

Minutes of the Meeting of the Standards Committee of Ivydale School, held on Tuesday 27th November 2018 at 6:00pm.

Present

Sophie Broadfield (SB) (Chair)	Helen Ingham (HI) (Head)
Jessica Skinns (JS)	Anna Townsend (AT)

Also Present

Nicole Galea	Clerk
Judith Lambert	Observer
Ruth Fairclough (Items 1-3 & 6)	

PART 1

GOVERNOR BUSINESS		
1	<p><u>Apologies for Absence</u></p> <p>All committee members were present. The Clerk confirmed that the meeting was quorate.</p>	
2	<p><u>Declarations of Interest</u></p> <p>SB reminded Governors of the need to declare any interests for items on the agenda. There were no declarations.</p>	
3	<p><u>Minutes of the last meeting – 9/10/18</u></p>	
3.1	<p><u>Approval of minutes</u></p> <p>The minutes of 9/10/18 had been distributed in advance. It was RESOLVED that they were an accurate reflection of the meeting and SB signed the minutes to be retained by the Head.</p>	
3.2	<p><u>Actions Log</u></p> <p>Governors reviewed the actions log and provided updates where appropriate (attached). In addition the following was discussed:-</p> <p><u>Item 7: SDP</u> SB asked if it had been possible to identify any outstanding schools to use as a comparator. HI reported that the DfE provide a benchmarking tool using PP and SEN data but when using this, Ivydale tends to be compared to schools outside of London but that she will continue to look for similar schools within Lewisham and Southwark to compare with.</p>	HI
STANDING ITEMS		
4	<p><u>Teaching and Learning update (ASP/ISDR)</u></p> <p>HI referred Governors to the Analyse School Performance (ASP) which had been circulated in advance. She advised Governors that the IDSR should be published by the end of the month and be available for the FGB on 4/12/18. HI provided the following highlights from the ASP:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ASP is more in depth than the IDSR • It shows that the progress of disadvantaged pupils is particularly strong with reading slightly below and maths and writing above average 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ivydale is now starting to look at moving disadvantaged pupils to achieving GDS across the board and a higher average scaled score <p>JS asked how the school aims to get these pupils to GDS and a higher scaled score. JL stated that these children tend to be 'language poor' which impacts across reading / writing and maths so the focus is on improving their vocabulary and language structures, with greater exposure as early as possible. JL reported that she is attending training on the Alex Quigley approach to language which will be cascaded to staff.</p> <p>JS queried whether GDS achieved by disadvantage pupils at an early stage will continue for life. JL stated that unfortunately not, research shows that the gap widens as children grow up and the demands of the curriculum become more complex. GDS is no longer just about achieving the equivalent of the old L5 of the previous curriculum but is about concepts and structures outside of the usual way of thinking which require 'pre teaching' and exposure to additional language rich contexts.</p> <p>AT asked how attendance impacts on this group. HI reported that the attendance data will be provided for the next FGB broken down into groups. LAC tend to have the best attendance of all groups as it is part of their care package; attendance has been generally better this year than the same time last year at 96.7% including Nursery and Reception (non statutory). PP attendance can be separated from this.</p> <p>HI and JL suggested that it may be more realistic for the school to aim for improved rates of progress rather than higher attainment.</p> <p>AT asked if the school tracks the impact of interventions for progress. JL confirmed that they do and that targets for interventions are based on actual need rather than being identified as a particular group.</p> <p>HI stated that her Headteacher's Report will look at progress of SEN pupils across the school as a group which can be broken down into type of need but this cannot then be further analyses within a cohort.</p>	
5	<p><u>Review of the School Development Plan</u></p> <p>HI reported that inclusion was a main focus. The system of using committees to focus on their areas of the SDP is working well.</p>	
<p>ITEMS FOR REVIEW</p> <p>Strategic Priority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To narrow the achievement gap between identified vulnerable groups (including pupil premium and SEND children) and their peers 		
6	<p>Link governor – inclusion/SEND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inclusion focused meeting - SEND Information Report/Policy - Inclusion Action Plan - Impact of Interventions 	
	<p>RT provided Governors with a presentation on the inclusion with the following highlights</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are 104 pupils on the SEND register, 8 of which have an EHCP (with more pending) [post meeting note: this is an updated figure]. 	

- Breakdown by year group shows that Y6 has the greatest percentage of need but that EY (Nursery and Reception) is a growing area of need, higher than that seen in recent times
- There are more non PP pupils and boys on the register
- The school is facing increasing levels of need but this is becoming more of a budgetary challenge
- Biggest type of need is Speech Language and Communication (61%) but this covers a large spectrum of need
- Much of the Inclusion Team's time is also taken up with SEMH (social, emotional and mental health) issues
- **JS asked if all of the pupils on the register have a diagnosis.** RF stated that pupils are usually only placed on the register in discussion with parents, if they need substantially more than the usual provision over a sustained period of time. Only 8 have an EHCP.
- **Governors asked how many EHCPs are pending.** RF confirmed that there are 15.
- The Inclusion Action Plan has been discussed with AT as the Inclusion Link Governor. There are 2 key priorities:-
 - improve the overall inclusion offer by restructuring that area of the school with a phased Inclusion Team and a SENCo Lead
 - increase parental engagement and voice for SEND
- Consideration is being given for alternative model for EHCP funding allocation to maximise impact – possibly by having a Resource Base with specialists and a teacher rather than using TA led interventions. She stated that Rye Oak and Redriff are achieving good outcomes with their model
- The school's values are at the core of all that is done within the Inclusion Team

RF briefed Governors on the new model of support in place this year for learning and inclusion; class teachers make referrals to the referral team which meets 3 times per week to allocate provision, usually for 3-6 weeks. There are 3 waves of intervention which pupils move through, the main focus is on Universal Wave 1 including of all pupils

- Wave 1 - classroom support for SEND learners: Quality First Teaching for all including SEND pupils; most pupils are in this group. Capacity is being built in this wave to help the class teachers support these children in class
- Wave 2 – targeted provision: Interventions and additional provision which usually takes place outside of the class at an additional cost. Data is used to identify who receives this level
- Wave 3 – specialist: All pupils with an EHCP come within this band, it includes seeing external specialists and is managed by the SENCo.

SB asked if there had been many more referrals since this model has been put in place. RF stated that there had not been, where possible teachers are referred back to the quality first teaching which should be in place in the class first; there are many strategies that the class teacher can use to support learning.

JS queried if pupils are monitored and tracked across all waves in the same way. RF confirmed that they are.

RF reported that action research is being used to narrow the achievement gap by building a bank of tried and tested methods. Staff were surveyed to establish their confidence level in supporting pupils with particular needs and only 19.6% of staff

felt confident to monitor pupils with SEND. This will be monitored with the aim to increase it. The survey also looked at the main barriers to teachers providing the support.

JS asked if the Inclusion INSET will be repeated. HI stated that the school always uses one INSET annually for Inclusion. This year the INSET also looked at used the PLP model by improving Support and Challenge through inclusion. Here the focus will be in looking at the evidence gathered to address this aspect of the PLP. In addition, 2 staff meetings have been held on inclusion.

AT noted that the PLP data given shows Support and Challenge as fully met, ranging from 2.0 to 2.3 and asked if this is because of the differentiation for the higher achievers. RF confirmed that this is the case but that there are specific resources and strategies for the types of need; JL is discussing this with staff.

JS asked if support could be captured more accurately and less of a top line within PLP. JL noted that the more 'qualitative' information could be quoted but that this is difficult to provide numerically. RF stated that they could consider how to gather evidence in the classroom. HI advised that she is tracking the data and they could compare where SEND pupils were last year compared to this. SLT are aware that it is in the classroom that the most difference needs to be made, action research will have the greatest effect and therefore hopefully also the best impact.

SB asked what the target time is for the outcomes of the SEND group to be more in line with the non SEND pupils. RF stated that no targets have been set for this because at the moment they do not know what is possible but there is not an expectation that it will be in line with the non SEND. HI added that the challenge is that their outcomes, especially for the Speech , Language and Communication needs pupils will probably be lower because of the nature of their need. This is not necessarily the case with all pupils eg some pupils with ASD are exceeding expectations. The gap is being narrowed but it is not clear by how much and there is no national guidance as SEND is such a broad term.

RF stated that she is in discussion with the SENCo at Redriff to see how they are approaching this.

SB asked what is being done to increase parental engagement and voice and how is this measured. RF stated that during the Link visit, she and AT discussed the best ways to consult with parents and agreed that coffee mornings based on themes would be a good option which could be targeted to those parents in particular need. The school's position is that parents know their child best and are the primary educator, they can discuss what works and what their aims and aspirations are. This model will be kept under review.

RF added that the changes to inclusion have also been discussed with Parents' Forum for their views on the policy.

Governors asked if it is possible to disaggregate the SEND parents from the current parents survey, noting that the parents and carers of 109 pupils is a large enough group to be statistically significant. HI reported that it is not possible but that a specific survey just for this group would be useful.

AT added that she and RF had discussed the proposal to pool the SEND / EHCP funding and the importance of keeping parents on side if this went ahead.

AT asked what the timescale would be for a child who has been identified by the class teacher as potentially having a need. RF stated that the aim would be to complete two cycles of access / plan / review / do of class based strategies and

	<p>quality first teaching – which would take approximately one term. However, interventions could be put in place more rapidly depending on the need.</p> <p>Governors asked if the school has the resources to address the needs identified. RF stated that the school could always do with more resources but it is possible currently to meet the needs of wave 2, although the focus is on wave 1.</p> <p>JS asked if Speech and Language Therapy is still available. RF confirmed that it is, she would like to increase it but funding implications do not allow this at present.</p> <p>AT commented that the visit had provided her with a much better understanding of SEND at Ivydale; it was agreed that her report would be re-circulated for the FGB.</p> <p>Governors thanked RF for her presentation and then withdrew from the meeting.</p> <p>HI commented that SEND has moved so far in one term with the new clear structure in place; there have been some challenges with new pupils who have an EHCP and significant needs, but equally there have been opportunities.</p>	HI
7	<p><u>Link Governor - Pupil Premium</u></p> <p>SB had circulated her Link Governor visit report in advance.</p> <p>SB reported that the focus is on the provision of classroom teachers; interventions are targeted and evidence based. There were no questions raised.</p> <p>Pupil Premium Statement</p> <p>HI referred to the Pupil Premium statement that had been circulated in advance. She stated that the school follows an holistic view of PP pupils in terms of what it can offer them both across the curriculum and the extended curriculum.</p> <p>HI advised that for budget setting purposes the actual amounts have been broken down but in order to avoid the identification of individuals and their salaries this was not included in the PP statement.</p> <p>Governors RESOLVED to ratify the PP statement for publication on the website.</p>	HI
8	<p><u>Sports Premium</u></p> <p>Governors discussed the Sports Premium Statement that had been circulated in advance. HI reported that the LA has a target to introduce the 'daily mile' in 2019 and so she is looking at options of how this could be introduced. There is concern that the time for this initiative will need to come from somewhere else.</p> <p>It was RESOLVED to ratify the report pending the inclusion of the following breakdown of information:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the costs and numbers involved • impact on pupils • sustainability • use of sports coaches • CPD 	HI
11	<p><u>Dates of Future Meetings</u></p> <p>22/1/19 Maths and literacy visits Sex and Relationships Education Policy</p>	

	Standing Items – T&L data Outcome of LA Review 14/5/19	
12	Urgent Business There were no further items and the meeting concluded at 7:30pm.	
	Signed: Date:	