

LOOSE PRIMARY SCHOOL
Minutes of the Local Governing Body Meeting
Wednesday 6th February 2019 at 5.30 pm

Present: Peggy Murphy (CoG – co-opted), Alan Chell (co-opted), Giacomo Mazza (joint HoS), Anita Makey (joint HoS), John West (co-opted), Samantha McMahon (parent), James Daniels (parent), Ingrid Dutch (staff)

In attendance: Darren Webb (EHT), Andy Lacey (Trust Business Manager), Bev Evenden (DHT), Clare Nursey (clerk)

Agenda item and discussion	Action or decision
<p>1 Welcome and introductions CoG welcomed all to the meeting.</p>	
<p>2 Apologies for absence All present.</p>	
<p>3 Declaration of Business Interests 3.1 There were no new interests to declare. 3.2 Governors were reminded to declare any interests as discussion developed tonight. 3.3 Governors updated declaration forms where necessary to include any directorships or trusteeships held by themselves or family members in case these became relevant as related party transactions.</p>	
<p>4 Minutes of the last meeting (12th December 2018) 4.1 Minutes, including the annex, were agreed as an accurate record and signed by JW as CoG had been absent from the last meeting. 4.2 CoG clarified (para 15.2) that the leadership monitoring report had been circulated with other reports, and it was only any additional verbal feedback missing from the meeting as both monitoring governors had sent apologies. <i>Matters arising</i> 4.3 Data – governors were reminded they could mail questions or queries on data to leaders at any time. 4.4 H&S – JW confirmed that all matters he wished to draw to governors’ attention were on his written report and would be covered under item 12 below, and some matters would be discussed outside this meeting. Governors noted it was unfortunate that AL could not accompany the site walk (occupied with KS1 flood at the time) and agreed that he should attend all future walks. 4.5 AL would follow up the query on insurance cover in the event of legal action against the trust.</p>	<p>Action: AL Action: AL</p>
<p>5 Update on Trust matters 5.1 EHT advised there were no significant trust matters to draw to governors’ attention. 5.2 Minutes of the December trust board meeting were not yet available but would be circulated (for information only) for the next meeting. 5.3 (This discussion was strictly confidential to governors at this meeting.) EHT confirmed that the trust board had approved the leadership reorganisation proposal to establish a permanent leadership structure for the trust, providing 1 HT, 1 DHT and Assistant HTs at each school (details had been emailed to governors). Since then appointments had been agreed and these would be notified to parents and staff next</p>	

<p>week. Sarah Holman would be HT at LPS with Anita Makey as DHT/Head of School. Giacomo Mazza would be HT at CPS. The CPS DHT post was not affordable at present and until it was the role would be filled by Bev Evenden (appointed as the Trust DHT) who would be based predominantly at CPS from September. This structure would enable the trust to move forwards and appointments had spread skills effectively across the trust.</p> <p>5.4 Governors extended their congratulations to all staff on their appointments.</p> <p>Q. How would accountability change under the new structure? EHT – EHT would remain ultimately responsible (he was currently officially HT of the schools) but in future HTs would be accountable for standards etc and would report to the EHT at trust level. The EHT would step away from involvement at LGBs as the HT would lead for the school in this forum.</p> <p>Q. What was the difference between the DHT, HoS and AHT roles? EHT explained that DHTs have full delegated powers in the absence of the HT and can make all decisions relating to the school. (At LPS, the DHT role will be called HoS.) AHTs have no delegated powers but are involved in operational leadership of the school and the role is useful as a means of developing leaders.</p> <p>5.5 EHT advised there would be a thorough transition period for both schools, running through T5 and T6, so that leaders could “hit the ground running” in September. It was a real advantage of the trust that such a transition could begin in advance of formal implementation.</p> <p>5.6 EHT drew attention to the Ofsted consultation on the new inspection framework. This suggested a shift in emphasis from outcomes to the curriculum (though governors should be mindful that data would still be important where published data showed a drop in performance) which would reduce the workload in school as in-school data would be less important, but would affect how the LGB could demonstrate progress to Ofsted.</p>	
<p>6 Trust policies Governors were advised the following policies had been approved at the last trust board meeting and were now posted on the websites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H&S policy • Staff policies (Discipline and conduct including flowchart, Bullying and harassment, Grievance, Capability) 	
<p>7 Head of School report <i>Monitoring and data</i> 7.1 Discussion in annex for governors. <i>Staffing</i> 7.2 YR teacher was leaving but Felicity Benjamin would be returning 4 days pw. Experienced TA appointed to Crystal class. Redeployment of staff to team teach and address some issues with challenging children in KS1 was having a positive impact and SLT did not now have to be so involved. 7.3 Some discussion in annex for governors.</p>	
<p>8 School Strategic Document and Impact Statement <i>Strategic document</i> 8.1 HoSs drew attention to where the document had been updated with additional targets and data. 8.2 BE reminded governors that data showed where the children currently are and governors should expect to see movement in the next data. This would be highlighted to governors at a meeting after the data had been updated. 8.3 Some discussion in annex for governors.</p>	BE

<p>9 Feedback from reviews</p> <p>9.1 Governors had received the report following the Term 3 internal review and HoSs advised that actions from the T2 review had been completed. Nothing surprising had come up in the latest review, and this had shown there was a good base to build on for curriculum development to meet the likely revised Ofsted framework.</p> <p>9.2 The meeting agreed it would be useful for governors to be involved in future internal reviews as this would provide opportunity for governors to challenge on more strategic matters than were covered in monitoring visits.</p> <p>9.3 EHT suggested it would be useful for the standards monitoring pair to attend curriculum development meetings with staff as this would inform their questioning during monitoring visits.</p>	<p>Governors</p> <p>Governors</p>
<p>10 Residential trip</p> <p>AC advised he had checked all papers on behalf of governors and could confirm that everything was in order. Governors approved the residential trip to Sayers Croft.</p>	<p>Decision</p>
<p>11 Budget</p> <p>11.1 Governors had received the BM's summary report and were invited to ask questions.</p> <p>11.2 AL explained he, EHT, Carina Cuddington (trustee) and the finance officers had met on Friday to go through December monitoring data to ensure all legacy details were covered and data was accurate. Problems had arisen on academisation (some double counting, ICT cost missed, budget tool not very effective etc) which would not be repeated next year but the situation had highlighted that a second check of budget data outside the business team would be useful going forwards, possibly involving the HTs and SLT.</p> <p>Q. What would be the impact of losing funds?</p> <p>AL – there would be no impact on in-year funding, only on end of year figures. The trust now forecast a surplus of £104k in Yr 1, £130k in year 2 and £119k in year 3 but the Reserves policy specified that £84k should be held as a reserve with a further £15k held as contingency funding. Although actual numbers were lower than originally planned, there was no deficit and the viability of the school and the trust were not in question.</p> <p>EHT – the impact, for the trust and especially LPS, was that there would be little money available to commit to achieving trust strategic priorities. This was disappointing and the schools and trust would have to look for creative solutions to release funds.</p> <p>Q. Was the library refurbishment still included in plans?</p> <p>AL – yes, this cost would be met from the capital budget, and there was still £14k uncommitted money in this budget due to extra government funding received.</p> <p>Q. Why were budget allocations for staff development and buildings maintenance reduced next year?</p> <p>EHT – no inspirational training session was required next year hence that budget was reduced.</p> <p>AL – one off improvements costing £9k had been made this year (not a recurring cost).</p> <p><i>Sports Premium</i></p> <p>11.3 AL explained the school had received £27k sports premium funding which could not be carried over to next year. A project was proposed to provide new equipment and a new surface in the area at the back of the swimming pool. 3 quotes had been obtained (£17750, £18700, £23045) and he recommended accepting the cheapest of these as the specifications were identical (AL to circulate details) and all providers were recognised, having worked for KCC schools before.</p>	

<p>19.1 Discussion at several items deemed confidential to governors and contained in confidential annex. Non confidential minutes to be publically available after approval at next meeting.</p> <p>19.2 Governors agreed that the Head of School report, Impact Statement and Internal Review report should remain confidential documents for governors only.</p>	
<p>20 Dates for diaries</p> <p>Next LGB meeting: Wednesday 15th May 2019 at 5.30 pm</p> <p>BE would mail dates for Parents' evenings and SATs week when governor attendance would be useful.</p>	

Signed.....

Date.....