

**LOOSE PRIMARY SCHOOL**  
**Minutes of the Local Governing Body Meeting**  
**Wednesday 17<sup>th</sup> July 2019 at 5.30 pm**

Present: Giacomo Mazza (joint HoS), John West (co-opted), Samantha McMahon (parent), James Daniels (parent), Ingrid Dutch (staff)  
 In attendance: Darren Webb (EHT), Bev Evenden (DHT), Carole Hardy (trustee), Clare Nursey (trust clerk), Liz McLaren (schools clerk)

Agenda item and discussion	Action or decision
<p><b>Meeting with School Council representatives</b></p> <p>Six members of the Council came to talk to governors – Micah (yr 5), Ted (Yr 6), Luke and Beau (Yr 3), and Elliot and Caden (Yr 4). They invited governors to ask questions on the Council’s activities this year.</p> <p><b>Q. What have been the Council’s biggest successes this year?</b></p> <p>Changing the school’s house names. The houses were all named after men which we didn’t think was fair and the names had been used for a long time. The whole school joined in choosing new names. Everyone was set homework to suggest one male and one female name, and each year group voted for their favourites. The whole school then voted and the new names chosen were (Marie) Curie, (David) Attenborough, (Rosa) Parks and (Julia) Donaldson. Each house then shared information on the person after whom they were named with the other children.</p> <p>We are also pleased with helping choose the new upgraded play equipment. Every class was asked for their views and the School Council chose some of the equipment and the school chose some. We are very pleased with the new equipment.</p> <p><b>Q. Have you enjoyed being on the Council and what advice would you give to next year’s representatives?</b></p> <p>Yes, we have really enjoyed helping the school. We would tell next year’s Council that they have to let the school decide things, we can only help by giving the children’s views.</p> <p><b>Q. What have you done to make school better for the children?</b></p> <p>We have helped change school dinners – no more soggy bottoms on chips! We asked each class for their views on dinners and fed these back to the school. We met the new chef to give our ideas for changes, like having more jacket potatoes available as these kept running out. We asked if we could have salt and ketchup available but were made aware of government rules on healthy eating, about not having too much fat or sugar etc, so we came up with healthier options to improve meals. We now have a self service salad bar in KS2 (<i>ID – waiting for one in KS1</i>) and KS2 also has a baguette bar.</p> <p><b>Q. What else have you done to help the school or others?</b></p> <p>We have helped raise a lot of money for charity.</p> <p>We helped recruit new teachers for the school by interviewing them and sharing our opinions with staff, eg which year new teachers might fit best. (<i>GM – shows that the Council is part of leadership at the school.</i>)</p> <p><b>Q. Do you think you have helped make a difference at the school?</b></p> <p>Yes, and we have learned that staff listen to our views. This showed us that we are important and have a voice at school.</p> <p>Governors thanked the representatives for coming to this meeting to answer questions</p>	

and for being such fine ambassadors for the school.	
<p><b>1 Welcome and introductions</b></p> <p>1.1 CH thanked governors for attending this meeting and reminded them that, following Peggy Murphy’s move to CPS as CoG, she would be acting as interim CoG without a vote until a new CoG was ready to assume the role.</p> <p>1.2 CH introduced Liz McLaren who would be clerking all 3 LGBs next year, and governors introduced themselves and explained their roles.</p>	
<p><b>2 Apologies for absence</b></p> <p>Received and accepted from Anita Makey (joint HoS – personal commitment). No apologies received from Alan Chell (co-opted). The meeting was quorate with 5 of 6 governors in post present.</p>	
<p><b>3 Declaration of Business Interests</b></p> <p>There were no new interests to declare.</p>	
<p><b>4 Minutes of the last meeting (15<sup>th</sup> May 2019)</b></p> <p>4.1 Minutes, including the annex, were agreed as an accurate record and signed by JW on behalf of governors.</p> <p>4.2 There were no matters arising not included on the agenda tonight.</p>	
<p><b>5 Update on Trust matters</b></p> <p>5.1 Governors had received minutes of the last Trust board meeting and had no questions to ask.</p> <p>5.2 The Partnership and Development document had been circulated as agreed at the last meeting. EWT advised this had recently been tweaked following a stipulation in the St Katherine’s academy order that no more than 2 LGB CoGs could sit on the Trust Board in case this limited the spread of skills available on the TB. LGB involvement was a big part of the trust’s ethos and the TB was now giving consideration to how this could be preserved going forwards.</p> <p>5.3 The meeting discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The possibility of CoGs rotating as trustees, although this might be difficult as trustee names had to be notified to Companies House</li> <li>• The possibility of extending the committee structure, eg to establish a Chairs’ group to meet before TB meetings</li> <li>• The possibility of the 3<sup>rd</sup> CoG attending TB meetings as an associate (though not practical if the trust grows further).</li> </ul> <p>5.4 The meeting agreed that a system was needed which provided every LGB with assurance that their views would be represented to the TB, but that whatever was decided had to be future proofed to avoid further change as the trust grows. CH confirmed that the TB would discuss options at their next meeting.</p> <p>5.5 There were no other trust matters to discuss and governors suggested no matters to be raised at the next TB meeting.</p>	
<p><b>6 Trust policies</b></p> <p>6.1 Governors noted that the following policy had been approved at the last Trust Board meeting and was now posted on CPP website</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Equalities objectives</li> </ul> <p><a href="https://www.coppiceprimarypartnership.kent.sch.uk/page/?title=Key+Documents&amp;pid=15">https://www.coppiceprimarypartnership.kent.sch.uk/page/?title=Key+Documents&amp;pid=15</a></p> <p>6.2 Governors were advised that the following internal policies had been approved at the</p>	

<p>last Trust Board and were available on request</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finance policy</li> <li>• Disclosures in school</li> </ul>	
<p><b>7 School strategic matters</b></p> <p><u>Head of School report</u></p> <p>7.1 Governors had received the written report and GM invited questions and drew attention to the following:</p> <p><i>a) Staffing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Year 3 teacher has unfortunately left the school midterm – cover in place from existing Yr 5 and 6 teachers</li> <li>• Site manager now in post and site team line management all agreed. New site manager working at a fast pace. All important issues addressed and other issues which had perhaps slipped while the post was unfilled have been picked up and will be addressed over summer and in next year’s programme of work</li> <li>• Staffing for next year – recent recruitment has been very successful and there will be a strong team in place at the school next year. Induction process has been reviewed so that all new teachers are aware of the school’s high expectations. Completely new team in place for EY next year. School will be fully staffed, possibly except for 1 TA (just resigned)</li> <li>• Further discussion regarding staffing is in the confidential annex</li> </ul> <p><b>Q. How will leaders ensure the right teacher is allocated to the right class/year group?</b></p> <p>GM – learning walks from day 1 will monitor this. All staff will attend a “conditions for learning” session at the start of the year as part of the revamped induction process, and all staff will have access to development opportunities from the start of the year. Support will be put in place where needed, including directing staff towards specific sessions in the Outstanding Teacher Programme (OTP). Governors should be assured that swift action will be taken where needed.</p> <p><b>Q. Are leaders happy with the range of strengths in each year group for next year?</b></p> <p>GM – yes, very pleased. Has been the subject of much discussion and careful thought (staffing structure circulated is version no 13). School has benefited from the decision to recruit early.</p> <p><i>b) Appraisal</i></p> <p>All midyear teacher appraisals had been completed and documentation had been reviewed to reflect the new Ofsted framework with the emphasis on curriculum not data next year. JD confirmed that the appraisal cycle for support staff had been discussed during the governor monitoring visit – item in annex for governors.</p> <p><b>Q. How would the school quantify whether targets were met when less data was available?</b></p> <p>GM – Progress would still be quantified but discussions would not be so data driven and would instead focus on T&amp;L. Pupil progress meetings would still involve target setting for children.</p> <p><b>Q. How would staff prove they had had positive impact without so much data?</b></p> <p>GM – everyone was aware of the need to evidence impact; some data would still be available as would results of observations etc.</p> <p><i>c) CPD</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mark Burns had run a 3<sup>rd</sup> day of training for leaders and this had proved very helpful</li> <li>• The OTP continued</li> </ul>	

- The “Teach meet” had been very positive
- Pete White had provided some free leadership coaching sessions

*d) T&L*

- Targeted support was in place where necessary
- Additional support had been put in place in YR, which would have new teachers and a new leader next year
- Both the Schools Direct trainee and the NQT had successfully passed the year (NQT staying on next year)

*e) Outcomes KS2*

- Overall the school was happy with attainment though SATs results (provisional) were slightly below predictions: Reading 87%, Writing 80%, Maths 83%, Combined 73%
- Progress measures would prompt some thought: Writing would be positive, Maths would possibly just fall into negative (an improvement on last year), Reading would be negative, perhaps not significantly so and an improvement on last year but not where the school wanted to be
- Reading had been a focus this year, with a huge amount of work taking place and a new approach to the teaching of Reading. Guided reading books showed evidence of improvement but it would take time for results to feed through the school

**Q. Did results show that the investment in Maths this year had paid off?**

The group of children involved have improved which will have influenced the progress measure.

The progress measure for Maths would show a huge improvement, from significantly negative last year to around 0 this year.

**Q. How would the school ensure that teachers hit the ground running in the new year?**

OTP sessions would have a focus on Reading, and Branwen Tayler (T&L lead) would focus on this area.

**Q. What targets would be set for Reading and how could the school ensure there were no surprises in next year’s results?**

Key Performance Indicators have been agreed for next year. Although testing would reduce there would still be assessment in the spring term as the starting point for work in Year 6. The current Year 5s had taken the latest test this year and the school had learned from this – the paper was in a slightly different style, with more precise language, and this would be built into teaching. In depth pupil progress meetings would be held in autumn and these would inform monitoring - Ofsted would no longer wish to see in year data so progress in books would be key to proving that the children were making progress. Leaders believed they had got the balance right this year – the children had enjoyed a broad and balanced curriculum alongside core subjects (in which they could be “hot housed” but this was not the school’s ethos), and leaders were confident that changes, including the new curriculum next year, would feed through.

**Q. Does the school believe it has the balance right between teaching of Maths and English?**

Both have been priorities this year, with a focus on increasing challenge in Maths. Year 6 teachers responded well and did all they could and, even with hindsight, the school would have done nothing different. On the whole staff are confident in teaching the subjects and where necessary support is put in place.

*f) Outcomes KS1*

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although outcomes were below predictions, the school remained confident that judgements were accurate.</li> <li>• Phonics test result 93%</li> <li>• Yr 2 Phonics retakes – 5 of 6 passed the test</li> <li>• EYFS 79% GLD (target 79%)</li> </ul> <p><i>g) Local collaborations</i> At the last meeting LPS had asked that the group develop a challenge partner approach as this will be of greater benefit to LPS. If this does not happen, LPS will draw a line under the arrangement.</p> <p><i>h) Admissions</i> There would be 5 sets of twins in YR in September and around 2/3 of new entrants would be siblings, the highest number ever at the school.</p> <p><i>i) Attendance</i> The school was very pleased with the attendance rate (% above national) with thanks given to ID for her hard work as FCM. The system had been tightened this year with penalty notices (28) issued for the first time.</p> <p><i>j) Health &amp; safety</i> The biggest concern was use of the new play equipment before and after the school day. A risk assessment was in place and clear messages had been given to parents and children via the newsletter, assemblies and talks to individual classes, but the problem persisted. The school would continue to issue regular reminders that children were their parents' responsibility before and after school.</p> <p><i>k) Other matters</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moderation had agreed all judgements for YR and Yr 6; Yr 2 had had full moderation with some judgements moved up</li> <li>• The school had joined in a times tables pilot test this year. Although the test was new to the children, scores had been broadly in line with others and provided a baseline view. There was room to develop though and some good ideas had come out of participation and would be incorporated in the SIP</li> <li>• The recent sponsored walk had raised an amazing £6000, to be put towards ipads for the school</li> <li>• One item in annex for governors.</li> </ul> <p><u>Impact statement and Strategic document</u></p> <p>7.2 Governors had no questions to ask on either document.</p> <p>7.3 BE noted an amendment was needed to the data table in the Impact statement – she would mail correct figures.</p> <p>7.4 GM confirmed that the curriculum was the biggest focus from September, as shown in the Strategic document, and staff were pleased with what had been put in place.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;"><b>Action BE</b></p>
<p><b>8 Feedback from reviews</b></p> <p>8.1 Governors had received the T6 internal report/compliance check. HoS advised this had raised no surprises and several matters had already been identified by the new site manager, whose background in fire safety was proving extremely useful. The next internal review report would include an update on action taken – see annex for governors.</p> <p>8.2 Governors had received the report following LEAF's (based at Five Acre Wood School) review of SEND at the school. GM advised that LEAF would be providing final feedback this week but the review had been comprehensive and supportive. LEAF had noted many strengths at the school, including the impact of TAs and how well supported and engaged</p>	

<p>the children were, but had also identified some areas for development. Leaders were now considering how to take these forward and key actions agreed would be reported to governors next term. BE advised that discussions about how to record progress of children working below their age group had been particularly interesting and this would be followed up with LEAF.</p> <p><b>Q. What evaluation of TA support had been undertaken at the school?</b></p> <p>EHT – some action research had been undertaken and results applied across the trust, with a new approach to TA deployment reflected in staffing structures for September.</p> <p><b>Q. Would the school seek closer links with FAW regarding TAs?</b></p> <p>GM – communication and collaboration with FAW was already very good, and the school planned to explore this in the continuing professional dialogue.</p>	
<p><b>9 School statutory documents</b></p> <p>9.1 Governors received and <b>approved</b> for publication the updated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inclusion and SEND offer and statement</li> <li>• Sports Premium statement</li> </ul> <p>9.2 HoS advised the Sports Premium statement would be updated next year to include the impact of spending on the new play equipment which was already being well used.</p>	
<p><b>10 Budget matters</b></p> <p>10.1 Governors had received school budget monitoring data (May 19) and the 19/20 draft school budget and 3 year plan.</p> <p>10.2 HoS advised that the most recent quarterly budget monitoring data (p/e June 19) showed a healthy forecast revenue rollover of £106k (up £2k on the last period). The capital budget had been fully spent this year and this needed to continue as some areas of the school were looking tired (in need of new furniture, carpets etc). Work had been prioritised and some would take place over summer.</p> <p>10.3 JD (finance monitoring governor) confirmed he had studied draft budget plans with Clare Hancock (finance officer) and had identified no problems.</p> <p>10.4 EHT reminded governors that next year the school would continue to contribute to CPS's budget. This would be the second year of contributing and LPS governors should monitor closely whether this was having impact at LPS. Obviously the goal was for CPS to be self sufficient and it was hoped this would happen in the next 2 years but it depended on increases in the CPS roll – population in the area was increasing and YR and 3 other year groups were full next year but there remained gaps in other years. The trust was expanding next year, and there would be no need to support SKPS financially in 19/20. The TB would keep the situation under review and it was important that LPS governors challenged TB decisions if they felt this necessary.</p> <p>10.5 Governors agreed that this would be important if it transpired that things were not being done at LPS because the budget could not afford them due to the contribution to CPS. EHT assured governors that this was not the case at present. Results showed strong outcomes (LPS remained the strongest of the 3 schools) and the school would ensure these were maintained and not compromised by support given elsewhere.</p>	
<p><b>11 Premises</b></p> <p>There were no significant matters to report.</p>	
<p><b>12 Health and Safety</b></p> <p>12.1 There were no matters to report other than those covered in the H&amp;S monitoring report (item 13 below).</p>	

<p>12.2 Following a query at a previous meeting regarding H&amp;S during holiday times (front gates left open for deliveries while the holiday play scheme was running), HoS and EHT confirmed that robust risk assessments were in place, including for the holiday play scheme itself, and the conclusion was that the likely cost of any changes to the entry system would be disproportionate to the low risk involved in leaving gates open. All staff were aware of procedures in place.</p> <p>12.3 Governors agreed that the expense would be hard to justify when the risk was so low and SM advised that, as a parent using the holiday scheme, she had no concerns with current arrangements.</p> <p>12.4 EHT assured governors that the issue would be revisited if there was any future need (feedback or incident), and that he was not aware of any issues at a similarly organised scheme elsewhere. It would though be prudent for governors to check the risk assessment and ID agreed to do this and report back at the next meeting.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">ACTION - ID</p>
<p><b>13 Governor monitoring visits</b></p> <p>13.1 Reports had been circulated for Welfare and Leadership in advance of the meeting. The Standards report had only been circulated today. JD confirmed that the quarterly budget monitoring had taken place only recently so no report was provided but there was in any case no significant feedback to give (see 10.3 above).</p> <p>13.2 CH had noted that monitoring reports across the trust were very detailed and while she very much appreciated the time and effort governors put into monitoring, she was concerned that reports strayed into operational territory, eg H&amp;S matters. She reminded governors that their role was strategic, and that monitoring visits provided opportunity to challenge leaders on priorities and progress on those priorities based on the school strategic document. JW responded that the H&amp;S report had been written from a business perspective – what would he (and fellow governors) want to know about a business, including planned or suggested follow up action on any problems identified. He agreed though that it was sometimes difficult to identify where the governor role started and ended, for example he had included comment on the reaction of the children during SATs in the report as he believed their respect for their peers reflected an aspect of “welfare”.</p> <p>13.3 CH suggested that greater flexibility on monitoring might be introduced next year. Governors across the trust had done extremely well in the first year of the trust’s operation, and going forwards it might sometimes be as effective for LPS governors to carry out monitoring via phone call or email, rather than by an additional visit (EHT confirmed that 3 face to face governor monitoring visits would continue at both schools next year). Governors saw the logic in this but agreed that as new governors, the face to face visits had been extremely useful this year in building up their knowledge and relationships at the school.</p> <p>13.4 In respect of H&amp;S monitoring, EHT advised that monitoring governors did not have to accompany all the termly H&amp;S site walks, but should receive and review documentation (schedule of works etc) to assure themselves that the school was fulfilling its obligations and to apply their business knowledge to challenge the school on priorities or if items were outstanding.</p> <p>13.5 CH reported she had received a request from a governor to change area of monitoring responsibility. Governors present commented they had been appointed to their particular monitoring area to maximise their existing skills and knowledge, and that these had been developed further over the past year. All wished to continue in their</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Action</p>

current monitoring role. CH would report back to the governor concerned.	CH
<p><b>14 Governor matters</b></p> <p>14.1 CH was pleased to advise that Emma Eldridge, formerly a governor on LPS FGB, had agreed to join the LGB, filling the co-opted vacancy left by PM's move to CPS. The TB would confirm the appointment at their next meeting, and the LGB would discuss next term where EE would fit into monitoring responsibilities.</p> <p>14.2 CH confirmed that JW and AC had both offered to join a chairs' training programme and this would begin next term.</p> <p>14.3 CH advised that 4 offers had been received from potential trustees (currently 2 vacancies on the TB) and the TB would discuss these next term.</p>	
<p><b>15 Safeguarding and disability matters</b></p> <p>There were no matters to raise.</p>	
<p><b>16 Any other urgent business including Chair's update</b></p> <p>16.1 No other urgent matters were raised.</p> <p>16.2 Governors asked that their thanks and congratulations be sent to all staff for the hard work and progress made this year. They thanked school leaders (GM, AM and BE) for their work this year which had made a real difference at the school, and offered GM and BE best wishes for their new positions at CPS next year. They also asked that thanks be passed to the PTA for their hard work through the year, particularly in arranging and running the recent very enjoyable Summer Fun Day.</p>	
<p><b>17 Agreement of confidentiality, action points and points to feed back to the Trust Board</b></p> <p>17.1 Some discussion at items 7 and 8 deemed confidential to governors.</p> <p>17.2 <b>Action points:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BE to update table (7.3)</li> <li>• ID to check front gate risk assessment (12.4)</li> <li>• CH to write to governor (13.5)</li> </ul> <p>17.3 There were no matters to feedback to the TB.</p>	
<p><b>18 Schedule of meetings 19/20 – all meetings at 5.30 pm</b></p> <p>Wed 2 Oct 2019</p> <p>Wed 27 Nov 2019</p> <p>Wed 5 Feb 2020</p> <p>Wed 18 March 2020</p> <p>Wed 13 May 2020</p> <p>Wed 8 July 2020</p>	

Signed.....

Date.....