

Minutes – Begbrook Primary Academy Council

Version:	Final	
Date	17 July 2019	
Location:	Begbrook Primary Academy	
Time:	4.00 pm	
Members Present:	Su Coombes (SC)	Sponsor Academy Councillor (Chair)
	John Israel (JI)	Teacher Academy Councillor
	Graham Wilkie (GW)	Sponsor Academy Councillor
	Tony Mooney (TM)	Student Advocate
	Emily Mowlem (EM)	Parent Academy Councillor
	Laurie Munro (LM)	Academy Principal
	Steve Taylor (ST)	CEO, attending for Susie Weaver
Attendees:	Jen Shaw (JS)	Academy Assistant Principal
	Emma Pearn (EP)	Operations Manager
	Linda Corbidge (LC)	Academy Council Clerk
Apologies:	Shashi McGregor (SM)	LA Representative Councillor
	Sally Harrison (SH)	Parent Academy Councillor
	Susie Weaver (SW)	Executive Principal
	Becca Hine (BH)	Academy Vice Principal

Absent:

Minutes

Item	Description	Action
1	Introductions	
1.1	Welcome and introductions were made by SC.	
2	Declarations of Interest	
2.1	None.	
3	Minutes of Previous Meeting	
3.1	The minutes of the meeting held 22 May 2019 were agreed as accurate.	
4	Matters Arising, from previous meetings	
4.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asset Register – EP confirmed this was now up to date and the Risk Register had been updated to reflect this. Request for review of school dinner contract re complaints on portion sizes and quality. EP reported that she had received further complaints since the last meeting and had asked to bring Aspens audit forward to September. Taken forward for update at next meeting. Academy Councillors to attend student council meetings- TM had attended and had found good student engagement and was pleased to see older children working well with the younger ones. All visit notes would be summarised by the Chair and circulated at the end of every term. ST 	EP

Item	Description	Action
	<p><i>commented that the good practice regarding the new visit note format had been recognised by CLF.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Academy Council request for parent meetings to be held on different days for variety</i> - LM confirmed that parent meetings were now being held on different days and different times am/pm. TM reported that the morning meeting had been well attended. It was noted the evening meeting had less people which had enabled a more detailed discussion. • <i>Request to review newsletter format</i> – TM had sent a sample template to the academy. LM reported that CLF were also looking at an alternative solution re communication by academies. <u>Taken forward to next meeting for update</u> • <i>Comparative data on exclusions from other CLF schools requested</i> – LM explained the different context and size of other CLF schools; it was recognised that comparison was difficult due to different context. SC commented on the increasing exclusions, particularly SEND. LM responded that the exclusions were mostly children on the SEN Register with SEMH; almost all cases were as a result of violence to staff. <u>Academy Council requested exclusions to form part of Behaviour Review for September, with an item on the next agenda.</u> • EP advised that the <i>Intimate Care Policy</i> had been amended as requested – <u>approval</u> was ratified. • <i>EP to confirm that the up to date Equality Policy was now on the website</i> – Academy Council had noted the Equalities Statement was on the website but not the Policy. <u>EP would chase the policy and upload to website</u> • Academy Council visit notes summary – <u>SC would email the visits note when relevant to the Clerk for distribution with the minutes</u> 	<p>LM</p> <p>LM</p> <p>EP</p> <p>SC</p>
5	Student Voice / Student Advocate	
5.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GW reported that he had attended the student council meeting where the children had reviewed and celebrated everything they had been involved with this year. • EM explained that the group had been really involved in transition which had been a great success – it was the first time they had met their new class with a known adult from the year group. • Re-election would take place in September. <i>Academy Council asked if this was communicated school wide</i> – EM said that Year 3 wanted to do an assembly. <u>Academy Council requested that the video of the children shown at the previous meeting was published on the website – EM would action</u> • <i>Academy Council discussed the importance of providing a response to the student council on issues raised.</i> It was recognised this was done through academy councillors attendance at meetings. 	EM
6	Academy Council Report	
6.1	<p>LM briefed on highlights of SATS results, which had been detailed in the circulated report:</p> <p>SATs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nationally reading was down; BPA were under NA for maths; previously boys had not done as well as girls however this had reversed this year. 	



Item	Description	Action
	<p>Reading</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academy Council discussed the reasons for the low results for BME children in reading. LM explained that there had been difficulty with reading due to understanding of the vocabulary in the test. It was noted that the small numbers of children in the data had affected the percentages. The academy would be adjusting the curriculum next year with a focus on oracy. • Academy Council asked if attendance had been a contributing factor to the lower reading results for the BME children. JS confirmed that this had been checked and had not been a factor. LM added that overall, where children had met the standard at KS1, low attendance below 90% had impacted on them meeting the standard at KS2. • Academy Council commented on the good Maths results of 65% compared to NA of 60%. Discussion followed on what had made the difference – LM said that the issue had been around fluency in arithmetic which had been relatively easy to solve. Fluency within calculation at Maths would be a focus in Year 5. Breakfast maths also had a big impact along with more focus for SATs towards the start of the year. • Academy Council asked why staff were so far off with predictions. LM explained that predictions were based on the Mock where 12 had met the standard at reading but didn't in the SATs due to vocabulary. In Maths 15 more children had progressed. Academy Council asked how the academy would learn from this going forward. LM said more children needed to be secure by Easter in order to improve outcomes for May and teachers needed to fully understand the marking scheme. • Academy Council asked where they would be able to monitor the learning. LM explained this would be monitored through the Raising Standards Action Plan. Academy Councillors would be taking an area of scrutiny from the plan next year – SC would confirm at next meeting. • Academy council asked what feedback had been received from parents. LM had received feedback from two parents to who were both very proud of their children; both children didn't get all three. • Academy Council questioned actions being taken regarding the lower results in Maths for PP children. LM explained a strategy was already in place in Year 5, going forward into Year 6. It was agreed this would be an area of scrutiny for Academy Council next year. • LM said that feedback from families on the balance and care in the lead up to SATs had been good; as a result provision would be kept the same next year. • ST commented on the really strong outcomes in other key stages at Begbrook with exceptional practice being recognised. ST emphasised the need for focus on PP Maths next year. <p>Year 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The year group had included 11 new arrivals. Data in the report includes some children who would be reported at end of KS2 as new to the school. The cohort had a low starting point for combined results at KS1 of 49%. LM said the 52% for writing was pessimistic. • Academy Council commented on the gender gap for reading in every year group other than Year 6, questioning the impact of the new Reading Strategy which had been implemented a year ago. LM explained that the reading strategy was helping however the gap was about vocabulary; as a result this would be a huge focus next year. Academy Council asked if the 	<p>SC</p> <p>SC</p>

Item	Description	Action
	<p>reading strategy had been evaluated. LM said there had been soft evaluation which showed that it seems to be supporting children with reading. Academy Council commented that this was not showing in the data, particularly around PP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion followed on the quality of teaching and learning and any support plans in place. Academy Council questioned whether middle leaders had identified the support needed. LM explained they were now much quicker to act on data to support colleagues which was having an impact. Academy Council requested an update on support plans at the next meeting. Academy Council commented on the current gap in Year 5, questioning whether interventions would be put in place early on in Year 6. LM confirmed all would be put in place in the first term. <p>Year 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were 60 in the year group with two classes; one child with SEND would be leaving shortly; PP children did well in this group. SEND children had low outcomes in Year 4 – Academy Council asked if this was due to high SEMH needs. LM explained that needs were different in Year 4. <p>Year 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This year group had significant challenge with children with SEMH needs. Academy Council recognised the data showed the provision in place was good for SEMH. LM explained the focus on non-teaching support which had been put in place. Academy Council asked if the extra provision put into Year 3 had helped. LM said it had helped by allowing the teachers to teach. JS commented that the right level of support had been put in place; this had been extended across all year groups according to need. <p>Year 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There had been a focus around fluency and recall for maths during Year 1 and Year 2 which had resulted in children being number fluent. There was a big gap between girls and boys writing – JI explained there was a high number of SEN children in the cohort who were boys which affects the gender gap. Academy Council asked what interventions were planned for SEN boys going forward. LM confirmed interventions would be the same across the whole school. Academy Council noted the good results, commenting that it was encouraging to see the good foundation for maths. LM explained the plan for KS1 next year was to utilise volunteers to support children reading for fluency – ensuring 5 or 6 readers per class. Academy Council asked if volunteers were forthcoming – LM confirmed they were. <p>Year 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focus on Phonics in the past had been variable; the creation of Phonics across the school last year was beginning to show impact. <p>Good Level of Depth (GLD):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The clarity around provision was enabling children to reach GLD. Results had been 80% GLD, NA 72%. Academy Council commented that the excellent results for GLD were to be celebrated. 	<p>LM</p>

Item	Description	Action
	<p>Changes to location of classes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LM explained the reasons for the changes was to locate KS1 in one area, KS2 in another. SC confirmed that she had been involved in the discussions and a walk around, including impact on behaviour policies. <p>Nurture Provision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academy Council asked if the impact of nurture provision had been evaluated. JS confirmed that they had asked for a review which had taken place yesterday – report would follow shortly. It was confirmed that evaluation going forward would be by way of exit profiles. <u>Report to be presented at the next meeting.</u> <p>Admissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of in-year admissions had been high this year, with children coming from Steiner School and 7 children In Year 5 who were all EAL. In total, 11 children had been new to English in total. Academy Council asked if this would change the focus next year. LM explained this would be within the AIP, as part of meeting the need for all pupils, through the focus on supporting language vocabulary deficit. Academy Council asked how it would inform practice around EAL provision. LM explained that teachers had action plans in place to support EAL. EAL would be embedded in the ‘Teachers as Experts’ programme. The 4 children from Steiner school in Year 2 were expected to catch up with extra support. Academy Council recommended cross referencing with BME data as there were still some gaps. It was noted that to ensure strategy in classrooms, pupil progress meetings next year would be focussed in 3 groups; pupils new to school, SEND children and those in receipt of PP Grant. 	<p>JS</p> <p>LM</p>
6.2	<p>Quality of Teaching and Learning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academy Council questioned pupil voice in relation to teachers and if the results fed into teacher assessment. LM explained that a questionnaire was completed by a sample from each year group from Year 2 to Year 6 which fed into the assessment. Academy Council discussed if children understood why they received homework, suggesting this could be built into work with student voice. <u>EM would take this forward for student voice</u> 	EM
6.3	<p>Behaviour:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academy Council asked if support was being given to key children during unstructured time/play provision/integrating into the main playground. JS explained the provision in place, which depended on individual needs. It was noted the provision was routinely reviewed. 	
6.4	<p>Risk Register:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LM highlighted changes since the last meeting. Academy Council asked what provision was being made for disabled parking as a result of the gate now being closed. EP said she was liaising with central CLF regarding how to proceed. It was noted there was a disabled bay at the front of the school. 	

Item	Description	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re parking issues/safety – Discussion took place regarding the Council proposal to close roads outside schools at drop off time. Academy Council requested that an EOI should be sent to the Council. EP to send EOI. • Front Entrance – LM reported the new front entrance was going well. EP to up date risk. • ST pointed out 4 risks where the mitigation did not appear to lower the risk. Academy Council would look at risks 20, 24, 28, 32 at the next meeting. • DP breach – LM explained the details of the breach and actions taken to ensure it didn't happen again. It was noted the ICO had dismissed the breach after investigation. 	<p>EP</p> <p>EP</p> <p>LM</p>
6.5	<p>Staffing update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LM advised that since the report was written Abby McManus had resigned; an appointment had already been made to the role. 	
6.6	<p>AIP PLANNING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LM explained the process had started as part of ARM, under four areas; developing teachers as experts and developing excellence; work around oracy; reading, writing and teaching of mathematics; alongside any child, any book, any subject. LM would send the draft plan to Academy Council for comment. 	LM
6.7	<p>Safeguarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Annual Report – Academy Council noted that two checks were still outstanding. EP explained that the checks were taking some time to come through. EP was requested to chase. 	EP
6.8	<p>The SEND Annual Report was noted.</p>	
6.9	<p>Finance, Health & Safety & Estates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LM highlighted that, with increasing costs, balancing the budget going forward was more difficult. 	
6.10	<p>Compliance, including Policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Supporting Children with Medical Needs Policy was approved. • Academy Council queried the following policies which required updating. E Safety Policy on website needs updating (new CLF policy being drafted); Access Plan; Business Continuity; SEN/Inclusion; Sex & Relationship Education. EP would update and present the policies in September • It was noted the academy were seeking more information about the possibility of taking part in a project to support the implementation of the new RSE duty Taken forward to next meeting for further discussion. 	<p>EP</p> <p>LM</p>
7	Governance	
7.1	<p>Chairs Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership – SC had met with LM and TM to look at the skills set of applications for the sponsor vacancies on academy council. Two people had been recruited and another one was visiting today. Further details would be available in the new term after submission to COAC. An election would take place at the beginning of Term 1 for the Teacher and Support Staff vacancies. • Training - SC advised that a new training schedule would be published shortly which would include both online and face to face training. 	<p>SC</p> <p>LC</p>
8	Matters for the attention of the Board	

Item	Description	Action
8.1	None reported.	
9	AOB	
9.1	Academy Councillors thanked John for his work and support as Teacher Academy Councillor and wished him well for the future.	

The meeting closed at 6.00 pm

Meeting Dates:

Board and Academy Council Results and Strategic Review - Saturday 21 September 9.00 – 12.00

(Principals, Board, Exec Team, Academy Councillors)

Academy Council Meetings:

9 October 2019, 4 December 2019, 12 February 2020, 25 March 2020, 8 July 2020 (all Wednesdays at 4.00 pm (pre meet 3.30 pm))