## Churchlands Primary School Board Meeting



Churchlands Primary School Board Meeting Minutes 25.10.2021				
Community Meeting in the School Library				
1.0	Welcome and Apologies	ACTIONS		
1.1 Chair	<ul> <li>6.00pm Nick opened the meeting and welcome all attendees.</li> <li>Nick introduced and welcomed Jane to the board. All board members introduced themselves.</li> </ul>			
1.2 Chair	Attendees: Kim, Leigh, Nick, Lucy O, Lucy M, Steve, Libby, Thuy, Chris and Shane.			
	Apologies: Rebecca Brown (Bec), Luke Johnson			
1.3 Chair	Confirmation of agenda: Yes Confirmation of previous minutes: Yes  Bec's meeting minutes were acknowledged in terms of quality and timeliness.  Shane volunteered to take the meeting minutes next followed by Chris for the first meeting in 2022.	Minutes from previous meeting: Approved Nick Confirmed Chris		
2.0	<b>Disclosure of Interest</b> (Real, perceived or potential conflicts of interest experience the items on the agenda)	ed by any member in relation to		
2.1 Chair	No disclosures noted.			
3.0	Business Arising from previous minutes			
Chair	<ul> <li>Website is still being refreshed. Web developer has been engaged to assist the school three days per week given the volume of content and communications.</li> <li>Parent Communications – has been added to the webpage</li> </ul>			
4.0	Finance			
4.1 Kim 10 mins	<ul> <li>Financial Overview</li> <li>Number of teachers are doing reduced FTE for 2022 which can be a challenge.</li> <li>Next year's budget will not be flush as 2021.</li> <li>Education Assistant support has increased but remains even if the child requiring support leaves which can be a challenge.</li> <li>All revenues (voluntary contributions) are in.</li> <li>Positive variance of \$163, 798.</li> </ul>			
5.0	Welcome Community to Open Meeting			
Nick/Kim 10 mins	<ul> <li>Nick welcomed community members to the Open Meeting (1 parent attended in addition to the Board Members and P&amp;C President).</li> <li>Kim provided an overview of 2021 which took the approach of "Plan, teach, assess". The overview included:         <ul> <li>The roles and responsibilities of the Deputy Principals;</li> <li>Details of the Maths audit whereby the school used the RUCSAC method for problem solving aligned to critical thinking;</li> <li>The school's introduction of Bright Path Maths program for moderation assessments;</li> <li>The school's introduction of the Positive Behaviour framework</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			

	students/teachers/community and the move towards the use	
	of more positive language;	
	A spelling audit following a decrease in results and a     remediation program will be implemented in Term 4, 2022;	
	remediation program will be implemented in Term 4, 2022;	
	<ul> <li>Programs fully implemented in 2021 at CPS:</li> </ul>	
	■ Visible Learning;	
	Talk for writing; and	
	Seven Steps for writing.	
	Assessment programs used at CPS:      Dright and the Finalists.	
	Brightpath – English;	
	PAT assessment – English/Maths; and	
	<ul> <li>Kindy KAT assessment tool.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Early intervention/support programs used at CPS:</li> </ul>	
	<ul><li>EAL/D program;</li><li>Mini Li; and</li></ul>	
	Sounds Write.	
	The Ownited and the Land 11 February 11 C 2004 11 C 200	
	Teaching and Learning Framework (Aim, Activate, Achieve	
	and Assess); and	
	<ul> <li>A high-level overview of the 2022 NAPLAN results which</li> </ul>	
	indicated the targeted approaches have resulted in significant	
	growth, and as such, CPS will continue to develop, embed and	
	grow all focus areas both academic, social and emotional.	
	<ul> <li>A community member asked about any outcomes from the Spelling</li> </ul>	
	Audit to which Kim advised it is too early to share at this stage.	
6.0	Data Presentation to Board and Community	
0.0	Bata i resentation to Board and Community	
Jo	<ul> <li>Jo provided an overview of the 2021 NAPLAN results which indicated</li> </ul>	Summary of the 2021 NAPLAN
20 min	CPS had done well overall.	results to be published on the
20 min	The Numeracy overview included:	
20 min	<ul> <li>The Numeracy overview included:</li> <li>65% of Year 3 students sit in the top 20% of the state;</li> </ul>	results to be published on the
20 min	<ul> <li>The Numeracy overview included:</li> <li>65% of Year 3 students sit in the top 20% of the state;</li> <li>52% of Year 5 students sit in the middle 60% of the state;</li> </ul>	results to be published on the
20 min	<ul> <li>The Numeracy overview included:</li> <li>65% of Year 3 students sit in the top 20% of the state;</li> </ul>	results to be published on the
20 min	<ul> <li>The Numeracy overview included:</li> <li>65% of Year 3 students sit in the top 20% of the state;</li> <li>52% of Year 5 students sit in the middle 60% of the state;</li> </ul>	results to be published on the
20 min	<ul> <li>The Numeracy overview included:</li> <li>65% of Year 3 students sit in the top 20% of the state;</li> <li>52% of Year 5 students sit in the middle 60% of the state;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort achieved better than our like schools whilst</li> </ul>	results to be published on the
20 min	<ul> <li>The Numeracy overview included:</li> <li>65% of Year 3 students sit in the top 20% of the state;</li> <li>52% of Year 5 students sit in the middle 60% of the state;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort achieved better than our like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools; and</li> </ul>	results to be published on the
20 min	<ul> <li>The Numeracy overview included:         <ul> <li>65% of Year 3 students sit in the top 20% of the state;</li> <li>52% of Year 5 students sit in the middle 60% of the state;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort achieved better than our like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>All Business Plan targets for Year 3 were met and half the Business Plan targets for Year 5 were met.</li> </ul>	results to be published on the
20 min	<ul> <li>The Numeracy overview included:         <ul> <li>65% of Year 3 students sit in the top 20% of the state;</li> <li>52% of Year 5 students sit in the middle 60% of the state;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort achieved better than our like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools; and</li> <li>All Business Plan targets for Year 3 were met and half the Business Plan targets for Year 5 were met.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Reading overview included:</li> </ul>	results to be published on the
20 min	<ul> <li>The Numeracy overview included:         <ul> <li>65% of Year 3 students sit in the top 20% of the state;</li> <li>52% of Year 5 students sit in the middle 60% of the state;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort achieved better than our like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools; and</li> <li>All Business Plan targets for Year 3 were met and half the Business Plan targets for Year 5 were met.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Reading overview included:         <ul> <li>56% of the Year 3 students were in the top 20%;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	results to be published on the
20 min	<ul> <li>The Numeracy overview included:         <ul> <li>65% of Year 3 students sit in the top 20% of the state;</li> <li>52% of Year 5 students sit in the middle 60% of the state;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort achieved better than our like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools; and</li> <li>All Business Plan targets for Year 3 were met and half the Business Plan targets for Year 5 were met.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Reading overview included:         <ul> <li>56% of the Year 3 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>44% of the Year 5 students were in the top 20%;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	results to be published on the
20 min	<ul> <li>The Numeracy overview included:         <ul> <li>65% of Year 3 students sit in the top 20% of the state;</li> <li>52% of Year 5 students sit in the middle 60% of the state;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort achieved better than our like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools; and</li> <li>All Business Plan targets for Year 3 were met and half the Business Plan targets for Year 5 were met.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Reading overview included:         <ul> <li>56% of the Year 3 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>44% of the Year 5 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort exceeded like schools whilst the Year 5</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	results to be published on the
20 min	<ul> <li>The Numeracy overview included:         <ul> <li>65% of Year 3 students sit in the top 20% of the state;</li> <li>52% of Year 5 students sit in the middle 60% of the state;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort achieved better than our like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools; and</li> <li>All Business Plan targets for Year 3 were met and half the Business Plan targets for Year 5 were met.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Reading overview included:         <ul> <li>56% of the Year 3 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>44% of the Year 5 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort exceeded like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	results to be published on the
20 min	<ul> <li>The Numeracy overview included:         <ul> <li>65% of Year 3 students sit in the top 20% of the state;</li> <li>52% of Year 5 students sit in the middle 60% of the state;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort achieved better than our like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>All Business Plan targets for Year 3 were met and half the Business Plan targets for Year 5 were met.</li> <li>The Reading overview included:         <ul> <li>56% of the Year 3 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>44% of the Year 5 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort exceeded like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools;</li> <li>Half the business plan targets for Year 3 were met (one</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	results to be published on the
20 min	<ul> <li>The Numeracy overview included:         <ul> <li>65% of Year 3 students sit in the top 20% of the state;</li> <li>52% of Year 5 students sit in the middle 60% of the state;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort achieved better than our like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools; and</li> <li>All Business Plan targets for Year 3 were met and half the Business Plan targets for Year 5 were met.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Reading overview included:         <ul> <li>56% of the Year 3 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>44% of the Year 5 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort exceeded like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools;</li> <li>Half the business plan targets for Year 3 were met (one student away from meeting the second target – very close);</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	results to be published on the
20 min	<ul> <li>The Numeracy overview included:         <ul> <li>65% of Year 3 students sit in the top 20% of the state;</li> <li>52% of Year 5 students sit in the middle 60% of the state;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort achieved better than our like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools; and</li> <li>All Business Plan targets for Year 3 were met and half the Business Plan targets for Year 5 were met.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Reading overview included:         <ul> <li>56% of the Year 3 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>44% of the Year 5 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort exceeded like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools;</li> <li>Half the business plan targets for Year 3 were met (one student away from meeting the second target – very close); and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	results to be published on the
20 min	<ul> <li>The Numeracy overview included:         <ul> <li>65% of Year 3 students sit in the top 20% of the state;</li> <li>52% of Year 5 students sit in the middle 60% of the state;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort achieved better than our like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools; and</li> <li>All Business Plan targets for Year 3 were met and half the Business Plan targets for Year 5 were met.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Reading overview included:         <ul> <li>56% of the Year 3 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>44% of the Year 5 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort exceeded like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools;</li> <li>Half the business plan targets for Year 3 were met (one student away from meeting the second target – very close); and</li> <li>On entry to Year 3, reading business plan targets were met.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	results to be published on the
20 min	<ul> <li>The Numeracy overview included:         <ul> <li>65% of Year 3 students sit in the top 20% of the state;</li> <li>52% of Year 5 students sit in the middle 60% of the state;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort achieved better than our like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools; and</li> <li>All Business Plan targets for Year 3 were met and half the Business Plan targets for Year 5 were met.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Reading overview included:         <ul> <li>56% of the Year 3 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>44% of the Year 5 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort exceeded like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools;</li> <li>Half the business plan targets for Year 3 were met (one student away from meeting the second target – very close); and</li> <li>On entry to Year 3, reading business plan targets were met.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Writing overview included:</li> </ul>	results to be published on the
20 min	<ul> <li>The Numeracy overview included:         <ul> <li>65% of Year 3 students sit in the top 20% of the state;</li> <li>52% of Year 5 students sit in the middle 60% of the state;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort achieved better than our like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools; and</li> <li>All Business Plan targets for Year 3 were met and half the Business Plan targets for Year 5 were met.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Reading overview included:         <ul> <li>56% of the Year 3 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>44% of the Year 5 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort exceeded like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools;</li> <li>Half the business plan targets for Year 3 were met (one student away from meeting the second target – very close); and</li> <li>On entry to Year 3, reading business plan targets were met.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Writing overview included:         <ul> <li>The aim was to address the downward trend line; this was</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	results to be published on the
20 min	<ul> <li>The Numeracy overview included:         <ul> <li>65% of Year 3 students sit in the top 20% of the state;</li> <li>52% of Year 5 students sit in the middle 60% of the state;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort achieved better than our like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools; and</li> <li>All Business Plan targets for Year 3 were met and half the Business Plan targets for Year 5 were met.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Reading overview included:         <ul> <li>56% of the Year 3 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>44% of the Year 5 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort exceeded like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools;</li> <li>Half the business plan targets for Year 3 were met (one student away from meeting the second target – very close); and</li> <li>On entry to Year 3, reading business plan targets were met.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Writing overview included:         <ul> <li>The aim was to address the downward trend line; this was achieved, and the cohorts made good progress with a 1/3 of</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	results to be published on the
20 min	<ul> <li>The Numeracy overview included:         <ul> <li>65% of Year 3 students sit in the top 20% of the state;</li> <li>52% of Year 5 students sit in the middle 60% of the state;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort achieved better than our like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools; and</li> <li>All Business Plan targets for Year 3 were met and half the Business Plan targets for Year 5 were met.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Reading overview included:         <ul> <li>56% of the Year 3 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>44% of the Year 5 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort exceeded like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools;</li> <li>Half the business plan targets for Year 3 were met (one student away from meeting the second target – very close); and</li> <li>On entry to Year 3, reading business plan targets were met.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Writing overview included:         <ul> <li>The aim was to address the downward trend line; this was achieved, and the cohorts made good progress with a 1/3 of business targets being met;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	results to be published on the
20 min	<ul> <li>The Numeracy overview included:         <ul> <li>65% of Year 3 students sit in the top 20% of the state;</li> <li>52% of Year 5 students sit in the middle 60% of the state;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort achieved better than our like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools; and</li> <li>All Business Plan targets for Year 3 were met and half the Business Plan targets for Year 5 were met.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Reading overview included:         <ul> <li>56% of the Year 3 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>44% of the Year 5 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort exceeded like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools;</li> <li>Half the business plan targets for Year 3 were met (one student away from meeting the second target – very close); and</li> <li>On entry to Year 3, reading business plan targets were met.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Writing overview included:         <ul> <li>The aim was to address the downward trend line; this was achieved, and the cohorts made good progress with a 1/3 of business targets being met;</li> <li>With regarding to Spelling:</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	results to be published on the
20 min	<ul> <li>The Numeracy overview included:         <ul> <li>65% of Year 3 students sit in the top 20% of the state;</li> <li>52% of Year 5 students sit in the middle 60% of the state;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort achieved better than our like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools; and</li> <li>All Business Plan targets for Year 3 were met and half the Business Plan targets for Year 5 were met.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Reading overview included:         <ul> <li>56% of the Year 3 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>44% of the Year 5 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort exceeded like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools;</li> <li>Half the business plan targets for Year 3 were met (one student away from meeting the second target – very close); and</li> <li>On entry to Year 3, reading business plan targets were met.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Writing overview included:         <ul> <li>The aim was to address the downward trend line; this was achieved, and the cohorts made good progress with a 1/3 of business targets being met;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	results to be published on the
20 min	<ul> <li>The Numeracy overview included:         <ul> <li>65% of Year 3 students sit in the top 20% of the state;</li> <li>52% of Year 5 students sit in the middle 60% of the state;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort achieved better than our like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools; and</li> <li>All Business Plan targets for Year 3 were met and half the Business Plan targets for Year 5 were met.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Reading overview included:         <ul> <li>56% of the Year 3 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>44% of the Year 5 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort exceeded like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools;</li> <li>Half the business plan targets for Year 3 were met (one student away from meeting the second target – very close); and</li> <li>On entry to Year 3, reading business plan targets were met.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Writing overview included:         <ul> <li>The aim was to address the downward trend line; this was achieved, and the cohorts made good progress with a 1/3 of business targets being met;</li> <li>With regarding to Spelling:</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	results to be published on the
20 min	<ul> <li>The Numeracy overview included:         <ul> <li>65% of Year 3 students sit in the top 20% of the state;</li> <li>52% of Year 5 students sit in the middle 60% of the state;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort achieved better than our like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools; and</li> <li>All Business Plan targets for Year 3 were met and half the Business Plan targets for Year 5 were met.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Reading overview included:         <ul> <li>56% of the Year 3 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>44% of the Year 5 students were in the top 20%;</li> <li>The Year 3 cohort exceeded like schools whilst the Year 5 cohort achieved similar results to like schools;</li> <li>Half the business plan targets for Year 3 were met (one student away from meeting the second target – very close); and</li> <li>On entry to Year 3, reading business plan targets were met.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Writing overview included:         <ul> <li>The aim was to address the downward trend line; this was achieved, and the cohorts made good progress with a 1/3 of business targets being met;</li> <li>With regarding to Spelling:             <ul> <li>Year 3 – 56% sitting in top 20%; and</li> <li>Year 3 – 56% sitting in top 20%; and</li> <li>Year 3 – 56% sitting in top 20%; and</li> <li>Year 3 – 56% sitting in top 20%; and</li> <li>Year 3 – 56% sitting in top 20%; and</li> <li>Year 3 – 56% sitting in top 20%; and</li> <li>Year 3 – 56% sitting in top 20%; and</li> <li>Year 3 – 56% sitting in top 20%; and</li> <li>Year 3 – 56% sitting in top 20%; and</li> <li>Year 3 – 56% sitting in top 20%; and</li> <li>Year 3 – Year 3 – Year 3 – Year 3</li></ul></li></ul></li></ul>	results to be published on the

	<ul> <li>Similar trend whereby the Year 3 cohort are performing better</li> </ul>	
	than like schools relative to the Year 5 cohort.	
7.0	Curriculum Focus and direction 2021 and beyond	
Kim 15 mins	Kim provided an overview of 2021 and direction for 2022 and beyond	
8.0	P & C Rep	
Thuy	Overview of P & C recent activities:	
9.0	<ul> <li>Thuy and Luke were invited to an education forum by the new local member – Hon Sue Ellery. The event was for local representatives and the key discussion themes included security support for special needs and support for aboriginal needs.</li> <li>P&amp;C hosted a "Teacher Thank You Morning Tea". Teachers confirmed it was well received.</li> <li>P&amp;C hosted the annual Quiz night fundraiser over the weekend with a strong turnout and positive feedback. This event had strong demand to be retained on the P&amp;C calendar and whilst this year didn't have the same lead time and smaller volunteer group than previous years, the event was a great success. A big thank you to the school for allowing the use of the assembly hall.</li> <li>P&amp;C Executives will be meeting before the community meeting with a full the agenda including a review of the events hosted this year, new aims for the P&amp;C, balancing with fund raising with other P&amp;C objectives, a review of the P&amp;C structure, a look ahead into 2022 and discussion of how to start the new year on the front foot.</li> <li>Aboriginal artist has been sourced and work is underway.</li> <li>Thuy asked about the school wish list and Kim confirmed it is with Maree.</li> <li>An update was provided on the oval play space. Thuy advised the P&amp;C would vote on this Tuesday 26/10/21 and votes received prior have not been supportive. There were some concerned raised by P&amp;C members about the proposal. Thuy shared some of the feedback received which was requested to remain anonymous. Concerns were around the lack of detail supporting the cost. Kim shared the challenges with getting detailed quotes.</li> <li>General Business</li> </ul>	Thuy to provide Kim a quote she had received for a ninja type playground for \$33k.  Kim to reshare the information on the work done to date for this play space.
9.0	Class Structures:	
	<ul> <li>Nick and Thuy both advised they had received numerous comments and requests from parents about spilt classes.</li> <li>Kim shared the challenges of balancing class structures with the school financial budget and regulations of classroom numbers.</li> <li>Kim advised the school Executive had discussed and the school won't provide class lists prior the school holidays as lots of things can change (ie new children, children leave etc).</li> </ul> Security Cameras:	Kim to share the class structures for 2022 in the second last newsletter.  Nick to share suggested changes to the class structures document.
	Nick spoke about the school statues being broken, bikes being stolen, and damage to the new frog pond. He advised the same activities have occurred at Churchlands High School.	

Kim advised she had been in contact with Head of Security who confirmed there will no security cameras or school fences. Kim will continue to progress this matter.

## **Next Meeting:**

- Next meeting will be the last for 2021 with an end of year dinner
- 8.12pm Meeting adjourned.

Next meeting:

Chair signed:

Date:

Meeting Closed:

Principal signed: 6/12/2