

Minutes – Begbrook Primary Academy Council

Version:	Final	
Date	12 February 2020	
Location:	Begbrook Primary Academy	
Time:	4.00 pm	
Members Present:	Graham Wilkie (GW)	Sponsor Academy Councillor (Chair)
	Emily Mowlem (EM)	Student Advocate
	Laurie Munro (LM)	Academy Principal
	Shashi McGregor (SM)	LA Representative Councillor
	Sally Harrison (SH)	Parent Academy Councillor
	Hayley Moulding (HM)	Sponsor Academy Councillor
	Kate Richardson (KR)	Executive Principal
	Rachel Harris (RH)	Teacher Academy Councillor
	Sally Harrison (SH)	Parent Academy Councillor
	Divya Raj (DJ)	Sponsor Academy Councillor
	Alice Coyle (AC)	Support Staff Councillor
Attendees:	Jen Shaw (JS)	Academy Assistant Principal
	Linda Corbidge (LC)	Academy Council Clerk
	Emma Pearn (EP)	Operations Manager
Apologies:	-	
Absent:	Tony Mooney (TM)	Parent Academy Councillor

Minutes

Item	Description	Action
1	Introductions	
1.1	Welcome and introductions were made by GW.	
2	Declarations of Interest	
2.1	None.	
3	Minutes of Previous Meeting	
3.1	The minutes of the meeting held 4 December 2019 were agreed as accurate.	
4	Matters Arising from previous meetings	
4.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Newsletter readability on mobile devices</i> – no further issues reported. • <i>Website to be updated with newsletters/parent letters/Safeguarding Policy</i> – completed • <i>Curriculum statement to be updated on website.</i> LM advised that this is in process. <u>ACTION: Taken forward for review.</u> • <i>Academy Councillor Visit Summary to be emailed to ACs</i> – <u>ACTION: GW to send to LC for uploading to Teams.</u> • <i>Academy Councillors to complete remaining visits before Christmas; PP Link Visit to include questions on Maths</i> – It was confirmed that all Academy 	<p>LM</p> <p>GW</p>



Item	Description	Action
	<p>Councillors had made visits, reports to be sent to GW. Immersion Day would be arranged for June. <u>ACTION: Academy Councillors to send Visit Reports to GW for summary</u></p> <p><u>ACTION: GW would arrange Immersion Date with JS.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Student Council to discuss why children receive homework and EM to re-film video for website – see Pupil Voice item.</i> • <i>Update on application for BCC to close roads at drop off times – EP advised that the Academy had heard back today with various options. EP would report back with further information when available.</i> • <i>Spot check on SCR to be completed before next meeting – GW advised that he would include a check at each Safeguarding Visit.</i> • <i>Parent Forum dates to be circulated to AC for representation – JS explained that they had been waiting for a date from CLF regarding the new RSHE Policy in order to consult with parents. This would now take place on 19 March.</i> <p><u>ACTION: GW/SM will attend evening on Thursday 19 March.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Finance update re follow-up meeting on budget – LM reported that the CLC Finance Manager was happy with the academy finances; the supply risk had been noted. LM advised that, as part of their NPQH, a colleague may look at options at the academy to utilise HTLAs rather than supply. KR advised that going forward the Trust would be using one supplier. Academy Council questioned the responsibility of planning if HTLAs were used. LM clarified that planning responsibility would remain with the teacher, HTLAs would teach.</i> • <i>Parents to be asked to offer opportunities on enrichment re wider curriculum – it was agreed this was an ongoing request.</i> • <i>EP to email an update on Policies E-Safeguarding, SEN & Equalities following AC comments on Teams – see item on policies.</i> • <i>External Report requested by Academy Council re impact of behaviour of children with particular needs and on the school body: LM briefed on the report which had been circulated.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reads very positively in support of the school; there were 3 or 4 children who would benefit from alternative provision (AP). Since the report, 2 children were now in the EHCP process. One other has a place at AP, one is expecting a place shortly. This had resulted in less actions as there were now less children with high need. Actions recommended included further staff training and frosted plastic on windows to corridors to create a barrier. Academy Council commented that they were pleased to see the report highlighted the school's inclusive ethos and the high level of support given to the children. - Academy Council asked how the academy could identify the needs earlier to access the right level of support. LM explained that as a result of the Bristol SEND Ofsted letter and high demand for specialist provision, schools were re-assessing to start the EHCP process earlier. It was agreed this was a big piece of work for SENCos. Academy Council asked if the SENCo had enough capacity for the extra work involved. LM said that the SENCo had been given one day a week to work on it. 	<p>ALL ACs GW</p> <p>GW</p>

Item	Description	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Academy Council discussed staff morale and asked if those dealing with difficult behaviours felt supported. LM and JS explained the support provided; which included some costed outside 1:1 support (prioritised according to need) with priority being given in cases of high need. In addition, staff could access CLF counselling through the Trust Employee Assistance programme. KR commented that there was a Trust wide mental health strategy. Staff members commented that there was a very supportive staff culture and constant dialogue where issues were picked up quickly. Academy Council said it was important that staff should be aware of the range of support available and requested that staff be reminded. Academy Council agreed that it was helpful to have someone supporting with supervision from outside of school. Further suggestions included support staff having weekly/monthly meetings. • Case studies showing progress of children who had been in Gem House Provision to be presented – JS briefed on the report which had been circulated. Academy Council asked why some pupils had not improved. LM explained the data was a broad approach as there were many approaches used. Data showed that overall Gem House provision was of benefit. Additionally, the data analysis included other provision, e.g. the Nest which showed that the school had done all it could. Academy Council noted that the provision made it easier to identify early interventions. Discussion followed on how Pupil Premium and Top Up Funding was used for the provision. Academy Council noted that some of the comments in the report were really powerful and teacher feedback was good. • KR to look into why Data Dashboard had not been produced centrally - the Dashboard had been produced this term. • Pupil Premium Report to next meeting for information – LM briefed on the PP Report presented. Eligibility had reduced from 22% to 16% resulting in less funding. LM explained the strategy and interventions used at the academy. GW, Pupil Premium Link, reported that the PP strategy was well thought out. LM commented that Ofsted had called the strategy ‘exemplary’ when they last visited. • EP to update risk Register re RSHE implementation – this had been done. • SC to undertake a Safeguarding Visit before she leaves – GW reported that he would be visiting with SC after half term and would report back at the next meeting. ACTION: Safeguarding Visit Report to next meeting. • LM to update Equalities Objectives on website re difference between socio economic groups, and written report to be provided for information at next meeting – LM reported that it was decided the report did not need amendment. • Academy Council information on website to be updated – this would be updated shortly with new Academy Councillors. ACTION: Update AC information on website • Access Plan to be reviewed and comments added to Review Sheet in Teams before 20 January. EP to note – see policy item. 	<p style="text-align: right;">GW</p> <p style="text-align: right;">LC/EP</p>

Item	Description	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Skills Audit for AC</i> – it was agreed that the minutes should have noted that there was a safeguarding deficit on the Academy Council following SC’s resignation not Education; GW has safeguarding knowledge. 	
5	Academy Council Report	
5.1	<p>LM briefed councillors on the last Academy Review Visit (ARV) where it was agreed that the academy would currently be judged as ‘Good’ under the Ofsted Framework. There had been a discussion around Behaviour and Personal Development which was preventing the academy being outstanding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academy Council asked why the number of fixed term exclusions (FTE) was high and if this related to individual children. LM explained that there had not been any exclusions since Christmas; every alternative to exclusion is always sought. LM was also looking at other options to ensure that school time was more suitable for when they return. KR explained that there had been discussion that there should be more communication with staff regarding the Trust’s aim to be a low excluding Trust. • Academy Council asked for a comparison to other schools. LM said the academy was the same as CLF (0.9) and above national (0.6); the national average was low. LM assured academy council that they had data on case studies. • Academy Council asked if hosting children on exclusion from other schools puts more pressure on staff. LM explained that they come with a member of staff and there is full reflective discussion with those children. • Academy Council asked if it was expected the number of FTE would reduce. LM said ‘yes’. • Academy Council asked if the children where alternative provision was being sought were regularly reviewed. LM assured councillors that the two children at alternative provision were visited regularly whilst waiting for the EHCPs. Further discussion took place on the type of provision and funding. Following further questioning academy councillors were assured that the academy was closer to resolution for the children. 	
5.2	<p>Personal Development Discussion took place on how personal development was communicated; noting the different focus between taught and learnt.</p>	
5.3	<p>Attendance Academy Council requested a presentation by Zoe Sutton (Family Support Worker who leads on attendance) at the next meeting regarding the introduction of a graduated response/communication from a member of the re impact from non-attendance. ACTION: Finn and Zoe to present on attendance at next meeting.</p>	LM
5.4	<p>Safeguarding GW advised that he would be making a Safeguarding Visit (as Link Councillor) this term.</p>	
5.5	<p>Quality of Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading element – LM advised that the AIP would be amended to reflect that everybody is an expert in reading. • LM reported that the quality of phonics teaching was really strong. Academy Council noted that the academy needed to purchase de-codable books which would involve a large cost. Academy Council questioned details of the 	

Item	Description	Action
	<p>funding. Following discussion, LM explained there was an outline of a timeline to put in a bid to get match funding which would ensure this is delivered within the school budget.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academy Council questioned where the academy was regarding Intent for the SEND curriculum and how this was being actioned. LM explained there was more work to be done around Curriculum Intent; which would involve all staff articulating the curriculum consistently with the support of SLT. • Academy Council questioned the focus for those with lower attainment. LM explained the different strategy for those students which over time would ensure more children were meeting ARE. 	
5.6	<p>Quality of Teaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academy Council asked for an update on the quality of teaching. LM advised that out of 31 teachers in the school, only 1 was on a formal support plan and would be coming off soon as support was going positively. • Academy Council questioned the teaching staff present for staff voice. Staff explained that sharing workload and team ideas etc. have resulted in the positive support provided. • Academy Council asked the teachers how they felt following introduction of the new curriculum. Teachers reported that they were excited to plan and were really enjoying the new curriculum implementation – there were very few moans. EM said ‘I can’t work anywhere else now’. 	
5.7	<p>Data/Targets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academy Council questioned the gender attainment gap – are the gaps for boys narrowing? It was agreed to take forward to the next meeting when data would be provided in advance of the meeting. ACTION: Provide data in advance, looking at DOYA (Deepening/OnTrack/Yet to be On Track/At an early stage) and wider curriculum as evidence • Academy questioned the targets following recent testing. LM explained his confidence in outcomes after the recent mock and that the academy is hoping to achieve 88% for Writing. • KR asked what LM thought combined measure at KS2 would be. LM responded that the target is 72%. Discussion followed on preparing Year 6 children within a broad and balance curriculum. Resource was also put into therapy sessions and interventions because these outcomes were important - more importantly we want them to have a board and balanced curriculum experience and a focus on the whole child. • Academy Council questioned maths outcomes. LM explained the positive picture of maths teaching more generally and the development work happening there. KR explained the maths picture across the Trust and the developments happening more broadly working in collaboration with the Boolean Maths Hub. • Academy Council asked about Year 3 and Year 4 writing ability, questioning the reason those who were deepening in writing now aren’t. LM explained the school journey with greater depth and the dip in assessment within Year 3. LM explained how writing was collectively moderated and the need to do more of this above and below year groups in the future. Teachers feel more secure about writing as the year develops. Maths is also more quantifiable. Teachers on the AC supported this view. • Academy Council asked about the staff absence and how this is affecting classes – who is having more than one teacher etc. LM explained that the 	LM

Item	Description	Action
	<p>school works proactively to cover the class with familiar members of staff. Academy Council commented that absence in reception seemed to be high. LM and JS explained that a TA and a teacher had been absent for factors outside of the academy's control and the school had forward planned where possible to cover absence with high quality teachers. LM emphasised that there is a level of confidentiality when communicating with parents about staff health needs and conditions.</p>	
6	Student Voice / Student Advocate	
6.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EM shared a video about the roles of the school council and asked if this could be the first item on the agenda in future meetings. Further actions included a fundraiser for Children in Need; Anti-bullying and World Book Day. EM reported that children commented that they 'love it' (the council) because they get to help solve problems and make the school a better place. SH commented on the buzz around choosing the new reps for the academy council across the academy. EM fed back on her discussion with the group about homework, following the request by academy council. The academy feels it has a well-planned homework policy and there were a variety of responses to this topic - <i>we want it harder/easier/more/less etc.</i> EM said she felt the children liked the consolidation of what had been taught in school. The children brought the ideas of the class to the group - not just their own ideas. Playtime had also been discussed, which felt really positive - they would like the MUGA to always be open (although this was a staffing issue). They feel that the dinner staff were very kind and Year 2 were enjoying the sense of freedom. Year 1 were enjoying the larger space they have this year. <p>Later topics are school dinners and reading at home.</p>	LC
7	Governance	
7.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AC training day on 23rd March – GW requested all ACs to attend if possible. <u>ACTION: Link to register and agenda to be shared.</u> 	LC
8	Risk Register	
8.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following discussion, it was agreed that Coronavirus should be added to the Risk Register. <u>ACTION: Add Coronavirus to RR.</u> It was agreed that GW, LM and EP should meet to review the risk. <u>ACTION: GW to arrange a meeting to review risks.</u> 	EP GW
9	Matters for the attention of the Board/COAC	
9.1	None to report.	
10	Any Other Business	
10.1	<p>Academy Council asked what actions were being taken regarding the continuing issue of inadequate portion sizes. EP said that she was working on this. It was agreed that KR would raise with Heidi. <u>ACTION: KR to talk to Heidi about Aspens re the continuing issue of inadequate portion sizes.</u></p>	KR

The meeting closed at 6.05 pm

Meeting Dates: (all Wednesdays at 4.00 pm (pre-meet 3.30 pm)
25 March 2020, 8 July 2020

See over page for DOYA explanation....

**DOYA*

- *Deepening (D): child has reached the year group expectation and is now taking this deeper into more abstract work – following their passion within a broad curriculum that inspires the full range of attainment and interest.*
- *On track (O) / Working At current age-related expectation. The child is working at the age-related expectation for their Year.*
- *Yet to be on track (Y): the child shows some working at age related expectations, but is not yet on track to achieve them.*
- *At an earlier stage (A) in their learning journey. The child is short of the age-related expectation, typically around a year behind.*