the Headteacher for her approval or further editing. The Headteacher would review the section of the policy regarding children under 5 and make any changes she thought fit. The Headteacher would share the revised policy by email with all Committee members. If the majority of members were happy with it, it would stand. If more than half the committee was not prepared to accept the revised document, it would be brought back to the March meeting of the Committee for further consideration.	H. Darrell/ S Jarvis	
	11	The Headteacher would highlight changes made to previously agreed policies when presenting revised versions to the committee so that governors would know which sections of the document to focus on	H. Darrell	



St Paul's Church of England Primary School

	12.1	There should be a presentation on Science to the March meeting and a presentation on Maths to the May meeting.	H. Darrell/ Clerk	
	12.2	To discuss OFSTED preparation at the Governor Away Day on Thursday, 28 th January.	A. Smith	