



Gladstone Primary Academy Committee Minutes

Thursday 3 February 2022 at 4:00pm

This was a virtual meeting

Present: Ifrat Jawaid (IJ), Simon Martin (Head Teacher) (SM), Sukaina Manji (SMj), Kathy Fountain (KF) and John Turner (JT) (Chair)

Also present: Isabel Clark (Clerk), Paul Fountain (PF), Mick Gernon (CEO), Matt Newton (MN), Zander Berry (ZB) and Ben Wilson (BW).

Observer: Deborah Wortman (DW)

Apologies: Alan Sadler (AS)

		Action
1	Welcome and introductions A welcome was made to all especially to DW as an observer of this meeting.	
2	Declarations of Interest No additional declarations were made for this meeting.	
3	Previous minutes and matters arising (9 December 2021)	
3.1	Members AGREED the minutes as a true record of the meeting.	
3.2	Matters arising <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response to a question on progress was elaborated on. The DfE use KS1 to KS2 data. We had 124 Year 2-6 children, but now at 89. The 2109 calculation was used as the methodology and Year 6 mock SATS results. January's scaled scores show positive improvement from -3.1 (2019) to +5 in Reading and -1.7 (2019) to +1 in Maths. In Phonics the LA average is 77%, here we are at 71% 	
4-7	Overview of Curriculum presentations	
4.1	Geography Geography is the focus, as this was highlighted in the OfSTED report as not yet being sequenced and will be one of the Deep Dive foci of the next inspection. The presentation was a follow up from the previous one, given to members in December 2020. MN and ZB made the presentation.	

4.2	<p>Highlights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Move from working memory into long-term memory ○ Mental models/schema ○ Pyramid model, building on prior knowledge ○ Being good readers is important as this can quicken the pace ○ 3 Is and OfSTED descriptors. ○ Consistent planning across all year groups <p>Curriculum design work is never finished.</p> <p>Long term plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Vision (why?) and vision statement ○ Knowledge domains and key concepts to be developed and embedded ○ End points ○ Progression maps ○ What taught and when ○ Detailed case studies developed within a topic <p>Members asked the following questions;</p> <p>Q Are all subjects now sequenced?</p> <p>A There is something in place for all subjects, but not necessarily as detailed as this. When complete they will all follow the same format.</p> <p>Q How sure are you that the teachers have enough evidence for assessment on the key concepts?</p> <p>A Teachers come together to discuss and do book-looks. Books are kept beyond each separate year group.</p> <p>English</p> <p>The same concepts apply. The domains are Fiction, non-fiction and poetry and the key concepts are comprehension and fluency.</p> <p>End points are aligned to the national curriculum and assessments. These have been reviewed by CB (TDET) and found to be meticulous and successful.</p> <p>Careful text choices and teachers know the long-term progression.</p> <p>Members asked the following questions:</p> <p>Q What support is available to parents especially for reading at home?</p> <p>A there is an expectation that every child reads at home every day albeit that that can be with a sibling. In the classroom we pick up those where there may be a barrier to reading at home. We do follow up with a home-language call home and discuss the importance of reading at home with the parents.</p> <p>We are keen to let parents know that their experiences are valued as much as what the children can learn in school.</p> <p>Pre-Covid we were offering workshops for parents on Phonics and hope to do so again soon. These are done with the children present.</p> <p>Q In the news this week was a report on Phonics failing children</p> <p>A We need a mix of both, natural texts as well as Phonics and to be sure of</p>	
-----	--	--

	<p>comprehension of both. We have a lot of books for reading around a child's interest in school.</p> <p>Overall, Geography is the most developed area of the curriculum. The Reading long-term plan has been done and we are moving on to writing. MFL, Art, PE, History all have plans in place and are all taught by subject specialists. DT and computing is less developed but is a work in progress.</p>	
8	<p>EYFS Consultation</p> <p>We are intending to consult on a change of age-range. Currently we are 4-11 and want to change that to 2-11, adding in a new phase. There are positives to being one school rather than the school running a pre-school. One being PP children in pre-school do not get FSM, in the school they would. We would be the first in the city to run a 2-11 school and there would probably be a lot of scrutiny and interest from other Early Years providers.</p> <p>MG added that it is for the Trust to go out to consultation.</p> <p>Members asked the following questions:</p> <p>Q Will it change the admissions criteria?</p> <p>A We have addressed this in the recent consultation on changing the PAN. It is a bit of an unknown at the moment how Pre-school children would apply for places and whether or not they would move directly into the main school in Reception Year (advice is being sought). Whilst our PAN should be 90 now, we would still only take 30 Pre-school children.</p> <p>Q Would it make any difference to what members are required to do?</p> <p>A At present we have a separate committee for the pre-school, that could continue as a sub committee of this committee, but overall members would be responsible for all the children in the school.</p> <p>Q Will the existing pre-school close?</p> <p>A Yes, but the children will just transfer. Technically the Trust are already running the pre-school.</p> <p>Q Is this a benefit to the community and parents?</p> <p>A Yes and will get that message out.</p> <p>Q What physical changes will there be?</p> <p>A The pre-school would move into the main school building, that's all.</p> <p>Members AGREED that the consultation should go ahead.</p>	
9	<p>PP and recovery funding plan.</p> <p>We are running a project with the LA, EEF and the Norwich Research School, sharing best practice and sharing data. Already it is re-shaping our thinking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PP report is a public document and should not drill down too far • A wider range of evidence and analysis is required • To review each objective: do we continue, do we change, do we stop? • It is a 3-year plan with milestones (yearly) and termly reviews (9 review points) 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The format is dictated by the DfE Quality First teaching is the number one focus As barriers are removed, we should start to see gains <p>The report reflects our own AAAP. We have 40% PP children in school.</p> <p>Member asked the following questions:</p> <p>Q Does this include recovery funding?</p> <p>A Yes; it's all in one pot now.</p> <p>Q Do we review again if the funding alters?</p> <p>A It is a substantive plan (RAG rated) and adjusted as we go along.</p> <p>Q PP data was in the news this week with some queries.</p> <p>A Far more families are qualifying for PP and our Pp children do come from deprived families. Some are reluctant to claim and/or complete forms, but we work with them explaining the benefits for both the school and their children.</p> <p>JT commented that at his link meeting with PF the documents were reviewed and the milestones were very clear.</p> <p>Members were happy to ACCEPT the plan.</p>	
10	<p>Behaviour policy</p> <p>A slight amendment to the policy had been made. The anti-bullying policy has been incorporated into this policy.</p> <p>Members APPROVED the changes</p> <p>MG added that the Trust's complaints policy had also been slightly amended with an additional step being added in. This will come to the Committee soon.</p>	
11	<p>Equality objectives 2022-2025</p> <p>It is a statutory requirement to have these in place.</p> <p>Whilst it is a 3-year plan, they are reviewed annually.</p> <p>Members APPROVED the objectives.</p>	
12	<p>Covid update</p> <p>The Omicron wave hit the school in the last two weeks of January. One third of the teaching staff were off and 35 children. It was an effort to keep the school open, but we did.</p> <p>The Risk assessments were reviewed and we closed down the staff rooms again.</p> <p>Cover was provided by utilising all those that remained in school, but by the second week, the good will was waning.</p> <p>Today we have no staff off and only 8 children.</p> <p>The main effect has been that we have had to put the continuous development on hold.</p>	
13	<p>Member visits</p> <p>The pre-school minutes had been uploaded to GovernorHub.</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were lower numbers than usual due to some Covid reluctance • One resignation had resulted in some salary savings • The pre-school have a comfortable reserve • The pre-school is running well (SMj is also on this committee) <p>Members asked what the Trust's stance was on members being in schools? MG responded that this was very much down to each school, but his recommendation would be not until at least after half-term and preferably leave until after Easter, However, this was recognised as a key part of a member's role.</p>	
14	<p>Principal's report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Trust review had been postponed and rearranged for 1-4 March. The focus would be on English, Maths, Geography and PE • There was a new Sports Coach who was also providing high-level coaching to other Trust schools • A new TA had been employed who came from a special school background • The SKIT student was making good progress • A recent maternity leave returner had been given a TLR role • The school's budget was in a healthy position with an in-year surplus (most of which was ring-fenced) • There were 555 children in school; this was static, but with some ins and outs. Most years were at capacity, other than Year 4 where there were only 74 students against a PAN of 90. 	
15	<p>Trust updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Trust had a new Chair, Mark Potter. Richard Barnes had stood down as Chair but remained a Trustee. • The feedback from the training day (4 January) stood at 89% who agreed or strongly agreed and if adding in the slightly agreed this went up to 98%. This was very positive and endorsed the direction of travel for the Trust. • Three TDET roles had been advertised <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A teacher development role ○ A curriculum development role ○ A 6th Form development role • The Governance role would not be advertised again. A governance admin role would be created and a Clerk to Trustees assigned. 	
16	<p>AOB None</p>	
17	<p>Next meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thursday 17 March 2022 at 4:00pm <p>Items for the agenda:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Members' roles/links ○ Roadmap/future vision 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Trust review outcomes and actions○ SEF update review	
--	---	--

The meeting closed at 5:55pm