



Abbey School Local Governing Body Business Meeting Tuesday 25th January 2022 at 12:00 noon

| | | |
|------------------------|--|------|
| Those Present: | | |
| Alison Warner | Chair – Safeguarding Link Governor | AW |
| Louise Abbott | Support Staff Governor | LA |
| Tayla Hamilton | Staff Governor | TH |
| Sue Hodgkinson | Parent Governor – Family Champion, WAVEE and Careers | SH |
| Dawn Jeffery | Parent Governor | DJ |
| Jim McIntosh | Governor – Finance Link Governor | JMcI |
| Sonia Seymour-Thackery | Parent Governor – Vice Chair & T&L Link Governor | SS-T |
| Ian Tankard | Parent Governor – Careers Link Governor | IT |
| | | |
| Also Present: | | |
| Wayne Askham | Head of School | WA |
| Daniel Shirazi-Nejad | Faculty Lead for Explore and Science Subject | DS-N |
| Joel Hardwick | Assistant CEO – Strategy & Partnerships | JH |
| Emma Heyes | Governance Clerk | ES |
| | | |
| Apologies: | | |
| Ivy Dorchester-Brown | Governor – Wellbeing Link Governor | ID-B |
| Janine Brullo | Parent Governor | JB |
| | | |
| No Apologies: | | |
| | | |

| 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE | Actions |
|--|---------|
| 1.1. To receive apologies for absence | |
| Apologies were received for ID-B and JB. | |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>1.2. To accept apologies for absence</p> <p>Apologies were accepted for ID-B and JB.</p> | |
| <p>2. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS</p> | |
| <p>3.1. Chair to determine any items of urgent business</p> <p>No urgent items of business were identified.</p> | |
| <p>3. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS</p> | |
| <p>4.1. Individual Governors to declare any personal, business or other governance interests on any item on the agenda</p> <p>There were no declarations received.</p> | |
| <p>4. ABBEY SCHOOL LOCAL GOVERNING BODY MINUTES</p> | |
| <p>4.1. To approve the minutes of the following meeting:</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 30th November, 2021 were approved.</p> | |
| <p>4.2. Review of Action Tracker</p> <p>The outstanding actions on the tracker were reviewed and updated.</p> | |
| <p>4.3 Matters arising from the Minutes</p> <p>AW asked whether the Leadership Summit was still taking place in June. JH responded that it was on hold, for the time being, and that Governors would be contacted if a decision was made for this to go ahead.</p> | |
| <p>5. ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED</p> | |
| <p>5.1 B11 School Review Report (swapped from 5.2 on the agenda)</p> <p>WA went through Abbey School's B11 Review Report. He provided an overview of the process and provided an overview of each of the nine recommendations detailed on page 5 of the report.</p> <p>The first was around the need for school leaders to check the extent to which weak/early readers have access to appropriate reading materials. WA explained that the B11 had recommended the use of one phonics/reading scheme. WA explained that this creates challenges for a SEND cohort as support needs to be tailored to a wider range of individual pupils' needs.</p> <p>WA confirmed that the second recommendation of staff reinforcing pure sounds in phonics was ongoing.</p> <p>The third recommendation was in relation to rolling out training to all staff on, Head Sprout, the new phonics/reading scheme. WA explained that as Head Sprout was a pilot scheme there wasn't a need to roll this out to all staff, at the moment, until the pilot moves forward and the scheme is approved and accredited.</p> | |

AW asked about the school's commitment to sourcing appropriate reading materials for pupils. WA responded that the school ensured that it provided age appropriate, modern texts that run through the school and the curriculum and that the school continued to invest heavily in this.

IT stated that he could understand how Ofsted would see the benefits of having one phonics and reading scheme but asked if the B11 lead was supportive and understood the challenges this brought to a SEND cohort. WA confirmed that the B11 lead did seem to understand the challenges. He also commented that if Head Sprout became a registered scheme it had the potential to be adopted as a single scheme as it was aimed at SEND students.

IT asked if there were financial implications for the school having different schemes within the school. WA explained that it did but that it was part of all subject leaders' evaluation and was factored into budgets on an ongoing basis.

JM asked what the cost was for this. WA replied that Subject Leads budgeted £1000 per year.

IT asked if Head Sprout was used in other schools across other Trust. WA responded that it was just Abbey, at the moment, but that, nationally, you could see evidence of its success.

IT asked how the school was finding the engagement of families with the reading/writing at home agenda. WA explained that it was difficult to get full engagement from all families all of the time and that a number of different strategies had been adopted to try and combat this (sending materials home in different formats/Zoom meetings etc.) and that it continued to be an ongoing challenge.

IT asked if the pandemic had had an impact on the phonics data the school had. WA confirmed that it had but that various interventions were being adopted and the gaps were starting to close. He also explained the challenges of getting a comparable baseline as children came to the school at different starting points.

WA reported that the fourth recommendation around the website having curriculum information in a more visible and easier to read format had been completed.

Having speech and language/communication reports in a more streamlined format so that staff could easily pick this up was a further recommendation. WA explained that the 10-page document had been reduced to a one page sheet which also included the three most important issues to consider when communicating with that particular pupil.

WA reported that the recommendation around the Safeguarding Policy including Barnsley and Sheffield figures had been completed.

The B11 lead had recommended streamlining the school's Development Plan. WA explained that this was one area that the school would challenge as the plan had a proven record of working well with the senior management team and that he felt to do so would compromise its effectiveness. **SH asked whether the school were confident that they could provide a good rationale as to why they weren't responding to the**

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>recommendation. WA responded that he was confident that the school could provide this and could highlight how the plan had served the school well in going from Special Measures to Outstanding.</p> <p>IT stated that he felt that having such a detailed document showed thoroughness and quality and that it was better to have too much detail than not enough. WA agreed and confirmed that it worked well and helped to keep SLT aspirational and on track with what needed doing.</p> <p>AW asked how staff had found the process. WA reported that staff had fed back that they had found it useful and constructive, if not a little daunting. WA felt that having a practising HMI providing external review was important and ensured that the deep dives taking place in school were completed effectively and with the right amount of challenge.</p> <p>IT commented that, as a parent, how refreshing he felt it was that the school and Trust were actively seeking external challenge and assurance through the B11 Reviews.</p> | |
| <p>5.2 SIP Priorities</p> <p>WA provided a presentation on 'How do we ensure Quality of Education is monitored, evaluated and reviewed?' DS also contributed to the presentation and provided perspective, as a Faculty Lead, on how the Ofsted Quality of Education review framework worked in practice.</p> <p>AW asked DS if he felt that having a limited number of subjects in one faculty was limiting. DS replied that he felt he didn't as there was lots of opportunity to work and get support from other faculties which could be accessed at any time. He felt that teamwork was a really strong area at Abbey.</p> <p>AW asked how this work fits in with the role of Governors? WA responded that the deep dives promoted the importance of asking questions from lots of different perspectives and that it would allow Governors an opportunity to get to know the school even better and see evidence of the statements made in LGB meetings working in practice.</p> <p>SH asked how the school could demonstrate that Governors were involved in this process. AW responded that this could be evidenced in minutes of meetings, attendance at training and the fact that they will be more knowledgeable and be able to answer questions in more detail as they will be more informed.</p> <p>IT asked about the LARS title and if this should be consistent and visible in curriculum design. WA stated that this could be changed to make it more Government friendly. WA said that he could take this to SLT to get some feedback.</p> <p>AW asked when Governors could start to get involved in the Quality of Education process. WA replied that when the cycle had been completed he will send the information to Governors and that he would highlight, in different colours, the areas where Governors can get involved.</p> | <p style="text-align: right;">WA 15/03/22</p> <p style="text-align: right;">WA 15/03/22</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>5.3 School Admission Refusals</p> <p>WA informed the LGB that there were 84 refusals recorded but he would confirm this figure.</p> | |
| <p>5.4 Annual Self-Assessment</p> <p>Governors were informed that the annual skills self-assessment was about to commence and to expect to receive their assessment form shortly. They were advised to complete the audit and return it to clerkingservices@nexusmat.org</p> | |
| 6. GOVERNANCE MATTERS | |
| <p>6.1. Governors to complete Activity Log</p> <p>Governors were reminded to email any activity to clerkingservices@nexusmat.org</p> | |
| <p>6.2. Trust Verbal Update of Key Issues</p> <p>JH provided an update to the meeting. He explained that Covid was causing some disruption to schools in the Trust in terms of staff absence and that there had been some elements of short-term partial closures.</p> <p>JH explained how the Trust had been contacted by the Regional Schools Commissioner to take on some school improvement work with other schools in the region and that LW would be part of this.</p> <p>SH asked how Governors could be reassured around safeguarding issues in the school. It was explained that 'safeguarding' would be an item on the next (and every alternate) agenda so there was always the opportunity to explore this in more detail and ask any questions. It was highlighted that safeguarding was all Governors' responsibility (not just the Safeguarding Link Governor).</p> | |
| 7. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS | |
| <p>7.1. To consider any other urgent business agreed by the Chair</p> <p>No urgent business items were discussed.</p> | |
| 8. CONFIDENTIALITY & RISK | |
| <p>8.1. To consider the confidentiality of any items discussed during the meeting</p> <p>No confidential items were discussed.</p> | |
| <p>8.2. To consider any areas of risk discussed during the meeting</p> <p>No areas of risk were discussed.</p> | |
| 10. DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS | |

| | | | |
|--|---------------|--------------|----------------------|
| Tuesday 15 th March 2022 | 12:00 – 14:00 | Abbey School | Business Meeting |
| Tuesday 10 th May 2022 | 12:00 – 14:00 | Abbey School | Quality of Education |
| Tuesday 28 th June 2022 (TBC) | 16:00 – 19:00 | Crags School | Leadership Summit |
| Tuesday 5 th July 2022 | 12:00 – 14:00 | Abbey School | Business Meeting |

Minutes approved

| CHAIR | SIGNATURE | DATE |
|--------------|------------------|-------------|
| | | |