

COXHEATH PRIMARY SCHOOL
Local Governing Body Meeting
Tuesday 11th October 2022 at 5.30pm
In School

Present: Clare Nursey (Chair of Governors / Co-opted), Giacomo Mazza (Headteacher), Claire Webb (Co-opted Governor), Simon Malone (Parent Governor), Sam Sanders (Co-opted Governor), Darren Flisher (Staff Governor), Katherine Tunnicliffe (Associate Governor)

In attendance: Bev Evenden (DHT/Associate Governor)

[illegible]

<p>intruder; the lockdown alarm, prompting automatic door locking, is tested regularly, and regular whole school drills take place.</p> <p>Governors were satisfied that the school was taking reasonable measures to ensure security until building works could be undertaken.</p>	
<p>5 Any Other Urgent Business</p> <p>5.1 None reported.</p>	
<p>6 Trust Matters</p> <p>6.1 The minutes of the last Trust Board meeting on the 13th July 2022 had been received by governors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governors noted the comment on CPS LGB at para 5.5. They felt this unfair, not least as time at that meeting had been given to hearing from the School Council (a valuable opportunity to get feedback directly from children) and to acknowledging departing governors. However, the comment gave rise to a broad and useful discussion, reported under item 12 below. <p><u>Update re merger with OAT</u></p> <p>6.2 Governors noted the TB's recommendation to proceed with the merger following completion of due diligence. Governors were advised that Allington's recent Ofsted report confirmed the school's outstanding status which was good news.</p> <p><u>Trust strategic actions</u></p> <p>6.3 Governors received the trust strategic plan and actions document, highlighting key priorities and actions planned across the trust this year.</p> <p>Q. How does this fit with the school's improvement plan?</p> <p>GF advised that though the 3 schools were different, they had similar priorities outlined in the trust plan. These fed into each school's own plan which remained the key document for governors.</p> <p>Q. Has the school had the chance to feed into the trust plan?</p> <p>HT advised that MC clearly knows the schools well, and there has been 2-way communication enabling schools to feed into new and evolving ideas at trust level.</p> <p>Q. Is there a risk of duplication in monitoring – trust plan, school plan, ECC, internal and external reviews?</p> <p>See discussion at item 12 below.</p> <p><u>Reviewed Trust vision and mission statement</u></p> <p>6.4 Governors fully supported the vision and mission statement, although they felt the strapline wording "Aspiration through Excellence" might be reconsidered.</p> <p>6.5 SM advised that his employer had a similar mission statement and linked this with its reward scheme – staff at all levels were encouraged to give a shout out when they saw a colleague demonstrate one of the values, and this was considered as part of annual performance reviews. Governors thought this an excellent idea. GF confirmed he already acknowledged staff efforts directly (email at end of week) but he would take this wider idea forward and discuss with MC.</p> <p><u>Trust data pack</u></p> <p>6.6 Governors reviewed this alongside the school's own data information, and agreed it was useful to see and compare how schools across the trust had performed.</p> <p>Q. Did trust wide data suggest there were things to learn from the other schools, eg from SEN data which was stronger elsewhere?</p> <p>GF advised that school contexts were so different that little could be learned from attainment data. Mobility, category of SEND, and children's starting points all influenced results and it was more important to look at progress data (which had not been available at the last LGB meeting).</p>	

<p>6.7 Governors discussed the progress data available for the school and agreed this was very strong in any circumstances but exceptional in light of interruptions due to Covid, and better progress than LPS and SKPS. HT clarified that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Nationally the average progress score is zero. A score of zero means pupils in this school, on average, do about as well at Key Stage 2 as those with similar prior attainment nationally.</i> • <i>A positive score means pupils in this school, on average, do better at Key Stage 2 than those with similar prior attainment nationally.</i> • <i>A negative score means pupils in this school, on average, do not make as much progress by the end of Key Stage 2 as those with similar prior attainment nationally</i> <p>6.9 Governors noted that PP children's results were even better than those for all children, with the exception of Writing.</p> <p>6.8 BE drew attention to EYFS results (71% GLD compared with 65% national). KS1 phonics screening (75% matching national data) was disappointing but the introduction of the new scheme (SoundsWrite) and the better baseline should address this in future.</p> <p>Q. How do you measure the baseline in EY?</p> <p>GF - narrative based on practical tests completed within 6 weeks of starting school. Signs were that the current EY had joined the school with better speech and language skills, having had the opportunity to attend nursery schools.</p> <p>Q. Does the school plot results against data on the school context to provide a narrative from which lessons might be learned? Eg when particularly high mobility might impact on results.</p> <p>GF – not currently but might be considered.</p> <p>Q. Why is CPS's progress data so strong?</p> <p>GF – several factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching, parents, strong subject leads • Focus on Reading • White Rose maths scheme, strong subject lead • Broad and balanced curriculum, children not drilled for tests, amounts to children being better prepared for secondary school 	
<p>7 Trust Policies</p> <p>7.1 The following policies, approved by the Trust Board meeting of the 13th July 2022, were duly noted by the governors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lettings policy • Governor Code of Conduct • Extended services policy 	
<p>8 School Strategic Matters</p> <p>Headteacher's report</p> <p>8.1 Governors had received the first report in the new format (introduced to make production less time consuming for HTs) and agreed this was a more professional format with a clear strategic focus. The following points were discussed:</p> <p><i>Quality of Education</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School was very pleased with results, very positive post Covid • Current Yr 6 in line to achieve targets, current Yr 4 pose a challenge due to high level of SEN need in both classes • Report not yet available on recent external review of Art and Writing. Reviewer commented Art curriculum was one of the strongest she has seen. 	

<p>Writing curriculum to be stripped back to reduce over modelling (impact seen post Covid)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Science curriculum being implemented, still some issues with amount of content for staff and children. External reviewer (above) is writing new Kent Science scheme and has asked to work with the trust to develop this. <p><i>Behaviour and attitudes</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance remains a priority. <p>Q. Has the Attendance officer post had impact, is this and the FLO role separation now permanent, and is any other school in the trust adopting the same arrangement?</p> <p>GM – attendance officer now on permanent contract, not certain whether other schools have the same separation of roles. Difficult to measure impact of role, possibly only marginal gains. Developing good relations with parents through helpful dialogues, higher number of penalty notices being issued, confident that policy is now being followed. In reply to a question, HT confirmed that school does not receive the payments from penalty notifications.</p> <p><i>Personal development</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme for trips and visits published to parents • Further £5k worth of diverse books being purchased for library <p>Q. Any value in linking Word of the Week to values, ethos etc?</p> <p>GM – Words mainly linked to texts being read, values (including British Values) covered in assemblies</p> <p><i>Leadership and management</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 22 applications received for office post, interviewing this week. <p><i>School context</i> – no additional comments</p> <p>8.2 GM updated governors on pay and appraisal matters. MC had confirmed that LGBs did not need to be advised of pay decisions hence there was no report to governors on pay (NB Scheme of delegation says LGBs will be “informed” on pay decisions below leaders in school). The disciplined enquiry approach had not worked out as planned, perhaps being too ambitious in view of everything else going on at the schools. This year the focus for appraisal for teachers would be instructional coaching (new Appraisal policy to reflect this), which would support teacher development. The disciplined enquiry approach had worked better for TAs, who had been able more easily to incorporate work on their enquiry into day-to-day work, and would continue for them with some refinements. MDS appraisal would focus on behaviour management as this was the key part of their role.</p> <p><u>School Statutory Documents</u></p> <p>8.3 The following documents had been circulated to governors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emergency procedures - approved • Pupil Premium report – deferred to next meeting • Uniform policy – approved but governors wondered why the Trust did not adopt one supplier for uniforms and noted that cost varied greatly between the schools (LPS sweater £22, CPS £10) • Parent code of conduct – governors agreed this was a comprehensive document, clearly setting out expectations of parents. They discussed issues around comments on various social media, and HT confirmed he directly and immediately addressed any issues which came to his attention. Several governors confirmed they looked at such groups and would report any problems. 	
---	--

<u>School strategic plan</u> 8.4 Governors received and approved the strategic document containing the SEF and SIP. This would be the key document guiding LGB monitoring.	
<u>Year 6 trip approval</u> 8.5 Governors approved the residential trip to Bewl Water, subject to DF checking paperwork to confirm all was in order.	DF
9 Finance 9.1 Governors had received the August accounts and noted the overspend on photocopying (due to producing sheets for the Reach history and geography curricula) and questioned plans for using the very healthy rollover. GM advised that end of year accounts had not been finalised yet. Plans for the rollover would be discussed once the position was confirmed – he would report back to governors after the finance meeting planned for 19 October. 9.2 Governors noted they had not yet received the TB’s advice on the finance governor role. A governor would attend the finance meeting on 16 November to raise any questions.	
10 Safeguarding and disability matters 10.1 HT had nothing to report.	
11 Any other school matters 11.1 Nothing to report.	
12 Governor Monitoring <i>General</i> 12.1 The TB’s comment gave rise to a general discussion with both new and existing governors raising questions and making comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bearing in mind the challenge raised by education experts during specific internal and external reviews, as well as ongoing monitoring by the TL and trust T&L leader, what exactly did the TB expect LGBs to do to raise challenge leading to school improvement?• Was the LGB’s role less about raising challenge and more about providing assurance to the TB that what was happening in schools matched what they were being told by leaders?• With the programme for internal and external reviews, was there not a risk of duplication in monitoring, with a consequential imposition on staff time? LGB encouraged to focus on SIP which largely mirrors trust plan – shared priority areas.• While appreciating that the ECC was at an early stage of work, its purpose was not entirely clear (explained that ECC was designed to allow TB greater focus on school improvement). Should the ECC’s forward agenda influence LGB monitoring plans? Spring ECC agenda plans reviews of SEN and subjects in the 1st and 2nd year of new curriculum – should LGBs be monitoring these areas before the ECC meeting in order to provide feedback? Should LGB members be bringing any reports to the meeting?• If part of ECC role is to share good practice among LGBs, it would be worth circulating monitoring reports around LGBs. Governors will investigate what other schools do in terms of monitoring and feedback anything useful. <i>[Post meeting note – chair of TB advised that a paper is being developed which addresses many of these questions and TB plans to run training sessions for LGB once the paper is approved.]</i>	

<p><i>CPS LGB monitoring</i></p> <p>12.2 Governors reviewed the areas covered in last year's monitoring visits (nurture, geography, history, art, writing, reading, phonics, maths, wider curriculum, H&S, SEN and L&M). PE had been monitored via the sports premium statement (the school used the same scheme inspected at LPS earlier in the year). They noted that neither science nor EY had been monitored, both important areas, but the former had just been the subject of an external review and the latter was to be health checked shortly so neither should be included in T2 monitoring.</p> <p>12.3 PP would be specifically monitored as part of writing the PP statement, and safeguarding as part of compiling the annual report.</p> <p>12.4 Other subject areas not monitored were music, RE, ML, DT, and PSHE but HT acknowledged these were areas the school knew needed development so there was little to learn from visiting.</p> <p>12.5 While it had been useful to learn about individual curriculum areas, governors agreed that, to complement the SIP, a more strategic rather than subject-based approach to monitoring would be useful this year. Wherever possible, governors' specific knowledge/expertise would be put to use.</p> <p><i>Arrangements for T2 monitoring</i></p> <p>12.6 Governors agreed that T2 monitoring should go ahead while waiting for TB advice on questions raised. Date for monitoring moved to Thursday 10th November to avoid clash with Remembrance Day services.</p> <p>Pairs agreed as:</p> <p>Q of Ed – CW (humanities), KT (EYFS) and SS (maths) plus other governors as required – CW and KT to make familiarisation visit to EY next term</p> <p>Welfare – DF (H&S) and SW (other areas)</p> <p>Leadership & management (incl safeguarding/digital safeguarding and finance) – SM and CN</p> <p>SEN – SS and CN</p>	
<p>13 Any other governor matters</p> <p>13.1 KT, CW and SS were asked to produce short biographies for inclusion in the newsletter (send to CoG).</p> <p>13.2 KT and CW would be advised when the school photographer was next visiting so their photos could be added to the notice board.</p> <p>13.3 Involvement in the Parent Council would be reviewed at the next LGB meeting after the council's face to face meeting this term. Council meetings were a useful way for governors to meet parents but whether discussions there were strictly relevant to the governor role was debatable (minutes are available to read on the website).</p> <p>13.4 CoG to send CW and KT examples of previous monitoring reports, and DF information on H&S monitoring.</p>	<p>SS, CW, KT GM</p> <p>Next meeting</p> <p>CN</p>
<p>14 Agreement of confidentiality and action points</p> <p>14.1 No confidential discussions.</p> <p>14.2 Action points were agreed and listed in the table at the end of the minutes.</p>	
<p>15 Points to feedback to the Trust Board</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response to comment in TB minutes • Uncertainty about "Aspiration through excellence" strapline • Query why not single uniform supplier for trust schools • Comments and questions on LGB role (para 12 .1 above) 	
<p>16 Dates for next LGB meetings and any school events</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tuesday 29th November 2022 at 5.30pm 	

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tuesday 31st January 2023 at 5.30pm • Tuesday 21st March 2023 at 5.30pm • Tuesday 16th May 2023 at 5.30pm • Tuesday 4th July 2023 at 5.30pm <p>Governors to see weekly newsletter for school events</p> | |
|--|--|

Signed.....

Date.....

(Chair of governors to initial bottom of every page)

ACTION POINTS

[illegible]