

LOOSE PRIMARY SCHOOL
Minutes of the Local Governing Body Meeting
Wednesday 2 October 2019 at 5.30 pm

Present: Sarah Holman (HT), John West (co-opted), Samantha McMahon (parent), Mark Baker (parent), Ingrid Dutch (staff), Emma Eldridge (co-opted), John Kenny (co-opted)
 In attendance: Anita Makey (DHT), Carole Hardy (trustee), Clare Nurse (trust clerk)

Agenda item and discussion	Action or decision
<p>1 Welcome and introductions</p> <p>1.1 CH welcomed all to this meeting, particularly new governors (JK, EE, MB) and SH (first meeting as LPS HT), and all present introduced themselves and explained their backgrounds and roles on the LGB.</p> <p>1.2 CH confirmed she would chair this meeting in the absence of a CoG.</p>	
<p>2 Apologies for absence</p> <p>All present.</p>	
<p>3 Declaration of Business Interests</p> <p>There were no new interests to declare against items on the agenda.</p>	
<p>4 Minutes of the last meeting (17th July 2019)</p> <p>4.1 Minutes, including the annex, were agreed as an accurate record and signed by JD.</p> <p>4.2 There were no matters arising.</p>	
<p>5 Any other urgent business</p> <p>5.1 CH advised that governors would be invited to submit items to add to the meeting agenda when meeting reminders were sent out in future.</p> <p>5.2 CH advised that plans for a prospective CoGs' training programme had been changed since Alan Chell and James Daniels had both recently resigned from the LGB. She was delighted to advise governors though that John West and Sam McMahon had agreed to take on the CoG role jointly. JW would lead meetings, with SM leading discussion on education matters, allowing the LGB to benefit from their different skill sets. The trust board (TB) would confirm these CoG appointments at their next meeting.</p>	
<p>6 Update on Trust matters</p> <p>6.1 Governors had received the non-confidential minutes of the July TB meeting.</p> <p>6.2 CH drew attention to the TB's discussion of governor attendance at meetings, monitoring visits etc, and trustees' agreement that attendance of less than 75% was deemed of concern. She asked governors to advise any absences to the clerk as soon as these were known, so that meetings did not risk being non quorate for decision making.</p> <p>6.3 CH updated governors on TB discussion of how LPS LGB might be represented at TB level, following the DfE's instruction that no more than 2 CoGs could sit as members of any TB - she reminded governors that both Coxheath and St Katherine's CoGs were already members of the TB. At the July TB meeting, trustees had agreed that an attending trustee should attend LPS LGB meetings to ensure representation at Board level, but following further discussion of the potential for conflict of interests, trustees now agreed this idea should not be pursued. In the longer term, the trust hoped to reach a position where no CoG sat at TB level, and the proposal now was that all CoGs would meet in an informal group before TB meetings to share ideas and stay informed of trust matters.</p> <p>Q. How would the LGB receive TB information under this arrangement?</p> <p>CH – via the CoG who would attend the CoGs' meeting, and all local governors would continue to receive TB minutes. The arrangement would be monitored to see how it</p>	

<p>worked.</p> <p>Q. Would LPS LGB be at a disadvantage, compared with CPS and SKPS, under this arrangement?</p> <p>CH – The conduit between the LGB and the TB would continue via JW and SM as CoGs (the EHT had previously fulfilled this function in attending LGB meetings last year).</p> <p>SH – A similar arrangement existed for communications between the Executive Leadership team and the wider Trust Leadership group, with the EHT acting as the link between the two groups.</p> <p>6.4 CH reminded governors that the trust was new and still learning, so had to remain flexible and be prepared to rethink arrangements (eg a new business support model was being considered to meet needs as they had developed), and it was important that governors stayed focused on their strategic role.</p> <p>6.5 Governors received the Trust Strategic Document and had no questions to ask. They also received the 3 trust documents, prepared for use both within the trust and as the basis for discussions outside.</p> <p>6.6 Governors received the updated draft Scheme of Delegation 19/20. CH advised the main change was the introduction of a formal Finance and Audit Committee, with delegated decision-making responsibility which would streamline procedures. The document would continue to evolve and in fact another amendment had been agreed today, following a change to the Finance policy. Governors were invited to send any comments on the Scheme via the clerk for consideration at the next TB meeting when the final document would be approved.</p>	
<p>7 Trust policies</p> <p>Governors were advised the trust Appraisal policy had been approved at the last TB meeting and a copy was available on request.</p>	
<p>8 School strategic matters</p> <p><i>Headteacher report (verbal)</i></p> <p><i>Staffing</i></p> <p>7.1 One advert out for TA (High Needs Funding received), ongoing vacancies for extended services staff, otherwise teacher and TA staffing full.</p> <p>7.2 New staff (including 1 NQT) settled very well and rigorous induction completed and well received. Mentors appointed where appropriate.</p> <p>7.3 No class-based staff have left recently – now 66 staff on roll at school, including 26.9 FTE teachers making the teacher to pupil ratio 1:24.4 across the 21 classes (approximate national average is 1 teacher to 20 pupils).</p> <p><i>Appraisal</i></p> <p>7.4 All class-based staff appraisals complete, other appraisals will be completed by Christmas. HT and HoS have completed observations with leaders, to model observations for other leaders. Teaching very strong across the school (100% good or better last term) and reflects the success of the different recruitment strategy.</p> <p>Q. How frequent are observations and do these feed into the appraisal process?</p> <p>HT – one formal observation carried out in T1 then constant learning walks/20 minute drop-ins carried out when observations are fed back to staff. No further formal observations where teaching is good or better, but may take place where a concern is identified or the teacher expresses a training need/ambition. Teachers are using the rubric for self or peer assessment, showing accountability and evidence of the school holding itself to its own high standards.</p> <p><i>Professional development</i></p> <p>7.5 Continue to offer an amazing range of CPD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outstanding Teacher Programme (OTP) and Outstanding TA Programme (OTAP) – 2 sessions per term/10 across the year. Branwen Taylor leads OTP, and Anita Makey coordinates input from other leaders (Maths, SENCO etc) for OTAP 	

- Mark Burns continues to work with leadership including subject leaders – if governors would like to sit in on a session let HT know
- Alex Bell providing individual coaching sessions for senior leaders including the Trust School Improvement leader
- Development days – 1st focused on values/priorities; 2nd to be on curriculum including IT needs (3 workshops to be held); 3rd to focus on supporting pupils with anxiety. Governors noted this was a need across Kent including at secondary school level. Children suffered anxiety for a host of reasons (impact of family issues, change of schools, parental pressure re Kent Test etc) and it was part of the CPP ethos to support the children as part of their preparation for life. (See next item – Year 6 exit interviews)
- Treasured Memories Days (2 pa) to be held to offer bereavement and pre bereavement support to children, families, staff
- Average CPD provided in T1 was 4.4 hours per teacher; 3.06 hours per TA; and 1.15 hours per non class-based staff member

Year 6 exit interviews

7.6 Most children had reported they were ready to move on, with some expressing some anxiety. Experience days had been held at Cornwallis for Yr 5 and 6 to help prepare them for the changes at secondary school, and ID reported that LPS was now working with the Specialist Teaching Service on a pilot project relating to transition to secondary school. New initiatives had been introduced to reflect arrangements at secondary school (eg no trays so have to carry all books around, 3 different teachers for the class in the afternoons) and information is being gathered and will be analysed. EE advised the project had come out of a request to secondary schools to say what they wanted children to be able to do on arrival in Yr 7 (tie school ties and shoe laces, and be able to write at speed for note taking), and if successful would be rolled out across Maidstone.

Admissions

7.7 The school was oversubscribed with a waiting list for all year groups.

Inclusion

7.8 SEND children represented 8% of the roll (lower than the national average); 2% children had EHCPs (about average); 6% of children had English as an Additional Language; 15 children were in receipt of High Needs Funding. AM advised that the HNF application process was an incredibly lengthy procedure, and that Laura James (SENCO) worked tirelessly on these to ensure the school received the funding (c£78k this year) to ensure the children got the support they needed.

Safeguarding and attendance

7.9 Robust systems were in place at the school. The Families and Community Manager (ID) was working with around 100 children/80 families to provide support as necessary. The attendance rate at the school was above national, for all children (98.2%) and those entitled to free school meals (98.3%), reflecting the rigorous procedures followed at school. Staff absence rate was 96.4%, which was in line with CPS and SKPS.

Q. What was the procedure for staff to notify an absence?

HT – staff were required to contact the HR officer (MB advised that requiring staff to phone rather than email might prove effective in reducing absences). Where there was an issue about fitness for work this was covered by capability procedures, but the process took time and had to be very clearly evidenced.

Behaviour

7.9 HT advised that behaviour at the school was excellent, and Behavioural or Pastoral support plans were in place to help the few children who struggled.

Health & safety

7.10 There had been very few incidents or accidents recently. Issues raised relating to Compliance would be followed up on the next monitoring visit and internal review in

term 3.

Extended Services

7.11 All policies and procedures had been checked and pupil/staff ratios were satisfactory.

Premises

7.12 The trust board was considering bids to the Condition Improvement Fund (CIF) for capital funding, including for work at LPS on the flat roofs; the swimming pool; a lockdown link between the two buildings; and drainage. The trust could submit 3 bids, deadline was December, and a specialist bid writing firm was being employed to produce the applications.

7.13 HT suggested governors might like to discuss other possible projects at future meetings.

Budget

7.14 The school had rolled forwards £106-110k from last year (school figures differed from those produced by the accountants), some of which was identified as contingency funding.

School Strategic document

7.15 Governors had received and now **APPROVED** the school strategic document for 19/20.

7.16 HT advised

- The document had been reworded in line with the new Ofsted framework (particularly Quality of Education where curriculum “Intent, Implementation and Impact” were now key)
- Data (p4-8) showed actual numbers, national averages and identified trends
- Attainment – RWM was better than both local and national measures
- Progress based on prior attainment was a particularly important measure; Reading progress had improved since last year but was a priority area for the school and new initiatives had been introduced but would take time to embed; Writing progress measure was consistent with previous year’s and Maths progress measure had improved.
- Boys were doing better than girls in Reading (girls at the school were not doing as well generally as girls nationally)
- Disadvantaged pupils made more progress than “all pupils” in R, W and M. The gap was closing for progress but not for attainment but governors should note this was only a small group of children
- The trust targets agreed for 19/20 were based on FFT 50 (Fischer Family Trust target for the average school) – CH advised this had been discussed by the TB which had agreed that some lowering of the FFT 50 target was appropriate to recognise mobility issues, but that targets all remained challenging.

7.17 HT reminded governors that data was less important under the new Ofsted framework, and that progress and curriculum were now the key area of focus. It was however vital that the school hit Reading targets this year. Page 11 of the document showed both the overarching priority areas for this year and long term goals.

Q. Were children coming in to EYFS at a higher standard than previously to explain the changed progress outcomes?

HT – possibly in terms of their RW and M ability but not in other areas. AM confirmed that staff carried out rigorous assessments in EY and were aware that baseline assessments affected progress measures but this did not influence findings and in any case all results were moderated.

Q. Why was SEND not included as a priority area in the SIP, with specific milestones and criteria?

HT – data showed that SEN provision was already excellent so SEND/differentiation did

<p>not need to be specified as a priority area and was included in the overall goal of achieving excellence.</p> <p>7.18 Governors discussed how governor monitoring would have to change to match the new Ofsted framework and recent changes on the LGB. Visits would have to focus specifically on the key priority areas in the SIP, with other matters/monitoring being discussed at LGB meetings. Governors noted that there was some ambiguity about which items sat under which broad heading for monitoring, and CH agreed to seek clarification from the EHT before monitoring pairs were finally decided. Governors were asked to email CH with their preference for which monitoring role they would like to pursue, but she warned that not all preferences were likely to be met as the LGB had to make best use of the skills mix available on the LGB.</p>	
<p>9 Safeguarding and disability matters HT had no matters to report.</p>	
<p>10 Any other school matters The updated Pupil Premium report was now published on the school website.</p>	
<p>11 Governor monitoring visits Discussed at para 7.18 above in context of School Strategic document.</p>	
<p>12 Any other governor matters 12.1 Training on school data would be provided once the full dashboard was available at the end of the year. 12.2 There were no other matters raised.</p>	
<p>13 Agreement of confidentiality, action points and points to feed back to the Trust Board 13.1 <i>Confidentiality</i> – No confidential matters recorded, minutes to be publicly available after approval at next meeting. 13.2 <i>Action points</i> – governors to advise CH of preferences for governor monitoring areas, and CH to seek clarity from EHT on areas for monitoring under the new framework. 13.3 <i>Points to feed back to the Trust Board</i> – none.</p>	<p>All CH</p>
<p>14 Dates for LGB meetings 19/20 Wednesday 27th November 2019 at 5.30 pm Wednesday 5 February 2020 Wednesday 18 March 2020 Wednesday 13 May 2020 Wednesday 8 July 2020</p>	

Signed.....

Date.....