

LOOSE PRIMARY SCHOOL
Minutes of the Local Governing Body Meeting
Wednesday 27th March 2019 at 5.30 pm

Present: Giacomo Mazza (joint HoS), Anita Makey (joint HoS), John West (co-opted), Samantha McMahon (parent), Alan Chell (co-opted), James Daniels (parent), Ingrid Dutch (staff)
 In attendance: Darren Webb (EHT), Bev Evenden (DHT), Clare Nursey (clerk)

Agenda item and discussion	Action or decision
<p>1 Welcome and introductions DW welcomed all to the meeting and governors agreed he should chair the meeting in the coG's absence.</p>	
<p>2 Apologies for absence 2.1 Received and accepted from Peggy Murphy (CoG, co-opted, own school having Ofsted inspection). 2.2 The meeting was quorate.</p>	
<p>3 Declaration of Business Interests 3.1 There were no new interests to declare. 3.2 Governors signed the updated Acceptable Use policy.</p>	
<p>4 Minutes of the last meeting (6th February 2019) 4.1 Minutes, including the annex, were agreed as an accurate record and signed by JD in the CoG's absence. <i>Matters arising</i> 4.2 JW updated governors that he had been in contact with KCC regarding risks from traffic at the Loose Road entrance and had suggested converting the traffic island into a zebra crossing or changing the yellow lines to red lines (no parking at any time). KCC's response had been the situation "was not dangerous enough" to warrant a zebra crossing and that red lines were only in use in London. They had however put him in touch with a transport planner who had agreed to meet JW to discuss the situation provided a representative of the school was at the meeting (SLT to check diaries). AC would check whether the local councillor was also available to attend the meeting. 4.3 One item regarding contracts in annex.</p>	<p>[Meeting arranged for 24th April]</p>
<p>5 Update on Trust matters 5.1 Governors had received minutes of the December and February TB meetings and were invited to ask questions. Q. Minutes suggested that the LPS CoG may move to CPS LGB – could the EHT confirm the position? There had been 2 recent resignations from CPS LGB (one parent, one co-opted governor) and no applications had been received in response to the recent advert to the parent community at both schools. The CPS LGB was low on both finance and education experience and the TB needed to address this by considering both long and short term solutions, including possible redeployment of current governors. The matter was on the agenda for the next TB meeting and any decisions would of course be run past this LGB. EHT asked governors to consider whether they knew anyone who might be suitable and willing to join the LGBs and if so to put them in touch with Carole Hardy (TB chair) for an initial discussion. 5.2 EHT advised there were no other trust matters to draw to governors' attention.</p>	<p>Governors</p>
<p>6 Trust policies Governors were advised the following policies had been approved at the last trust</p>	

<p>board meeting and were now posted on the websites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Admissions • SEND • Exclusions • Online safety <p>https://www.coppiceprimarypartnership.kent.sch.uk/page/?title=Key+Documents&pid=15</p>	
<p>7 Head of School report (written)</p> <p><i>Staffing</i></p> <p>7.1 Arrangements in Crystal class were working well – Felicity Benjamin working 4 days pw and Mel Prodger 1 day pw. Some discussion in annex for governors.</p> <p>7.2 Very pleased that four new teachers recruited for September, all trust-wide appointments so staffing plan still evolving - provisional plan for LPS for September attached for information.</p> <p>7.3 No Schools Direct trainees recruited yet (applicants lacking life experience) but currently holding interviews. Currently have links with Canterbury Christ Church and Greenwich Universities – SM suggested contacting Teach in Medway (which has links with TES Institute) as her school uses this partnership and is very satisfied with recruits. BE and SM to liaise.</p> <p><i>Appraisal</i></p> <p>7.4 Support staff appraisals completed. Teacher midyear appraisals being completed out now.</p> <p><i>Professional development</i></p> <p>7.5 CPD continues to be varied and given high importance at the school.</p> <p>Q. Is CPD cost effective/providing value for money?</p> <p>AM – Yes. So much is delivered in house, and where appropriate other schools are invited to join training events so recoup some of the cost that way.</p> <p>BE – LPS is hosting another “Teach meet” on 3rd June when schools in the collaboration get together to share good practice. 15 presentations planned already - excellent opportunity to network with colleagues.</p> <p>Q. Speaking of collaborations, are there any plans to extend the trust?</p> <p>EHT – Expansion is in the long term trust plan but it depends whether other schools approach the trust wanting to join. The collaboration is simply a local group of schools working together as evidenced by the Teach Meets.</p> <p><i>Teaching and learning</i></p> <p>7.6 Discussion in annex for governors.</p> <p><i>Pupil outcomes</i></p> <p>7.7 BE took governors through latest data and asked them to note that greater depth scores were particularly strong, especially for Reading where work across the school had been driven by the Literacy lead.</p> <p>7.8 Year 6 data showed the <u>current</u> position based on assessment at the end of March when children had taken last year’s SATs papers. Actual outcomes in SATs may be higher in Reading if there is movement among children on the cusp of expected and working at greater depth(WGD), and in Writing as teachers know gaps and have time to fill these before moderation. The Maths target (88%) was always ambitious and an outcome of 83% may be more realistic. The current RWM Combined WGD figure (missing from the paper) was 16%.</p> <p>7.9 Year 2 data was not yet available (also used 2018 SATs papers along with teacher assessment) and would be reported at the next meeting. The working at greater depth</p>	<p>BE/SM</p>

<p>target figure should read 23%.</p> <p>7.10 Year 1 Phonics outcome was expected to be 89% - lower than last year but still well above the national figure.</p> <p>Q. Why was the outcome likely to be below last year's?</p> <p>BE – Some children had joined at a very low level in YR. There were specific reasons why some children would not pass the test, but this small group (9) would have a big impact on data.</p> <p>7.11 EYFS target for Good Level of Development (GLD) was around 79%.</p> <p><i>Curriculum</i></p> <p>7.12 Discussions on curriculum development taking place now across both schools, involving all staff and School Councils. Really good ideas coming forwards, now for curriculum leaders to work with staff to design the curriculum plans. All professional development meetings next term will be devoted to this.</p> <p>Q. Will the new curriculum be trust wide or will it reflect the individual nature of each school?</p> <p>GM – looking at new curriculum across the trust to meet the trust vision, but will reflect the needs of each school as the differences between the schools, both among the children and each school community, are welcomed and to be protected.</p>	
<p>8 School Strategic Document and Impact Statement</p> <p><i>Strategic document</i></p> <p>8.1 HoSs drew attention to where the document had been updated with additional targets and data, and explained the graffiti project linked to literacy (priority 1.3).</p> <p>Q. Was the EY outdoor provision target (2.6) likely to be achieved by the end of the year in view of staff changes?</p> <p>AM – SLT are aware of the situation. The EY team know what needs to be done and will make a fresh start in T5, with priorities designed to inspire learning, especially boys' writing.</p> <p>8.2 BE explained her work with the SENCO to develop a new report format for children "working towards" their year group level (priority 2.3) to provide a more accurate picture of outcomes. Where children were not accessing their current year's criteria, the previous year's criteria would be used (or in the case of Yr 4 children working 2 years' below, the previous KS standard would be used). The new reports would be issued only in respect of children falling in this new category (1 or 2 children per class) and would be explained in conversations with parents.</p> <p>8.3 GM explained that staff and parent surveys were underway to collect information on wellbeing (3.3) and a pupil survey was being considered.</p> <p>Q. Could online surveys be explored as these were quick to fill in and might achieve a higher response rate?</p> <p>GM – response rates to hard copy surveys were traditionally high at the school but this would be considered going forwards, although cost and admin time had to be factored in.</p> <p><i>Impact statement</i></p> <p>8.4 This would be updated with latest data for the next meeting.</p>	
<p>9 Feedback from reviews</p> <p>9.1 AM drew attention to 2 red areas and explained:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 staff had still to sign to say they had read safeguarding documents. Governors agreed there should be a clear procedure on this, and that failure to comply should be treated as a potential disciplinary matter. SM reported that at her school staff were required to complete and pass a short survey after reading the documentation as evidence that they had done so. Governors agreed this was a good idea which the school would consider taking forwards. • In annex for governors 	

9.3 JW would check the Single Central Record on his next monitoring visit.	
<p>10 Business matters</p> <p>10.1 JD reported from the recent governor monitoring meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overspend on supply teacher budget was a concern but this was balancing out • Additional High Needs Funding (HNF) received – this funding was paid on a month by month basis (relates to specific children so is withdrawn when a child leaves the school) so the amount was volatile but there was a balance left of c£6k from the sum received after taking off spending on staff. There were options for spending this sum but EHT stressed that little would be available as the main school budget had already subsidised the 1:1 TA posts already in place and the apparently surplus funding really just redressed the balance. <p>10.2 GM updated governors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The forecast rollover was £82k which was roughly in line with projections • Risks to the budget were National Living Wage (would add £10k to next year’s salary costs if KCC took this on board as adjustments would be needed to support staff and TA pay), teacher pay award (2%, no additional government funding, only 1% allocated in budget)and increase in teacher pension contributions (government funding promised but amount and duration still unknown) • 2019/20 GAG funding for the school was exactly as expected (CPS would receive more than expected due to their rising school roll) and the annual spending review was due any time which would discuss future funding • Teacher absence insurance had not been renewed as the policy did not offer value for money (savings put into supply teacher budget – see 10.1 above). <p>10.3 GM updated governors on Sports Premium spending. He confirmed that references had been checked as requested at the last meeting and advised that the specification circulated to governors had been slightly changed to add a more durable surface (artificial grass not rubber crumb) to the project. This added around £2000 to the cost. The site would be inspected next month and installation would take place at some point during term time.</p>	
<p>11 Premises</p> <p>11.1 A new contract had been agreed for weekly visits for swimming pool maintenance. This would meet all H&S standards and provide a small budget saving on current arrangements. Staff would still carry out weekly pool testing as they had received the appropriate training.</p> <p>11.2 One item in annex for governors.</p>	
<p>12 Health and Safety</p> <p>JW confirmed that everything raised on his monitoring visit had been dealt with and HoSs had nothing else to add.</p>	
<p>13 Governor monitoring visits</p> <p>13.1 Governors drew attention to the following from recent visits: <i>Leadership</i></p> <p>13.2 Discussions with leaders had shown that leaders were already in a strong position to meet changes in data requirements as a result of the likely new curriculum-led Ofsted inspection framework.</p> <p><i>Standards</i></p> <p>13.3 Some discussion in annex for governors. Governors reported they had seen fantastic examples of reading journals and been very impressed with the post it notes project to collect ideas for the new curriculum. Modern foreign Language (MfL) provision will be discussed again on a future visit.</p> <p><i>Welfare</i></p> <p>13.4 Governors had viewed the safeguarding tracking system (same system was in</p>	

operation at CPS) and been pleased to learn this and other systems had been externally validated. [EHT advised this had been carried out as part of Alistair McKechan’s review of the school last year and Alistair, an ex Chief Inspector at Ofsted, would be returning to both schools next term to review all aspects of the schools’ operation.] Monitoring governors commented that safeguarding was clearly a huge area and one which seemed to change daily.	
<p>14 Governor training and other matters</p> <p>14.1 JW reported he had attended LA induction training for governors. This had been a full day’s training which he recommended to others but he suggested some 6 months’ experience of being a governor was necessary before attending the training in order to understand what was being discussed.</p> <p>14.2 Governors were reminded to take advantage of the LA training offer before the contract ran out at the end of May.</p> <p>14.3 Clerk apologised that notes from the 3rd local governor training session had not yet been circulated – she would send these shortly.</p> <p>14.4 Governor vacancies and recruitment had been discussed at item 5 above.</p>	
<p>15 Safeguarding and disability matters</p> <p>One item in annex for governors.</p>	
<p>16 Any other urgent business including Chair’s update</p> <p>No matters raised.</p>	
<p>17 Confidentiality</p> <p>17.1 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>17.2 The Head of School report, Impact Statement and Internal Review report would remain confidential documents for governors only.</p>	
<p>18 Dates for diaries</p> <p>Next LGB meeting: Wednesday 15th May 2019 at 5.30 pm</p> <p>AC and JW would attend to monitor during SATs week – BE would liaise on arrangements.</p>	AC, JW, BE

Signed.....

Date.....