

LOOSE PRIMARY SCHOOL
Minutes of the Local Governing Body Meeting
Wednesday 15th May 2019 at 5.30 pm

Present: Peggy Murphy (CoG, co-opted), 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), Sarah Holman (HoS CPS), Clare Nursey (clerk)

Agenda item and discussion	Action or decision
<p>1 Welcome and introductions PM welcomed all to the meeting and introduced Sarah Holman, HoS at CPS and HT designate at LPS for September.</p>	
<p>2 Apologies for absence All present.</p>	
<p>3 Declaration of Business Interests There were no new interests to declare.</p>	
<p>4 Minutes of the last meeting (27th March 2019) 4.1 Minutes, including the annex, were agreed as an accurate record and signed by JD on behalf of governors (CoG absent from that meeting). 4.2 There were no matters arising not included on the agenda tonight.</p>	
<p>5 Update on Trust matters 5.1 Governors had received minutes of the April TB meeting. 5.2 EHT and CoG confirmed there had been a long and detailed discussion at the last TB meeting prior to the TB's decision to accept St Katherine's School's application to join the trust. Matters discussed included the advantages and disadvantages of accepting the application, particularly in view of concerns over St Katherine's budget. However due diligence had shown the budget position to be healthier which was reassuring. Since the last TB meeting, St Katherine's' had made a formal application to join CPP and had completed the required public consultation (which had received a very positive response) and had now submitted their academy conversion application. The Headteacher Board should consider this in June and the expected conversion date should be 1st November. CPP and St Katherine's had signed a Memorandum of Understanding to cover the period from now till they join the trust, which allows CPP influence over school improvement and budget matters. Governors were pleased to hear this, recognising it as a way of mitigating risks. 5.3 EHT advised that Coxheath LGB had raised questions at their meeting including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that they had not known about the application before the TB chair had mailed all governors – EHT advised that discussions had been confidential between St Katherine's FGB and CPP until that point, but he sympathised with CPS governors and the LGB had agreed to discuss the matter further at their next meeting. CoG pointed out however that agreement to which schools joined the trust was not part of the LGB's remit in the same way that a maintained school's LGB had no influence over the LA's plans • Queries around the definition of "local" in respect of the trust – EHT advised the unwritten understanding of "local" had always been "mid Kent" but he acknowledged it would have been useful if this had been made explicit earlier • Whether CPP had further plans for growth – the core offer from the trust to schools wishing to join was laid out in the Partnership and Development document, begun 	Next agenda

<p>in September and recently approved by the TB. This document would be circulated to both LGBs before their next meetings as a basis for further discussion. EHT stressed that the trust was not actively seeking growth (the enquiry from St Katherine's had been entirely unexpected) and he acknowledged governors' concerns at the risks involved in expanding too quickly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How the LGB could input to such decisions and discussions in future – CPP was almost unique as a trust in that LGBs were represented at TB level by virtue of inclusion of LGB chairs as trustees. The CoG was the means of two way communication between the LGB and the TB and local governors should raise questions at LGB level which the CoG would take forward to the TB. <p>5.4 Some further discussion in annex for governors. 5.5 There were no other trust matters to discuss.</p>	
<p>6 Trust policies</p> <p>6.1 Governors were advised the following policy had been approved at the last trust board meeting and was now posted on the websites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education of Children in Care https://www.coppiceprimarypartnership.kent.sch.uk/page/?title=Key+Documents&pid=15 <p>6.2 Governors were advised that in future any policy which included them as a named governor would be sent to them for comment at the review stage.</p>	BE
<p>7 Head of School report (verbal)</p> <p><i>Surveys</i></p> <p>7.1 AM reported on recent surveys:</p> <p><i>Parent survey</i></p> <p>7.2 The survey was based on an NAHT model and covered most of the same questions as in the Ofsted parent survey. There had been 190 replies with very positive responses to 2 key questions (children enjoy school 98%, children are safe at school 99%).</p> <p>7.3 All responses had been over 90% except regarding visibility of senior leaders (88% happy). GM confirmed that leaders were out as much as possible, including at all 4 gates, and the matter had been discussed with the parent council, and leaders had been reminded of the need to be a visible presence around the school. Governors questioned whether parents and children actually knew who comprised the whole senior leadership team (possibly they interpreted this as just the HoSs and EHT) and noted that parents collecting from clubs would not necessarily see leaders. They wondered whether a photo board showing the staff structure would be helpful to help identify staff but recognised there was a risk this might appear overly hierarchical.</p> <p>Q. Has the school responded to parents yet? (You said – we did.)</p> <p>GM – Key headlines had been included in the newsletter but no individual responses had yet been sent.</p> <p><i>Staff survey</i></p> <p>7.4 There had been 26 responses from a possible 120. Governors noted that it was risky to assume that those who had not responded were happy as Ofsted would expect to see a high response rate. A governor suggested that an online survey might achieve a higher response rate as this was quicker to complete than a paper based survey. GM confirmed this would be investigated for next time but did though have a cost implication.</p> <p>7.5 AM reported that in general responses were positive, with wellbeing being mentioned as an area for development – leaders were already taking this forwards. Findings had not yet been fed back to or discussed with staff.</p> <p>Q. Was there a senior leader responsible for wellbeing? (It was a concern that wellbeing had been an area for development in the SIP since September but there were still issues.)</p> <p>HoSs – the senior leader responsible had recently left the school and HoSs had taken on the responsibility. Wellbeing was discussed during PDMs (personal development meetings) but</p>	BE/S M

<p>governors noted these meetings were just for teachers – when did leaders speak to other staff, including office staff? It was important that all staff had the opportunity to discuss the matter specifically, particularly as 23% of staff had responded that they felt they did not have enough CPD.</p> <p>7.6 The meeting agreed that it would be useful if the next staff survey included a box for staff to tick to show their type of role (teaching, admin, premises etc) as results might be different among the different groups.</p> <p><i>Children’s lunchtime survey</i></p> <p>7.7 ID reported that the survey had been held across both key stages. 75% of pupils thought that provision was good (food, portion sizes, activities available) and comments had been received on portion sizes, sort of food served, and activities the children would like to see (including the game “it” which was always a problem). ID had met catering staff to discuss findings and, eg portion sizes would be made more visible, and takeaway Fridays were being introduced from T6.</p> <p>7.8 GM advised that the school hoped to carry out a sports survey among the children shortly.</p> <p><i>Staffing</i></p> <p>7.9 Discussion in annex for governors.</p>	
<p>8 School Strategic Document and Impact Statement</p> <p>8.1 HoS advised these had been updated with March data but otherwise there was little change.</p> <p>8.2 Some discussion in annex for governors.</p>	
<p>9 Feedback from external review</p> <p>9.1 HoSs reported they were delighted with the outcome of the external review, which had been thorough and intensive. Alastair McMeckan, former HMI, had visited 12 classes, looked at books and met children, leaders and a governor. His conclusion validated the school’s own judgments and confirmed the school had maintained and improved on its outstanding status.</p> <p>9.2 Governors congratulated the school on this excellent result which confirmed the school was not sitting still having received the outstanding Ofsted result.</p>	
<p>10 Business matters</p> <p>10.1 JD (finance monitoring governor) confirmed he had no question to raise on latest monitoring data (March 19).</p> <p>10.2 AM confirmed that the expected outturn had changed since last month as High Needs Funding had been received, but this figure might change again in September when HNF was next reviewed. There was no news on whether the LA would be implementing the National Living Wage but this too would affect figures.</p> <p>10.3 GM advised governors that some areas of the school needed attention (re-decoration etc) and the next site walk would identify priorities for work over summer. Plans for new furniture in some classrooms had been put on hold.</p> <p>10.4 GM confirmed that the new playground equipment should be installed w/b 20th May.</p>	
<p>11 Premises</p> <p>HoS confirmed that review of the catering and leaning contracts had been deferred since St Katherine’s was joining the trust and economies might be achieved across the three schools.</p>	
<p>12 Health and Safety</p> <p>12.1 JW reported that the latest H&S walk had been completed and he was happy there were no H&S concerns from a governor’s point of view. Most items noted for action on the last walk had been dealt with and he thanked Andy Lacey for his hard work.</p> <p>12.2 He had noted 2 items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some First Aid kits need checking to ensure supplies are up to date • SCR – JW queried the need for paper records and the security arrangements for both paper and electronic versions of this sensitive material. EHT would double 	

<p>check arrangements and report back but was confident that the computer system was encrypted and that access to necessary paper documents was strictly limited to the member of staff who dealt with the SCR.</p> <p>12.3 JW and ID reported on their meeting with KCC and others regarding longstanding traffic and parking issues on Loose Road (report circulated). It was clear KCC would take no action to install a crossing and the school could not afford to fund this work independently. Suggestions for action now included starting a campaign among parents (and the community) to fund raise and see whether this might cause a shift in KCC's view. The meeting agreed to consider this further at the meeting in T1.</p>	<p>EHT</p> <p>T1 agenda</p>
<p>13 Governor monitoring visits</p> <p>13.1 AM would email governors to confirm dates and times for next monitoring visits.</p> <p>13.2 Clerk to circulate last SEND monitoring report.</p>	<p>AM Clerk</p>
<p>14 Governor training and other matters</p> <p>14.1 LGB membership – governors had received the TB chair's mail about membership from T6, including that PM would move to CPS to add strength in education and to act as LGB chair.</p> <p>14.2 PM reminded the meeting of her offer to act as CoG for both LGBs in T6 if this would be a benefit. Clerk to mail TB chair.</p> <p>14.3 Governors were reminded to take the Prevent on line training course and to send certificates to the clerk.</p>	<p>Clerk</p> <p>All Govs.</p>
<p>15 Safeguarding and disability matters</p> <p>15.1 HoS had no matters to raise.</p> <p>15.2 Isle of Wight residential trip – AC advised he had checked paperwork on behalf of governors and could confirm everything was in order. Governors approved the residential trip.</p>	
<p>16 Any other urgent business including Chair's update</p> <p>One item in annex for governors.</p>	
<p>17 Confidentiality</p> <p>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 Impact Statement and Review report would remain confidential documents for governors only.</p>	
<p>18 Dates for diaries</p> <p>Next LGB meeting: Wednesday 17th July 2019 at 5.30 pm – School Council attending</p>	

Signed.....

Date.....