



**The three key strategic objectives for 2023/24 are:**

1. Deliver a broad, enriched curriculum offer driven with high expectations for all children in all subjects
2. Ensure strong personal development, cultural enrichment and emotional support for all children to support their growth as individuals
3. Ensure a comprehensive and formative CPD offer, tailored to school and staff development

## MINUTES

**Deer Park School Local Advisory Board (LAB)  
Wednesday 11 October 2023 at 6 p.m. at the school**

<b>Present:</b>	<b>Parent Advisers</b> <b>Community Advisers</b> <b>Staff Adviser</b>	Triin Edovald ( <b>Chair</b> ), Simrith Arora, Isabel Pollen (via Zoom) Ann Hines, David Phillips Victoria Coward
<b>Also attended:</b>		Alex Lee, Headteacher Beryl Hawkins, Clerk

Boxed text = LAB member challenges submitted in advance, followed by initials of authors. *Green italics = responses to challenges in note form.*

	Item	Papers	Action/ SDP Ref
1.	<p><b>Business</b></p> <p>a. <b>Apologies</b> Apologies were received from Nicola Beharell.</p> <p>b. <b>Declarations of Interest</b></p> <p>i. <b>Register of Interests</b> The clerk <b>agreed</b> to write to LAB members about declaring interests for the annual update of the register of interests. See also Minute 1e.</p> <p><b>ACTION: BH to write to LAB members about updating their entries for the register of interest on GovernorHub. All LAB members to update declarations of interest.</b></p> <p>ii. <b>Conflicts of Interest</b> There were no declarations of interest for items on the agenda.</p> <p>c. <b>Resignation</b> The LAB <b>received</b> the resignation of Patrick Anim with effect from 13 September 2023.</p> <p><b>ACTION: TE and AL to consider arrangements for recruitment of a LAB member.</b></p> <p>d. <b>Report of the Clerk</b> There was no written report from the clerk.</p> <p>e. <b>BPET Structure and Terms of Reference</b> TE drew attention to the Bellevue Place Education Trust (BPET) Local Advisers'</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current membership</li> <li>• BPET Local Advisers Handbook, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ BPET structure and terms of reference for LAB members</li> <li>○ Declarations of interest guidance</li> <li>○ LAB Code of Conduct</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <a href="#">BPET Scheme of Delegation</a></li> </ul>	<p><b>BH LAB members</b></p> <p><b>TE, AL</b></p>

	Item	Papers	Action/ SDP Ref
	<p>Handbook, in particular the BPET structure and terms of reference for LAB members, guidance on declarations of interest and the Code of Conduct for LAB members. The BPET Scheme of Delegation was also noted.</p> <p><b>f. LAB Code of Conduct</b> The LAB <b>accepted</b> the BPET 2023/24 Code of Conduct.</p> <p>TE was thanked for the useful Deer Park School LAB overview she had prepared for the Meet the LAB event on 19 September 2023. TE <b>agreed</b> to recirculate the document.</p> <p><b>ACTION: TE to recirculate DPS LAB overview to LAB members. BH to write to LAB members about accepting LAB Code of Conduct on GovernorHub. All to sign up to Code on GovernorHub</b></p> <p><b>g. Minutes of last meeting</b> The minutes of the meeting held on 12/7/23 were <b>confirmed and signed</b>. <b>Arising from the minutes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>School Development Plan (Ref: Minute 3a, page 12)</b> With regard to the development area relating to the perceptions of pastoral work and its effectiveness, AL stated that the school would be messaging parents and providing information on the school website.</li> </ul>	<p><a href="#">TE LAB Overview for meeting parents autumn 2023</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft Minutes – 12/7/23</li> <li>• Draft confidential minutes – 12/7/23</li> </ul>	<p>TE, BH, All</p>
<p><b>2. LAB Self-evaluation</b></p>	<p><b>a. LAB Feedback Survey</b> TE thanked LAB members for completing the self-evaluation survey and stated that some of the points raised had been addressed in the agenda and that others could be taken on. The LAB noted the good practice identified within the LAB and reflected on how they could improve as LAB members. Arising from the review it was <b>agreed</b> that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visibility of the LAB could be improved but, because of the LAB’s governance role, there needed to be a healthy level of distance.</li> <li>• Compared to governing bodies, the LAB’s role focussed more on the advisory.</li> <li>• It was important to keep up with regular LAB member visits.</li> <li>• There were differences between LAB members in the content of visit reports; reporting for different subject areas was not necessarily comparable, but it would be useful for LAB members to read reports from other LAB members: this should be tried on a rota basis.</li> <li>• For advice on the line of enquiry for visits, LAB members should ask AL or the subject lead.</li> <li>• It would be helpful if reports were received earlier.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LAB Feedback Survey Summary of Findings</li> </ul>	<p><b>KSO1, 2, 3</b></p>



<p><b>3. Update from Bellevue Place Education Trust (BPET)</b> The LAB received the BPET 3-Year Strategic Plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BPET 3-Year Strategic Plan 2022-25</li> </ul>	<p><b>KSO 1, 2, 3</b></p>
<p><b>4. Progress and Policy Review</b> AL presented responses, prepared by himself and VC, to questions and comments received in advance. Further questions were raised and answered at the meeting.</p> <p><b>a. Updated School Self-evaluation (SEF)</b> It was noted that there had been no challenges from LAB members on the SEF and that this document would be presented to the Ofsted inspection team.</p> <p><b>b. Data Dashboard – AfC Spark Outcomes report, including questions for LAB members to ask</b></p> <p><b>LAB Member Challenge (NB)</b></p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 5px 0;"> <p>The VA (Value Added) scores for boys are considerably higher than those for girls across the board at Key Stage 2. Have you identified a reason for this and, if so, how are you addressing it?</p> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>In this cohort, girls have outperformed boys at KS1 and therefore have less ‘room’ for progress against the scaled score calculation. It is worth noting that there are 5 boys counted in this year’s VA (who had KS1 data available), and therefore the sample size is relatively small. Girls who achieved ‘expected’ at KS1 made similar progress to boys who scored ‘expected’ at KS1.</i></li> <li>• <i>Three boys achieved the EXS (Expected Standard) level in all subjects. One of those went on to achieve GDS (Greater Depth Standard) in all three. The one child who was WTS (Working Towards Standard) in all subjects went on to be EXS: both these two measures contribute significantly within the overall measure of the 5 boys’ progress. The child who achieved GDS in KS1 did the same in KS2.</i></li> <li>• <i>For the 15 girls for whom we had KS1 data, 6 were GDS in all subjects, and 9 were EXS in all subjects. There were no girls at WTS in any subject. Their progress score is still very positive, but reflects their higher attainment on average at KS1 (which will be covered in a subsequent question).</i></li> </ul> <p><b>LAB Member Challenge (DP)</b></p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 5px 0;"> <p>KS1: Boys significantly lower % above Expected standard (63% vs girls 88%). Is there an accepted explanation for this? Is this explanation supported by national data breakdown? Are we happy with this difference or have any measures to reduced the gender gap?</p> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Nationally for KS1 attainment, boys were 9% behind girls in reading, 12% behind in writing, and 2% behind in maths. This differential is mirrored at Deer Park. As noted in the above, our</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collation of email consultations and communications, including LAB member challenges</li> <li>• DPS updated school self-evaluation</li> <li>• Data Dashboard: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ School headlines data dashboard</li> <li>○ Outcomes report generated by AfC, including questions for LAB members to ask</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>KSO 1</b></p> <p><b>KSO 1</b></p>

historical data suggests that boys' attainment is behind girls at KS1, and then balances out at KS2 (leading to higher overall progress for boys). The measures put in place are not gender specific, but need specific: interventions or in-class scaffolded work are assigned based on need, however in tuition for disadvantaged pupils who are behind their peers, less than a third are girls.

**LAB Member Challenge (NB)**

It is great to see that the VA scores are higher than the national and Richmond and Kingston Borough averages. However I note that the percentage VA scores for low attainers are considerably higher than those for high attainers. What steps is Deer Park taking to challenge high attainers so as to further increase their VA scores and how will you measure progress?

- Value added – as a progress measure – is taken from the KS1 data of the cohort in comparison to their KS2 data. A scaled score of 102 at KS1, for example, followed by a scaled score of 102 at KS2, would be 'expected' progress and achieve a value-added score of 0. Our higher prior attainers are designated as such from their KS1 data: these children have achieved high scaled scores at KS1, and so have less 'room' to achieve a difference in their scaled score for KS2 (given that there is a ceiling of 120 for both). Correspondingly, children who at KS1 achieved lower scores have much more room to make progress, and their VA scores can – and should – be much higher. On the Outcomes report, you'll notice that the lower prior attainers make more progress than the middle, who make more progress than the highers.

**Q: How do you get data for levelling, given that there are no Key Stage 1 SATS?**

**A:** We do assessments. BPET has data on the same standardised scores, so we can compare with other schools within BPET.

VC offered to go through the assessment process with AH in more detail.

**ACTION:** AH to follow up with VC on explanation of assessment process if needed.

**LAB Member Challenge (DP)**

Girls vs Boys - KS2 Boys significantly higher VA in Reading, Writing & Maths. Although a relatively small sample size VA for girls was significantly lower for all three than boys - does this indicate that lessons or teaching styles might be geared towards boys that the girls? Or that boys are dominating the teacher's time, as often happens in a boy heavy environment (similar problems occur in secondary)

Answered in response to NB's above.

KSO 1

KSO 1

AH, VC

KSO 1

<p><b>LAB Member Challenge (DP)</b></p> <p>I echo [NB's] question regarding Value-Added and High Prior Attainers</p> <p>Significantly less progress made by <b>High PA</b> in both Reading &amp; Maths - what steps are being taken to ensure that the High PA are being challenged and extended?</p>		KSO 1
<p><i>Answered in response to NB's above.</i></p>		
<p><b>LAB Member Challenge (TE)</b></p> <p><b>KS1 results:</b> While the overall picture for pupils who achieved the expected standard and achieved greater depth in reading, writing, and maths was overall more positive than last year; however, the proportion of pupils who achieved greater depth in all three subjects was lower (see the table below). <b>Q: what additional support is in place to ensure that not only is the % of those achieving greater depth high in these subjects but across RWM?</b> (I suspect one of the SPARK report questions tries to address a similar point.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The context here is that GDS attainment in both reading (35%) and maths (33%) was higher than the previous year in KS1. The combined measure for GDS is 13%, down from 20% last year. There is of course a degree of fluctuation expected with cohort differences. However, there is an opportunity to be more forensic in our data analysis over the course of the year, to spot children who are greater-depth trajectory in two subjects but not a third (for example). This, however, was the final year of KS1 SATs being statutory, so this data analysis will be of internal rather than national data.</i></li> </ul>		KSO 1
<p><b>LAB Member Challenge (TE)</b></p> <p><b>An observation:</b> This one is slightly out of curiosity rather than anything. Our <b>science results for KS1</b> are closer to the national average results than those in other subjects. Yet DPS pupils achieve very high results in science in KS2. <b>Q: To what do we owe this?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Pupils in the upper school have 30% more science each week, with a conceptual lesson as well as a practical. We believe this adds to the quality of provision and ability to cover the curriculum in sufficient depth, for more pupils to achieve the expected standard.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Q: Do you moderate science with other schools in the Trust?</b></p> <p><b>A:</b> Yes.</p> <p>See also confidential minutes.</p>		KSO 1

<p><b>c. School Development Plan</b></p> <p><b>LAB Member Challenge (NB)</b></p> <p>Only one additional question from me. I note the emphasis in the SDP on CPD and training. The SIP reports references SLT providing cover for phase leaders to be released. How are you ensuring that all staff have the time and capacity to undertake training? How, also, are you monitoring the effectiveness of the training that is provided (both in terms of initial feedback and seeing the impact on teaching practices etc)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>When staff training is requested (or allocated) outside of school, this is granted in almost all cases, and cover is always provided for the staff member to attend. Training is provided through BPET networks, local school moderations, AfC training, and incidental training opportunities. Staff development is tracked, and staff pointed towards useful or developmental training where appropriate. The training received is then fed back to the staff through internal training in briefings or insets (if the attendee's evaluation is that the training attended was of good quality). When relayed back to staff this then becomes part of the monitoring cycle (if QofE related) and book scrutinies.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Q: Is cover for staff CPD provided on a rotational basis with staff taking a day each?</b></p> <p><b>A:</b> Yes. Staff in the senior management team will cover for a whole day for the senior leadership team and for individual staff members, with three members of staff being given for three days.</p> <p><b>LAB Member Challenge (NB)</b></p> <p>Noting previous comments in the Parent Survey re behavioural management at the after school provision, I am pleased to see from the SDP that training and monitoring by OHM and SLT will be introduced. Would it be possible to include a line in the next Headteacher's report to provide an update on this (including what the monitoring is showing) as this has been a feature of the previous SDP and parental comments and it would be good to see how it is progressing?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Yes it would be. I'd be happy to include this under personal development.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION: AL to include update on behaviour management at the after-school provision in Headteacher's Report under Personal Development</b></p> <p><b>LAB Member Challenge (IP)</b></p> <p>*(Top of Page 5 SDP) 'teachers are informed of pupil's dev from interventions etc' ....</p> <p><b>Question: How are we ensuring that parents are also made</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPS SDP for 2023/24</li> </ul>	<p>KSO3</p> <p>KSO 2, 3</p> <p>AL</p> <p>KSO 2</p>
--	---	--



<p><b>aware of the progress from these interventions so as to best support the staff?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Families are informed of participation via email. Progress from specific interventions is not reported to families for two reasons; one because more frequent reporting on development is not necessarily of benefit or practically possible, and two because the format of information provided to teachers is not brief, is mapped against learning objectives, and provides key feedback on areas of success and to work on (rather than 'moved from 1, to 2).</i></li> </ul> <p><b>LAB Member Challenge (IP)</b></p> <p><b>*(Bottom of page 5 SDP) "children are able to spell confidently by Y2"</b></p> <p><b>Question: what does this actually look like in practice? Surely there is a spectrum of 'spell confidently'.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Spell 80% of the Year 2 statutory spelling words without hesitation, and confidently apply taught spelling strategies (using phonics) to spell words which are unfamiliar.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>LAB Member Challenge (IP)</b></p> <p><b>*(Top of page 6 SDP) please say more about how that 'English leader is effective across the whole school'.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Effectiveness is judged through a) quality of outcomes in data and in books across year groups, b) influence on quality of teaching practice in English across the school, and support/development for teachers to improve practice idiosyncratically and as part of the whole-school English subject plan, c) external evaluation through the SIP, and Trust learning/leadership reviews.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>LAB Member Challenge (IP)</b></p> <p><b>*(Page 6 SDP) please say more about the 'self esteem trial'.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>It's called the 1-4-9 programme. The 1-4-9 trial is to support self-esteem and positive thinking on a more routine basis rather than specific and targeted interventions. The idea is to reach more children (and eventually all children) with a specific and actionable process for identifying positives within the school day, and identifying negatives which they can acknowledge and move on from.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>d. SIP Report</b></p> <p><b>LAB Member Challenge (TE)</b></p> <p><b>When it comes to curriculum implementation, the SIP report revealed the SIP's recent observations including the following: questioning needing further development, the tasks not being</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Autumn 2023 SIP Report for visit on 20/9/23</li> </ul>	<p><b>KSO 1</b></p> <p><b>KSO 1</b></p> <p><b>KSO 2</b></p> <p><b>KSO 1, 3</b></p>
--	---	--



<p>always aligned to the ability of the pupils, pupils being unable to access the task because they did not have the knowledge they needed (in Maths), limited use of effective talk to promote their mathematical understanding (in Maths).</p> <p><b>Q: What steps are being taken to address these points of improvement?</b></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>It should be noted here that these inclusions from the SIP report are all preceded by 'in some cases', or 'not always'. These are specific and in one or two classrooms from a learning walk rather than an extended observation. That said, our SIP is insightful and high quality, and her observations here are areas that have been fed back to these teachers with appropriate support (through team teaching, model lessons, and planning help) put into place by our curriculum leaders.</i></li> </ul>		
<p><b>LAB Member Challenge (AH)</b></p>		
<p><b>How are you progressing with finding a replacement SENCO?</b></p>		KSO 1, 2, 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Our first option is for AL to take the SENDCo role on from March, with support from the school's current deputy SENDCo. The second currently being investigated is part time maternity cover, with possible return of the school's previous SENDCo for this period of time.</i></li> </ul>		
<p><b>LAB Member Challenge (AH)</b></p>		
<p><b>What benefits would the school receive if it became part of the MHST (Mental Health Support Teams in schools)?</b></p>		KSO 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Funded provision of counsellors to undertake targeted work with children with low level mental health concerns.</i></li> </ul>		
<p><b>LAB Member Challenge (AH)</b></p>		
<p><b>Marie Newman questioned the use and monitoring of the Pupil Premium grant. Can you elaborate on this?</b></p>		KSO 1, 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Her questions all relate to the upcoming review and re-write of the strategy, and as such will be applicable when this is written: the statutory deadline is December 31st.</i></li> </ul>		
<p><b>LAB Member Challenge (AH)</b></p>		
<p><b>Are multilingual children withdrawn for extra help with language fluency? Are they withdrawn separately or in groups and are these groups exclusively for multilingual pupils?</b></p>		KSO 1, 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>44% of our children are EAL, so this doesn't apply to many of our children. For those who are new to English or have lower language fluency, there are a variety of different pedagogies interventions used to catch them up with the curriculum. Pre-teach sessions, rapid catch up for reading, or keep up catch-up, in addition to scaffolded work in class to support their language</i></li> </ul>		

<p><i>acquisition. These are not only for multilingual pupils.</i></p> <p><b>Q: How do you find the English of the children from Hong Kong?</b></p> <p>A: It varies.</p> <p><b>LAB Member Challenge (AH)</b></p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p>Can you explain the personal development tracking system that is being developed?</p> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Early stages thus far. We're currently looking at tracking all of personal development in the same way we track representative sport and music uptake, so that we can spot gaps and reward strong engagement. It's been very effective especially for sport, and for underrepresented groups in sport, and we hope to do the same across PD.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>e. Headteacher's Report</b></p> <p><b>LAB Member Challenge (DP)</b></p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p><b>Absence, suspensions &amp; Perm Excl.</b></p> <p>persistent absence shows an increase in 2023 vs 2022 - is there a particular group or year group that shoulders the bulk of this increase? Is there any link to this group's progress (ie does this group show a lower than expected progress)? Interventions in place?</p> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Reception, now year 1, and no: they achieved 92% at GLD.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>LAB Member Challenge (DP)</b></p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p><b>EAL students</b> - SIP indicates that multilingual students make less progress in reading than maths &amp; writing (also reflected in the Headteacher's report KS2 data where EAL students have a lower VA in reading than any other group). With 44% of students on role being multilingual is this a concern or area of focus? Is this a consistently underperforming group?</p> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>For the 1st year 6 cohort we had a statistically significant group of EAL pupils in Y6, and their reading VA was +3.6. Last year we had a group that was not statistically significant, and it was 0.0. EAL pupils as a whole across the school achieve in line with their peers; so it's not a consistently underperforming group either in national or internal data.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>f. Policies for Approval – Child Protection and Safeguarding</b> The LAB <b>approved</b> the Deer Park specific Child Protection and Safeguarding Policy 2023.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Headteacher's Report (includes confidential information)</li> <li>Child Protection and Safeguarding Policy 2023: Deer Park specific version</li> </ul>	<p>KSO 2</p> <p>KSO 1, 2</p> <p>KSO 1, 2</p> <p>KSO 2</p>
<p><b>5. Cost-of-Living Crisis</b> TE opened a discussion on the cost-of-living crisis, its impact on families at Deer Park School and how it was being addressed by the school, stating that she had three recent reports relating to the crisis that she could share later with the LAB.</p>		<p>KSO 2</p>



<p><b>September 2023</b> LAB members were reminded that changes to KCSIE were covered in the new AfC Safeguarding e-Learning for Governors and Trustees, details of which had been previously emailed to the LAB by TE.</p> <p><b>b. Safeguarding Quiz</b> A safeguarding quiz, including the 2023 updates to KCSIE, was tabled by AL and all LAB members asked to complete it individually. Starting with the first question, LAB members took turns to answer a question until all the questions had been answered.</p> <p>The LAB agreed that the quiz had been useful and good practice. AL <b>agreed</b> to do another quiz for the next meeting.</p> <p><b>ACTION: AL to prepare a KCSIE quiz for the next meeting.</b></p> <p>See also Minute 10d.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safeguarding Quiz</li> </ul>	<p>AL</p>
---	---	-----------

*Isabel Pollen left the meeting at this point*

<p><b>c. KCSIE</b> LAB members were asked whether they had read KCSIE 2023. The clerk <b>agreed</b> to write to LAB members about confirming on their profile on GovernorHub that they had read the document.</p> <p><b>ACTION: BH to write to LAB members about confirming on GovernorHub that they have read KCSIE. All LAB members to confirm on GovernorHub that they have read KCSIE.</b></p>		<p>BH, All</p>
<p><b>8. Ofsted Preparedness</b> The LAB noted that the school’s vision and HEART values page on the school website had been updated.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="https://www.deerparkschool.org.uk/vision-values/">https://www.deerparkschool.org.uk/vision-values/</a></li> </ul>	<p>KSO 1, 2, 3</p>
<p><b>9. Training and Community</b></p> <p><b>a. Interface with the School</b> TE asked LAB members to think about including features from different LAB members in the school newsletter and what the frequency should be if this was agreed.</p> <p><b>b. Reports from Training Completed</b> It was noted that a link to the presentation notes from the Ofsted Preparedness briefing by Marie Newman, School Improvement Partner, on 30/9/23 had been added to the meeting folder on GovernorHub.</p> <p><b>c. Training Needs/Available Training</b> AL stated that all LAB members needed to sign up to <b>AfC Safeguarding e-Learning for governors and trustees</b>, LAB members needed to complete some safeguarding training at least once a year, and complete other training as they felt they had capacity or need.</p> <p><b>d. Newsletter Content</b> TE suggested that it might be helpful to include a LAB team entry, with sentences about what each LAB member does, or a question-and-answer section in a future newsletter. TE stated that feedback from her introduction in a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Link to Presentation notes from Ofsted Preparedness briefing with Marie Newman on 20/9/23</a></li> </ul>	<p>KSO 1, 2, 3</p>

