

Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames



**CHESSINGTON SCHOOL**

**Minutes of the Local Governing Body (LGB) Meeting held on 5th February 2020  
in the Conference Room**

**PART ONE MINUTES**

<b>Co-opted Governors</b>	*Karen Carman (KCN) *Andrew Evans (AES) *Jules Hammond (JHD) (Chair) *Ramesh Kapadia (RKA) *Tony Mills (TMS) *Nicola Macbean (NMN) *Sonia Molnar (SMR) *Carolyn Withey (CWY)
<b>Headteacher</b>	*Ashraf Ali (AAI)
<b>Staff Governor</b>	*Amy Smith (ASM)
<b>Parent Governors</b>	*Vanessa Sinet (VST)
<b>Local Authority Governor</b>	*Christine Stuart (CST)
<b>Also in Attendance</b>	<u>Associate Members:</u> *Sarah Wilson (SWN) - Deputy Headteacher  *Lucinda Ayles - Clerk

\*Denotes present

The meeting was quorate (12 out of 13) Governors were present. Attendance = 92%.

***Wording in italics indicates Governor Challenge***

1.	<u>Welcome</u> - The Chair, JHD welcomed everyone to the Meeting.  It was noted that Governors had submitted a number of Part One questions on the Drive prior to the Meeting, which the School had since responded to. These would be added to the Minutes of this Meeting as Appendix I.	
----	--	--

2.	<p><u>Declarations of Interest</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AAI declared that he was currently both Headteacher of Chessington School and CEO of Every Child, Every Day Academy Trust; and</li> <li>• JHD declared that she was both Chair of Governors at Chessington School and Clerk to the Trustees of Every Child, Every Day Academy Trust.</li> </ul> <p>They each declared they would withdraw from the Meeting if an agenda item were to represent a conflict of interest.</p>	
3.	<p>a) <u>LGB Minutes (Part One) from 4.12.19</u> - as there were no amendments, JHD signed off the above Part One Minutes as a correct record of that Meeting.</p> <p>b) <u>Matters Arising</u> - The Chair went through the Actions. Completed actions have been updated on the Governors' Drive under <u>Chessington School - 2019-20/Local Governing Group (LGB) Meetings/LGB Meeting 3 - 5.2.20/Documents for the Meeting/Draft LGB2 Minutes and Actions/Part One Actions</u>.</p> <p>Outstanding actions are summarised on the Governors' Drive under <u>Chessington School - 2019-20/Local Governing Body (LGB) Meetings/LGB Meeting 4- 25.3.20/Documents for Meeting/Draft LGB3 Minutes and Actions/Part One Actions</u>.</p>	<p>Actions 1 - 9</p>
4.	<p><u>Single Central Record (SCR)</u> - SMR had checked the SCR that afternoon. She confirmed that staff put a lot of work into keeping all the records updated and it was a very comprehensive and complex document. The Office had an issue with transferring the spreadsheet to a Googledoc, however this was work in progress.</p>	
5.	<p><u>Public Sector Equality Duty and Objectives</u> - SMR confirmed that this came under 'Admin' Policies, which were to be reviewed the next half-term. Governors should now have access to the School Bus, which would be required for reviewing School policies from now on. Governors were requested to contact the Chair or the Clerk if they had problems accessing and were also advised to check their 'spam' if they had not received the logon details.</p>	<p><b>LGB3/P1/ 010 - ALL</b></p>
6.	<p><u>Policies</u> - The Meeting ratified the following policies (having been previously placed on the Drive):</p> <p>a) Complaints Policy; and</p> <p>b) Managing Serial and Unreasonable Complaints.</p> <p>A Governor asked if many vexatious requests were made by parents. AAI responded that yes, unfortunately, quite a number were received.</p>	

7.

Safeguarding - ASM reported the following:

- Safeguarding Quiz - this had already been reviewed under 'Part One Actions'.
- Safeguarding Summary - ASM had placed the Safeguarding Summary on the Drive and colour coded to show fewer or more Child Protection, Child in Need and Team Around the Child cases. **Following a Governor asking what the acronyms were on the Question Sheet**, LAS confirmed that she had updated them on the Glossary. A Governor asked what these terms were. ASM replied that Child in Need and Team Around the Child were voluntary level, whereas Child Protection was a statutory level.

ASM explained the colour coding and said that she had also added to the document all her Safeguarding Moments that she had highlighted at School Meetings this year. **A Governor suggested and it was agreed that as Meetings no longer contained Safeguarding Moments, where ASM's Safeguarding summaries were provided for LGB Meetings, the Safeguarding Moments from that document should be provided in an Appendix to the Minutes.** Please refer to Appendix II to these Part One Minutes.

- Chessington's Safeguarding Priorities - these Actions had been closed.
- Child-Friendly Safeguarding Report - this had been drafted and issued to students and parents. ASM would be working with the Student Council to come up with a Child-Friendly Safeguarding Policy.
- Update on Governors' Safeguarding Audit - ASM had asked RBK for specific feedback, however only general feedback had been provided to schools as follows:
  - STRENGTHS - Most school staff were Level 3 trained in Safeguarding; Safeguarding information was well disseminated and there was a good Safeguarding culture in most schools (eg meeting agendas and staff briefings);
  - AREAS FOR DEVELOPMENT - Safeguarding needed to be included in job descriptions for the Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL); more LGBTQI diversity training was needed and the Audit needed to be a 'live' document, not submitted too late. Feedback was required from schools on the Early Help Assessment (ASM had been working with CPD at AfC on this). It was a lengthy, admin document on areas that schools generally already covered.

Governor questions raised the following questions at this section of the meeting

**Q1 "Do School staff need LGBTQI training?"**

**A1** ASM replied that 'identity' issues were one of the categories on her list where support was sometimes required for pupils and this plus staff training was available from an Agency.

**Q2 "Does Chessington have more Safeguarding issues than Grey Court (GC) or Hollyfield (HF), despite being much smaller?"**

**A2** ASM replied that despite being half the size of HF, Chessington had six children on CP plans, whereas HF had two (but one on a Managed Move and one currently at Malden Oaks). Chessington Pastoral Leaders were all Level 3 trained and observed at Child Protection Conferences. There was no funding for schools for safeguarding/child protection.

**Q3 "Is there a reason Chessington School has double the number of children on CP Plans and high numbers of SEMH cases? Are we attracting more because of our reputation?"**

**A3** AAI replied that it was probably because the School was in the 2nd most deprived ward in Kingston and maybe also reputation. AAI said the School wanted to take as many as possible but there were cost implications. The **Chair of Finance said it was important for her to be able to explain at**

external meetings that the School was under considerable financial pressure due to having roughly double the number of children on CP Plans with no additional funding. ASM added that not all students on CP Plans qualified for counselling with Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) due to finance pressures, and they were fortunate that two children on CPs had access to two of the four counselling sessions provided free by a Charity (the normal cost would be £40 per hour). Students on CPs were supported by an external Social Worker.

- Q4** "Is there any support from the Borough? If they recognise our good work with vulnerable children, might there be extra funds from the School, particularly if it saves busing them 'Out of Borough' "?
- A4** AAI and ASM confirmed there were no other funds from the Borough, only small pockets of money for holiday or clubs. **Another Governor corrected that high needs students were only transferred 'Out of Borough' if they had physical, neurological or safety needs.**
- Q5** "In view of there being no further funds, where is the cracking point? The School simply can't continue taking more and more higher needs pupils with no extra funding".
- A5** AAI/ASM said it was certainly hard and they were so fortunate to have support from the Grace Dear Charity for a year. ASM said a reporter from Surrey Life had recently visited the School and observed their Eating Disorder initiative. The reporter was exploring what was done to help SEMH pupils on a Borough and School level. ASM also stressed that there was a long waiting list for children to see an Educational Psychologist (EP) due to being in short supply/funding issues. An EP was required when children were assessed for Education, Health and Care Plans and ASM was seeking creative solutions, eg she had successfully negotiated that Surrey County Council should fund an EP for a Surrey pupil.

Governors summarised that underfunding for special needs and no funding for Safeguarding was a real problem. They were adamant that they would do their utmost to support as many vulnerable children in the area that was practically possible. AAI said all Schools nationally were in the same position and the Schools' Forum that he attended constantly fed back to councillors, who in turn fed back to the Borough and Central Government, however this made no difference. **A Governor pointed out that a recent DfE report had concluded that Education was underfunded.**

- Q6** **A Governor wished to know more about the two students who might be moving from CIN to CP.**
- A6** ASM replied that she had followed up with Social Services and one was definitely to move to CP.
- Q7** **The same Governor asked if AfC were receptive.**
- A7** ASM replied that AfC had been strong on 'prevention' at their Ofsted inspection but needed to improve their CIN work and so were keen to hold meetings and follow up cases etc.

#### Student Mental Health

ASM reported the Surrey Life Reporter had been interested in School's work that had been enabled by KRE's contact with Grace Trust. In addition to sessions for students, they had run training sessions for teachers on Self-Harm and Eating Disorders and they would be training GJN on suicide prevention

#### Student Wellbeing

ASM was excited to announce that Chessington was the first school to trial Australian Wellbeing Software, whereby pupils were asked how they were feeling and chose from a range of emojis and added what they would like their

<p>teacher to know about how they were feeling (this section could be customised by the School). It was free for life as Chessington was trialling and ASM was to go to other schools to promote it.</p> <p><b>A Governor asked if the School could look at the results by year group.</b> ASM confirmed that the data could be looked at by year group; by positive/negative responses or, alternatively, groups could be set up. For example, if a group of pupils were set up to de-escalate anger or anxiety, they could be surveyed on their feelings both before and after the intervention. Thus the impact and a measure of students' wellbeing could be gauged.</p> <p><b>Another Governor asked if there were any issues regarding the security of the data.</b> AAI responded that no this was not an issue.</p> <p><u>E-Safety</u> E-Safety week was approaching and BCE was leading an awareness session for students and ASM was focusing on E-Safety in assemblies next week. Special groups were set up, where necessary, to tackle specific issues as they arose, for example, a group had been set up last year to raise awareness of Social Media for certain pupils.</p> <p><u>Children Missing in Education</u> ASM advised Governors there were eight students whose Attendance was less than 60% and there were three tough cases, whose Attendance were 3%, 20% and 30% respectively. As the children were not coming to School, the EP had used some of their time allocated to Chessington to visit the families and two families had refused entry. An Education Welfare Officer's (EWO) had also been consulted. In a small School, these extreme cases could easily skew the data. Governors questions were as follows:  <b>Q8 "Are the three cases, related in any way?"</b>  <b>A8</b> ASM confirmed that no, the three children were from different families.  <b>Q9 "Can we do anything to help?"</b>  <b>A9</b> AAI responded that Governors were already playing a very important part holding Attendance Panels. It was pleasing that 100% of parents asked to attend the Attendance Panel that afternoon had all turned up. The Vice-Chair congratulated the Chair on doing a great job with these Panels.  <b>Q10 "Are parents being fined or attending Court in such circumstances?"</b>  <b>A10</b> ASM said a decision had to be taken as to whether the family in question could afford a fine, and if so, whether it was likely to be a sufficient deterrent. Four or five families at Chessington had reached that stage.</p> <p><u>Agreed Action Points</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Chair of Finance to write a letter to Central Government annually to stress the financial problems Chessington School faces with SEN children and Safeguarding issues.</b></li> <li>● <b>AAI or Chair of Governors to write a letter to ITS and IDS complaining that it was unreasonable for children to have to wait until September to see an EP.</b></li> <li>● <b>The Chair of Governors was continuing conversations with MP for Kingston and Surbiton, EDY about mental health resources for Schools.</b></li> <li>● <b>Chessington School to invite a representative from Social Care in to School to observe for one day.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Q11 "What is happening (work-wise) to the three pupils who are not attending?"</b>  <b>A11</b> AAI replied that they were trying to boost their 'Bucket 3' subjects, eg Catering and Child Development. One was involved with drugs and gang violence; another was having meals at School although not entitled to free</p>	<p>LGB3/P1/ 011 - KCN</p> <p>LGB3/P1/ 012 - JHD/AAI</p> <p>LGB3/P1/ 013 - ASM</p>
---	---

	<p>meals and one had been called in to have a chat with AfC's Exclusions and Reintegration Officer - AB.</p> <p><b>Q12 "Is there anything else we can do to help?"</b></p> <p><b>A12</b> ASM replied that she was trying to boost pupils' sense of belief in themselves by getting them involved in a project run by the Princes Trust, where they received a certificate. She was also tackling misconceptions around attendance.</p> <p>ASM/SWN mentioned that in a few cases they picked up children from their homes before an exam to ensure they were in time for it.</p> <p><u>Disclosure and Barring (DBS) Checks</u> - Further to a point raised at the Trust's Chairs and Clerks' Meeting, JHD confirmed that Chessington School carried out renewed DBS checks for staff and Governors every three years.</p>	
8.	<p><u>Reports from the School</u></p> <p>The following discussions took place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Chair said <u>a parent at this afternoon's Attendance Panel had taken their child out of school for a week's holiday</u> due to her other child with autism not coping during term-time. Also the parent hadn't been aware of the 'lates'. The Attendance Officer was to send out a graph to parents to show their child's absence compared to their peers. The letter to parents was also being re-worded.</li> <li>• ASM explained <u>an issue had arisen with Class Charts</u>. Where a child was absent from lessons for a group activity eg sports, they were sometimes marked down as absent by the class teacher in error. ASM was instructing teachers on marking pupils 'in' on these occasions which would boost the Attendance data.</li> <li>• Governors discussed whether there was a need for an Attendance Working Party. The Vice-Chair of Governors said he didn't know what progress the Curriculum and Outcomes Working Parties had made, however he thought a third working party might prove 'too much', particularly as the Governors' Attendance Panel was proving very effective. JHD clarified that AES had done a lot of work on Department Visits which came under the Curriculum Working Party. <b>AAI agreed and said the School had also done quite a lot of work regarding the 'curriculum'. It was agreed that JHD and SMR would be 'at hand' to support ASM as and when necessary and they should bear in mind that this might develop into a Working Party.</b></li> <li>• ASM had recently found <u>an error in the Attendance Data that had been given to Governors</u>. The spreadsheet had looked at some (not all) of the students' Attendance data with the result that Attendance was actually 94.4% not 93.96% as previously given. (The error was due to the skills set in the School Office).</li> <li>• ASM reported that <u>three students had left the School, whose attendance had been 74%, 56% and 70% respectively</u>. The School's Attendance percentage had now moved from 94.4% to 94.68%. If the pupil on 3% attendance were to leave, this figure would increase to 94.89%, which proved that individuals could easily 'skew' the data.</li> </ul> <p><u>Additional Educational Needs (AEN) Report</u></p> <p><b>A Governor asked for others' views on the AEN Report.</b> AAI replied:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some Schools had refused it as the process took a lot of time.</li> <li>• Schools had commented the Report had no set format and wasn't as rigorous as it could have been. (They missed a couple of points that SMR had already raised with the School). It also moved on to Attendance and</li> </ul>	LGB3/P1/ 014 - ASM/JHD /SMR

	<p>Behaviour, which was good from the School's aspect as they had done so much on this.</p> <p>ASM added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The process used had been good for Heads of Year to be involved in the interview process (for their CPD).</li> <li>• <b>Further to a Governor's question</b>, ASM confirmed she had fed back the good feedback to the Pastoral Leaders and was working with KMN on the SEN focus.</li> <li>• ASM was concerned that the report mentioned the School was implementing the Borough's suggested interventions, when they had clearly been the School's ideas. The final version had been received; there had been no draft but ASM was following this up with them.</li> </ul> <p><b>A Governor challenged whether the School was geared up for a further increase in the number of SEN children joining the School in Year 7 next September.</b> AAI clarified that the number of SEN children in this year's intake had not been out of line. There were only two ECHP students likely to join in Year 7 next September. <b>It was agreed that LAS should bear this in mind for future Agendas so Governors could keep a close eye on this.</b></p> <p><u>School Council</u></p> <p>SMR gave the following updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some students from the Staff Council had visited TFL's office in London before Christmas working towards TFL's STARS project, Bronze Award. TFL would be visiting Chessington School after half-term and there would be time for the Student Council to raise local issues with TFL such as road safety. They would also be running an assembly, producing an advert as well as raising the safeguarding issue of children not being allowed on local buses if they left their bus passes behind. The Chair said that it was also a forum for TMS's work on Pedestrian Crossings near the school to be raised with TFL.</li> <li>• <b>A Governor said most schools had a <u>Travel Plan</u> and asked if one was needed for Chessington School as theirs had been done several years ago.</b> Governors discussed that a Travel Plan would only be needed if the School actually had a travel requirement and, in fact, the School did have very good train, bus and road links as well as a big car park. The same Governor said that if a requirement were to be put to TFL they would need data, which was important to bear in mind. <b>Another Governor asked if there was anything the School needed in respect of Travel Planning.</b> A Governor said he had been concerned for a while (and Student Council representatives had raised) that children were running across the road after school to get to the bus stop (near the cricket ground) and not using the crossings, which was a Health and Safety/safeguarding concern. Apparently children wanted to rush to that particular bus stop due to the timings for that particular bus. <b>Another Governor had been advised by the School Council that there had been one or two road accidents involving Chessington pupils.</b> AAI/SWN said they were unaware of any accidents but confirmed that they had already acted on this and it was no longer an issue. <b>The Governor thanked them but challenged that he would prefer that a patrol/solution was officially put in place rather than the School having to manage the safety of pupils putting themselves at risk, crossing the road in this manner.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Another Governor said there most definitely a problem with the crossing on Leatherhead Road regarding the timing of the lights. Very recently she had had to wait three phases of the lights before</b></p>	<p>LGB3/P1/ 015 - LAS</p>
--	--	-----------------------------------

	<p><b>being able to cross safely with a relative in a wheelchair. Another Governor confirmed that cars went far too fast along that road.</b></p> <p>SMR confirmed that the School Council had thoroughly planned their list of local transport issues to present to TFL.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Since the last LGB Meeting, SMR was pleased to report that following the departure of the local Police Constables (PC) assigned to the School, it had been confirmed that a new PC had now been allocated.</li> <li>• ASM confirmed that further to a Governor question, she had worked on finding younger Student Council members and a few had already joined).</li> </ul>	
9.	<p><u>Update on Governors' Intervention Panel</u></p> <p>An update had already been given, however SMR added that a parent had told the Panel that afternoon that she had taken her child out of School for a holiday because her other child had had a different half-term week in February. AAI thanked JHD and SMR for reinforcing to the parent that children must not be taken out of School.</p>	
10.	<p><u>Pupil Premium</u> - All said that work on this was ongoing.</p>	
11.	<p><u>Presentation on Literacy</u> - GMY gave out an information sheet on Literacy (which is now placed on the Governors' Drive under LGB Meeting 3/Documents for the Meeting). The key points from GMY's presentation were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students were tested at three points in the year - September, February (after half-term) and July. It was nice to see that 32% were above their reading age when they joined in September. Children made good progress over their time at Chessington.</li> <li>• There were six main types of literacy intervention: CLIP, Toe by Toe, Alpha to Omega, Reading Laboratory, Reading Group and Handwriting/Spelling. Groups were mainly led by Teaching Assistants (TAs) or a teacher. Groups were very small and sometimes there was 1:1 teaching.</li> <li>• A Year 11 student had made 36 months' progress after six intervention sessions.</li> <li>• Staff had access to students' reading ages and key/command words were a focus with all classes.</li> <li>• There was an early morning breakfast CPD for staff around new research into Literacy, funded by the Education Endowment Foundation and their top seven ways to improve literacy in secondary schools.</li> <li>• The School wished to thank Governors for their recent work in regenerating the library and pupils were being trained up as librarians. Kingston Library had donated 200 books to the School which needed to be collected and the nearest they could deliver them to was Hook Library. <b>CWY said she would be able to collect from Tudor Drive, if this worked. TMS said he had spoken to the Kingston Librarian's manager who had promised the School further help in planning the layout of the library plus other advice.</b></li> <li>• GMY said the School was welcoming a number of English as an Additional Language (EAL) students and a teacher had attended a CPD course on how to best help them make good progress. She would be updating all staff on this.</li> <li>• The School was hoping to participate in The Big Read where all Year 7 (2020 intake) would be given the same book at their induction and there would be lots of opportunity for discussion. The Book Group would select it. <b>AAI asked the Clerk to draft a letter of thanks from the Chair of Governors to a parent of a leaver last year who had made a donation to</b></li> </ul>	



<p><b>the School, which would pay for the Big Read books. This letter has now been issued.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• World Book day was approaching and a lot of fun, interactive activities were planned, including setting up reading stations so students could earn tickets by 'being caught' reading.</li> </ul> <p><b>Governor Questions</b></p> <p><b>Q1 "I am concerned about the level of reading in Year 11 as only 1% were above their reading age. What is the reason for this as it must have an impact on their GCSE results?"</b></p> <p><b>A1</b> GMY replied that there were 80 students in Year 11 and the 24% who were well below their reading age (i.e approximately two years behind). This group included 6 portuguese students. Reading for pleasure tended to come to an end at age 14 and graphs showed that in general, students progressed really well in literacy throughout school but then tailed off. The School was encouraging children to read as much as possible by holding Readathons and Book Days.</p> <p><b>Q2 "Is there a tendency for either boys or girls to struggle with literacy?"</b></p> <p><b>A2</b> GMY confirmed that girls tended to have better literacy levels.</p> <p><b>Q3 "Do children visit Hook Library from the School?" (The Governor was aware they visited from primary school and wondered if they continued going).</b></p> <p><b>A3</b> GMY answered that the School was planning to take Year 7s to Hook library to get them signed up with a library card, however it would be tricky to get their parents to sign, which was a requirement. <b>A Governor suggested that the music laboratory might entice children to visit the library.</b> GMY highlighted that last year a Poetry Van had visited the School and a young Poet Laureate had visited.</p> <p><b>Q4 Do children have to dress up for World Book Day as I am concerned that disadvantaged students might not be able to afford it?</b></p> <p><b>A4</b> GMY confirmed that students didn't have to dress up for this reason but sometimes the teachers did! All the book related activities compensated for students not dressing up.</p> <p><b>Q5 Will you ask for the books back from the Big Read so they can be re-distributed?</b></p> <p><b>A5</b> GMY explained, in effect, yes as the School had Book Swap days!</p> <p><b>Q6 What does the School deem to be the measure of success?</b></p> <p><b>A6</b> AAI replied that he felt the measure of success was to instill the love of reading into pupils so they continued reading on their own. This had to be achieved by talking about books and making reading fun.</p> <p><b>Q7 How does the School support EAL students and does the School receive funding for this?</b></p> <p><b>A7</b> AAI responded that he felt Governors should continue to challenge the School about supporting EAL students. They had done a lot to help, however, although the School was at 'capacity' perhaps a more planned induction was required with books in the library to meet their requirements.</p> <p>SWN stressed that although they were reviewing whether some students should take a reduced number of the number of GCSE subjects, this would not automatically apply to EAL students. All students were carefully monitored for at least six months before the options decisions were taken.</p> <p><b>Q8 "Out of the 80 Year 11 students, how many have been discounted for inclusion in the Progress 8 Score?"</b></p> <p><b>A8</b> SWN replied that 10 students (LPAG) students had been discounted.</p> <p><b>Q9 "Are you able to assess if EAL students are simply having problems with the language or if there are other learning issues?"</b></p> <p><b>A9</b> SWN replied that yes it was possible to tell and where appropriate, such students took language GCSEs for their 'native' language.</p>	<p>LGB3/P1/ 016 - LAS to add to future agendas</p>
---	--

	<p><b>Q10 “Please Could EAL students, from now on, be reported on in the Headteacher’s Report?”</b></p> <p><b>A10 AAI confirmed that this was a good idea and asked for an action to be noted for him to add to his Headteacher Report template.</b></p> <p><b>Q11 “If the issue with helping EAL students is capacity, what can be done to help?”</b></p> <p><b>A11 AAI replied that employing another TA would help but the School could not afford one. However, there was a TA working with EAL pupils, as well as someone from Grey Court helping once a week. SWM added that a teacher was to go on a course specifically for helping AEL students and they would be disseminating the information learned to the other staff.</b></p> <p><b>AAI suggested and it was agreed that perhaps the School should ask the students what else could be done to help them. It was also agreed that an English Course run at the School for Portuguese parents might be helpful.</b></p> <p><b>Q12 “Is Portuguese a similar language to Spanish? I just wondered if children who learn Spanish can chat to the Portuguese ones”.</b></p> <p><b>A12 SWN responded that it was similar and they could communicate a little in this way. However some of the Portuguese students were making excellent progress in English and translating for Portuguese parents at Parents’ Evening.</b></p> <p>Governors thanked GMY for her excellent summary sheet and for the work she was doing and hoped that the numbers of EAL pupils joining the School would slow down. AAI emphasised that it was important for Chessington be an inclusive School.</p>	<p>LGB3/P1/ 017 - AAI</p> <p>LGB3/P1/ 018 - AAI</p>
12.	<p><u>Data and Analysing School Performance.</u> ASM reported the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Following the PPEs, there was a lot of work to be done and they were not complacent. The PPE results were -0.59, which needed to be raised to +0.22 and this would require 100% from both teachers and staff.</li> <li>• Every week, a rotation of subject leaders were presenting the PPE results and their plans to SLT, who were challenging them.</li> </ul> <p><u>YPP Data</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SWN explained there were concerns with Science and there had been a Trust visit last week from AJN (T&amp;L at GC), a Science expert and the Head of Science at HF. The plan was to provide LAE with additional support with Science to supplement ASM and KMN, who both had considerable other responsibilities.</li> <li>• <b>To answer a question a Governor had raised in advance</b>, AAI said that moving forward, there would be 6 pupils at Chessington studying Triple Science. The plan was not only for these HPAG students to receive support from the Trust but to also ensure the curriculum matched their needs as those studying Triple Science needed to be stretched, being in the same class as other Science students. (SWN had led a cross-Trust discussion on the curricula for various subjects).</li> </ul> <p><b>Q1 A Governor challenged how teachers were able to support LPAG students to make good progress, however despite relatively small class numbers, HPAG were not making the same progress. She also challenged why the Science target for HPAG was zero.</b></p> <p><b>A1 AAI replied he wanted Governors to continue to challenge him on this as differentiation should make this possible. SWN explained their HPAG students were probably just into the HPAG category, but nevertheless should be able to make better progress.</b></p> <p><b>Q2 “How do teachers differentiate?”</b></p> <p><b>A2 ASM explained they focused on scaffolding and supporting and broke topics down. AAI said teachers needed to develop genuinely ‘stretching’ the HPAG</b></p>	

set and it had been a mistake for HPAG students to be taught in the middle sets, which would not happen in future. (SWN added she taught a Maths Foundation class with 3 HPAGs who could therefore only achieve a maximum of level 5. If they were moved to a higher Group it was likely they would only achieve a low grade).

**Q3 “Is the issue with HPAG students under-performing, a problem across all subjects”?**

**A3** AAI responded that yes, it was across all subjects. The School had highlighted and this had been raised previously at Governors’ meetings. **Another Governor pointed out that the last SIP report had highlighted that HPAG grades were 0.7 of a grade lower than other students.**

**Q4 “Would it be better if no one did Triple Science”?**

**A4** AAI said that this was not the solution. It was important the School tackled the issues so HPAGs were stretched and achieved high grades. SWN confirmed that those taking Triple Science had been reviewed at the beginning of the School year and a few had been moved to Double Science.

**Q5 “What can be done to fix the problem; have HPAG students become complacent and I am concerned whether progress will be made over the next year”?**

**A5** AAI responded that there were several factors: teachers needed to teach at the highest level; some HPAG students were complacent but every child was different. Pupil groups and curriculum were factors, however despite this, some students were getting grade 9s. SWN added that next year, Year 10s would no longer be categorised by HPAG.

**Q6 “Is there a correlation with achievement and literacy levels as per tonight’s presentation?”**

**A6** AAI replied it was important that children could understand exam questions and the language in Science papers. HPAG interventions were more around demonstrating to staff that ‘good’ teaching was not ‘good enough’.

**Q7 “What are you going to do between now and the summer to help boost students results in the summer exams”?**

**A7** SWN explained (already covered at a previous LGB Meeting) that every child had a Question Level Analysis (QLA) from their exams highlighting secure and insecure areas which would be the focus of teaching for the 9 weeks after half-term before the summer exams, including after school interventions. Some students would have a further, smaller set of exams.

**Q8 “When Governors carry out Departmental Visits, please could we see the Department Plans in advance and also talk to some of the children about their QLAs and ask them what they feel the benefits have been?”**

**A8** AAI and SWN agreed this was a good idea. **A Governor who was a parent said she was impressed by the ‘ragged’ SLA papers her daughter had been given.**

AAI summarised that whilst Governors needed to keep challenging, in fact, apart from last year’s Year 11s, in general, GCSE predictions tended to be at or above National Average. This year HPAG average predictions across the board were one grade below National Average (slightly lower in Science). Some HPAGs were doing really well and it was approximately five HPAG students who were under-performing.

**Q9 “Do you feel you have a grip on the HPAG situation?”**

**A9** AAI said the solution was a ‘long burn’ on quality of teaching and breadth of curriculum and they weren’t quite there yet for five HPAG pupils. One was ‘medical tuition’ who hadn’t been at School for a long time and whom they were trying to dis-apply for the exam results this summer.

- AAI explained that the SIP had felt that the predictions had been more

	<p>robust this year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SWN showed Governors the Horsforth Quadrant they were using to plot Year 11s according to their attitude to learning/progress etc in order to define strategies for the next 9 weeks. E.g. if there was lots of effort but not much progress, an emphasis on study skills/exam techniques might be needed; stress and anxiety might also be an issue and sometimes parents would be contacted.</li> <li>• <b>Following a Governor question</b>, SWN confirmed they also used the Horsforth Quadrant for Year 10s but this had not yet been embedded.</li> </ul> <p>The Meeting thanked SWN for her hard work and data analysis.</p>	
13.	<p><b>HT Report</b> - This had been placed on the Drive prior to the Meeting and there were no questions on this.</p>	
14.	<p><b>Learning &amp; Teaching (L&amp;T)</b> - GMY gave the following presentation (the L&amp;T document had been placed on the Drive prior to the Meeting).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GMY recapped from LGB2 that observations were under way and teachers had now completed their reflections on their observations (Target 1s -Year 11 = Class Targets; Target 2s = 'Brilliant Basics' and Target 3s = 'Marking and Feedback').</li> <li>• The L&amp;T sheet showed that staff had indicated they needed help with differentiation, literacy and peer and self assessment which has driven CPD training.</li> <li>• Approximately 45% of teachers felt they were meeting their Target 1 targets as well as Target 2s and 3s, which were longer term targets. Analysis was being carried out to see whether these staff had actually truly 'embedded' these targets and if so, had they not been sufficiently challenging?</li> <li>• Support planning work was needed for one member of staff; another had needed to be re-observed and was now fine and the T&amp;L Champion was working with a member of staff with behaviour management of pupils.</li> <li>• The IRIS camera was being used, particularly for Newly Qualified Teachers (NQTs).</li> <li>• A second round of observations would follow after half-term; targets 2 and 3 would be monitoring and new Target 1s issued.</li> </ul> <p><b>Governor questioning/comments:</b></p> <p><b>Q1 "What is the acronym THUD"?</b></p> <p><b>A1</b> GMY responded it meant Title, Heading, Underline and Date, which was a requirement for students on all pieces of work.</p> <p><b>Q2 "Is CPD working better now"?</b></p> <p><b>A2</b> GMY/SWN replied that the timing of CPD sessions were key with 15-20 people attending a recent breakfast CPD. Monday was not a good day; more people seemed to attend on Fridays and shorter sessions seemed more popular than longer CPDs.</p> <p><b>Comment: A Governor was pleased to hear that Rosenshines's principles had been covered at an Inset Day in September.</b></p> <p><b>Q3 "Has the Year 8 and 9 School survey of teachers been useful"?</b></p> <p><b>A3</b> SWN explained that despite having held an assembly on this, students didn't seem to have understood what the survey was getting at and so had not been particularly useful. They would consider asking similar questions at a later date, maybe verbally in student focus groups.</p> <p><b>Q4 "Are there any particular CPD plans for the new Art and History teachers"?</b></p> <p><b>A4</b> GMY responded that there would be CPD sessions for new teachers on Tuesdays. AAI added that both new staff had had a Safeguarding Briefing from ASM.</p> <p><b>Q5 "Was the survey of PGCE trainee teachers positive"?</b></p>	

	<p><b>A5</b> GMY said that four PGCE trainee teachers had spent some time recently at Chessington and their feedback had been extremely positive about the School.</p>	
15.	<p><u>New Ofsted Framework Update</u> - AAI covered the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Chessington needed to move to a transitional curriculum and return to the 2 year GCSE syllabus. It had been right at the time to implement the 3 year syllabus but it would still be possible to cover some GCSE content, matching to the National Curriculum in Year 9, for example the Cold War for History and some topics in Art. There would be less time though, for Bucket 3 subjects and Computer Science. <b>A Governor challenged that Computer Science was important.</b> AAI explained that there would be double periods of Computer Science in Year 9 to compensate. <b>Following another Governor's question</b>, AAI explained that all three Schools in the Trust would be following the 2 year GCSE curriculum. SWN had held a meeting to ensure that all three School schools were following the National Curriculum in Years 7,8, and 9 and were covering some GCSE topics in Year 9</li> <li>● There would still be Chessington specialisms, e.g. choosing either citizenship or RS and Year 7s would pick their specialised language.</li> <li>● DT (previously scrapped as a cost efficiency) was to become a full GCSE. Advertising was currently taking place for a DT and a Geography teacher.</li> </ul>	
16.	<p><u>Working Party Updates</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <u>Curriculum</u> - JHD updated that AES's work on Departmental Visits was part of the workstream for the Curriculum Working Party and that this piece of work had only just been implemented. The next meeting had been scheduled for after half term.</li> <li>● <u>Outcomes Working Party</u> - JHD updated that now the PPEs were over and SWN had more time, the Outcomes Working Party could meet up. The Meeting agreed the focus of this Working Party should be HPAG, PPG and Year 10. Due to a likely overlap between the two Working Parties a joint meeting will take place.</li> <li>● <u>Parent Forum</u> - TMS reported the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The last meeting had gone well with good attendance;</li> <li>- There had been some 'venting' of issues, eg detentions, however this had been managed;</li> <li>- TMS had fed issues back to the School and the next meeting would focus on "You said...We did..."</li> <li>- TMS had since sat in on a Homework Detention, where missed homework was completed;</li> <li>- It had been surprising that some parents hadn't picked up on various issues (e.g. Classcharts) that had been covered at Parents' Evenings and it was evident that 'Communication' needed improving.</li> <li>- The next meeting on 27th February would also include a scenario-based exercise that parents would work through on how the School deals with Parents' complaints that can escalate quickly. ASM would also attend.</li> <li>- TDE was disseminating a lot of information on Facebook and Twitter and it was felt a newsletter was also required.</li> <li>- The future of the Parents' forum very much depended on how things went and what was required.</li> <li>- KCN added that parents had been impressed to learn how much the School was doing for the children and were appreciative.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The Governing Body was pleased to hear that the Parent Forum had made such a good start.</p>	

17.	<p><u>Governors' Department Visits</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Following AES's work in this area, the next three visits were to be Maths, English and Science. It was agreed the next three would be Languages (French and Spanish), Geography and History. AAI confirmed that NMN should focus on Languages.</li> <li>• It was agreed that AES would liaise with SWN/ASM and EOE about the timing of the later Department Visits and in the meantime the Governors doing the Maths, English and Science would book themselves in with EOE. (Governors were to complete the write-ups using AES guidance within two weeks of the visit). Any questions to be directed to AES.</li> </ul>	
18.	<p><u>Governors' Training</u> - JHD referred Governors to the Training Folder on the Drive where LAS had updated a lot of information.</p>	
19.	<p><u>Any Other Business (AOB)</u></p> <p><u>SIP Report</u> - AAI and Governors were complimentary about the latest SIP report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>A Governor said he would submit a few questions to AAI via email (to save time) on this.</b></li> <li>• <b>A Governor asked if the National Data had come out yet.</b> SWN answered that this had been delayed and was out today.</li> <li>• <b>A Governor asked (as had the SIP) whether the data could be presented so Progress 8 achievement could be gauged rather than in alphabetical order.</b> SWN said that unfortunately this was not possible due to how spreadsheets worked.</li> </ul> <p><u>Proposed New School in Kingston</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governors discussed the proposed new free School in Kingston <b>and felt they needed to write letters to protest (the Chair in conjunction with AAI to provide a template letter) as there didn't seem to be a demographic need for an additional School in the Kingston Borough.</b> JHD had already been in touch with the the MP for Kingston and Surbiton, EDY about this issue.</li> <li>• AAI and TMS were to attend an RBK meeting with IDS on 6th March, where they would challenge the new School. They would provide an update at the next LGB Meeting.</li> </ul> <p><u>School Website Audit</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JHD updated that SMR and PME would be meeting to discuss this.</li> </ul>	<p>LGB3/P1/ 019 - JHD</p> <p>LGB3/P1/ 020 - AAI/TMS</p>
	<p>JHD thanked everyone for coming and closed the Meeting at 9.35pm</p> <p><b>The next LGB4 Meeting would be held on 25th March 2020 at 6pm</b></p>	

Signed: .....  
Chair of Governors

Date: .....