

WESTWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL & GROVE PRIMARY SCHOOL
ACTIVE LEARNING TRUST

Minutes of the meeting of the Local Governing Body of Westwood Primary School and Grove Primary School held at Westwood Primary at 4 pm on 28th October 2019

Present:	Mrs R. Aldous, Executive Head	Mrs E. Hall, Trust Governor
	Mrs L. Barnes, Staff Governor	Dr E. Hepburn, Parent Governor (G)
	Mr S. Clarke, Trust Governor	Mrs S. Holiday, Parent Governor (H)
	Mrs M. Corker, Trust Governor	Mrs S. Ross, Staff Governor
	Mrs J. Cutchey, Trust Governor, Chair	Mr P. Usher, Trust Governor

In attendance: Mrs A. Murray (Governor Services Clerk)

0	<u>Trust Update for Governors</u>	
	<p>The Chair welcomed all governors.</p> <p>David Hilton (Director of School Improvement for the Active Learning Trust) sent apologies as he was unwell.</p> <p>In his absence, the Head gave a presentation “An Update on the Trust” which he had planned to deliver:</p> <p>There were now twenty-one schools in the Trust.</p> <p>Recent developments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A through school (5-18) at Chatteris in Cambridgeshire. • A new school in central Ipswich. • A bid for a new school in partnership with the LA in Norfolk. <p>The Trust Data Manager was responsible for compliance matters e.g. school websites and GDPR.</p> <p>Bob Dool had recently been appointed as the Chair of the Board of Trustees. He had an extensive background in education.</p> <p>Stephen Chamberlain had recently been appointed as the CEO.</p> <p>From September 2019 Ofsted was operating a revised framework – schools would be rated on four areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of education – including teaching and data • Pupils – behaviour and attitudes • Pupils - personal development 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership and management <p>There would be an increased focus on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the role of middle managers e.g. subject leaders. • teachers demonstrating excellent subject knowledge. <p>The Trust had supported curriculum development by running subject leadership development groups.</p> <p>The Trust was also working with the Prince's Teaching Institute.</p> <p>ALT offered a strong CPD programme for staff including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly meetings for NQT and NQT+1. • Regular meetings for SENDCo and Safeguarding leads. • Preparation for headship courses <p>The Chair: Did all Heads contribute to the training offer? Most of the training was now provided by the central team.</p> <p>The Chair suggested that governors should make monitoring the quality of teaching their key focus.</p> <p>The Chair reported that she was a non-executive member of the Board.</p>	
1	<u>WELCOME AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</u>	
1.1	<p>No apologies for absence were received.</p> <p>Sarah Holiday and Eve Hepburn (new parent governors) were welcomed.</p> <p>Steven Clarke had been appointed as a Trust governor (having previously been a parent governor.)</p> <p>John Hughes and Maria Smith had resigned.</p>	
1.2	This item was not applicable.	
1.3	<u>PECUNIARY AND OTHER INTERESTS</u>	
1.4	No declarations of pecuniary or other interests regarding items on the agenda were made at this point. See Item 1.20 (EH declared a PI)	
1.5	Governors completed Pecuniary Interest forms at the meeting.	
1.6	Governors noted the requirement to update the register of pecuniary interests and to publish it on each schools' website.	
	<u>CHAIR'S ACTION / UPDATE</u>	
	See confidential minutes.	
	<u>ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR FOR 2019/20</u>	

1.6	Governors noted that the end of term of office for the Vice Chair would be the <i>first meeting of the autumn term 2020</i> .	
1.7	The Chair reminded governors that the Trust appointed the Chair. Emma Hall was re-elected Vice-Chair for the academic year 2019/20.	
	<u>ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS</u>	
	No items were declared.	
	<u>LOCAL GOVERNING BODY MEMBERSHIP AND ORGANISATION</u>	
1.8	See Item 1.1	
1.9	There were no vacancies on the LGB.	
1.10	The Head reported that she had updated the governors' details on GIAS (Get Information About Schools).	
1.11	Governors agreed that the governors would undertake monitoring roles as follows: Stephen Clarke: Safeguarding SEND & Pupil Premium: Mary Corker H & S: Sarah Holiday	
1.12	Governors reviewed and adopted the Code of Conduct for Staff (copy in the Minute Book).	
	<u>MINUTES</u>	
1.13	The minutes of the meeting held on 15 th July (copy in the Minute Book), having previously been circulated, were confirmed , and signed by the Chair.	
1.14	<u>Matters arising from the minutes</u>	
	<p>Item 4.2: LGB Membership The Head had updated GIAS</p> <p>Item 5.2: Matters Arising The Code of Conduct had been approved and PI forms signed</p> <p>Item 7.1 Head's Report The Safeguarding Audit of Westwood (by an external consultant) had been circulated. The Head advised that the report had been very positive. The consultant had spoken to a wide range of staff. She had spoken to SC (safeguarding governor) on the telephone. The Chair congratulated staff on the report.</p> <p>Item 7.2: SEND Report The SEND report had been placed on the website.</p> <p>Item 10.2: Governor Monitoring/Training</p>	

	Governors' skills audit – the Chair would clarify requirements.	Chair
	<u>EDUCATIONAL PERFORMANCES</u>	
1.15	<u>Head's report</u>	
	<p>Governors received the following reports (copies in Minute Book)</p> <p>Grove Primary Key Facts 2019/2020 Grove Primary Executive Summary Paper for LGB 28/10/2019</p> <p>Westwood Executive Summary Paper for LGB 28/10/2019 Westwood Safeguarding Audit/review 3 April 2019 Westwood EYFS Outside Development Plan Sep 2019</p> <p>EYFS Curriculum Intent (covering both schools) EYFS Development Plan September 2019 (covering both schools) Our Curriculum (covering both schools)</p> <p>The Head gave a separate report on each school as follows:</p>	
	<i>Grove Primary School.</i>	
	<p>The roll was very strong.</p> <p>15% of pupils were eligible for FSM. Most pupils were of white British origin; there were few pupils with EAL.</p> <p>86% of pupils had reached the expected level at Reading, Writing and Maths, at KS2, against a national average of 85%.</p> <p>Attendance was lower than the national average, largely due to term time holidays. The Attendance Policy had been changed to match other local schools. Fines were issued after five days unauthorised absence.</p> <p>EH: Did the school employ an Attendance Officer? Yes, she worked closely with the Family Support Practitioner. Pupils' attendance was reviewed every four weeks. The most serious cases were referred to the EWO (Education Welfare Officer). Classes with high attendance were rewarded with a free breakfast.</p> <p>EH: Were any other rewards offered for good attendance? Yes, this was the case.</p> <p>Exclusions/part-time timetables There had been fewer exclusions this year, following three years of rising exclusions.</p> <p>Providing one to one support from a TA cost £13,000; it took time to arrange such support.</p> <p>Some pupils were attending school on a part time basis. Pupils attended each day to ensure their welfare was monitored; their progress was reviewed every two weeks</p>	

	<p>The County Inclusion Service was supporting a number of pupils. Staffing attendance levels had improved. Phonics results had been pleasing.</p> <p>Reading was the weakest area at Grove in KS1.</p> <p>However, KS2 results at Grove were the strongest in the Trust.</p> <p>At Grove Primary School, many of the pupils who were eligible for the Pupil Premium also had SEND.</p> <p>The school was aiming for 85% of pupils to reach expected levels in Reading, Writing and Maths, with 30% reaching greater depth.</p> <p>The Chair: Did these targets apply to KS1 and KS2? Yes, this was the case.</p> <p>The Chair: Could the Head explain the tracking programme? Pupils were expected to make two points progress in Yr 1 and three points in Yr 2 and above.</p> <p>Performance Management 77% of teachers were reaching their targets.</p> <p>The Chair: Why had some staff had not received increments? Teachers who had reached the top of their scale would not receive increments.</p> <p>The Chair: Would anyone be present at the Head's Performance Review apart from the CEO? This information had not been shared as yet.</p> <p>SEND A representative of the Trust had met Judith Mobbs of the LA to express concern about the lack of SEN provision in Suffolk.</p> <p>Sarah Bayfield was undertaking all SEND work in both schools which freed SLT to undertake other work.</p> <p>EH: What was the profile of SEND pupils? Pupils were affected by a wide range of issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emotional and behaviour difficulties • Significant ASD • Moderate learning difficulties. • <p>Grove Primary School had twice as many pupils with an EHCP (Education and Health Care Plan) as the national average.</p> <p>EH: Were the SEND pupils concentrated in particular year groups? There were high levels in Years 3/4 and the nursery.</p> <p>Trust Review The Trust undertook a Teaching and Learning review every half term.</p>	
--	---	--

Grove EYFS had been rated as “requires improvement” during the most recent Ofsted Inspection. Provision was now much improved, children could be observed engaged in tasks, with a clear focus. Phonics and Reading results were pleasing.

See confidential minutes

In summary, the school’s priorities were

- Changes to the curriculum
- More pupils reaching greater depth
- Better phonics results.
- Improving challenge for more able pupils

Chair: How was the school promoting mental health?

The CHIMP programme focussed on mental and physical health.

Key aspects were:

- 8 hours sleep
- Limited screen time
- Exercise
- Communication with parents
- Managing friendships

The curriculum provided diverse learning opportunities through:

- Core learning lessons
- Topic learning
- Creative learning
- Skills for learning
- Positive lifestyles

H & S matters were monitored via “HANDSAM” software e.g.:

- PAT tests
- Water quality
- Fire alarms
- Risk assessments

Educational visits

This had been a controversial area as a high percentage of families did not contribute to the cost of trips. The shortfall meant that funds were being diverted from other budgets: this could not be maintained.

EH: Were parents unable to pay or choosing not to pay?

The Chair replied that some parents were reluctant to pay if they were aware that other parents were not paying.

EH: Did the school operate a Friends group?

Yes, the group was funding a trip to the pantomime.

EH: Could the school restrict places on more expensive trips?

All trips which took place during the school day had to be offered to all pupils. Residential trips or evening visits could be offered as an option.

The Chair suggested that it was more economic to bring enrichment activities to the school than to arrange visits.

	<p>The Head reported that pupils were being offered leadership roles to develop their skills and confidence.</p> <p>PE provision was much improved.</p> <p>EH declared a Pecuniary Interest as her brother, Ross Hepburn, provided PE activities at the school.</p>	
	<p>Westwood Primary</p>	
	<p>The roll had increased greatly in recent weeks, there had been high levels of mobility. 25% of pupils had changed since August</p> <p>SC: Why was mobility so high? Pupils were frequently housed near the school on a temporary basis and moved away when their families were placed in longer term accommodation.</p> <p>Several pupils with EHCP (Education and Health Care Plans) had recently joined the school. In one class, almost, a quarter of pupils had EHCP.</p> <p>52% of pupils were receiving Free School Meals. Many families used local foodbanks.</p> <p>Attendance For pupils who were not in receipt of Pupil Premium, the rate was 96%. For pupils who were in receipt of Pupil Premium, the rate was 91%.</p> <p>Some pupils in receipt of PP had very poor attendance. Breakfast was offered for a nominal cost, but ability to pay did not restrict access.</p> <p>Exclusions/part time timetables Fixed term exclusions were higher than average.</p> <p>A pupil had recently been permanently excluded and two pupils were now in a PRU.</p> <p>Four pupils were on a part time timetable at present .</p> <p>Staff absence was 2.5%, similar to the previous year.</p> <p>In contrast, staff attendance at Grove Primary was rising.</p> <p>35% of pupils had SEND so results were inevitably lower than at Westwood.</p> <p>Able pupils in Yr 6 were receiving extra teaching to help them reach the higher criteria.</p> <p>100% of teachers had met performance targets.</p> <p>EH: Did the school purchase LA services? Did the school use other providers? E.g. an Educational Psychologist. The schools bought in LA expertise when required. The Head at Highfield School was the Trust SEND lead.</p>	

	<p>SC: Did teachers at the top of the pay scale receive any financial rewards? Most teachers would receive a TLR or another type of payment. Not all teachers wished to take on additional responsibilities.</p> <p>EH: It was important to acknowledge that wellbeing was also important. Feedback from staff was obtained via a survey and the school provided a package of support. The Head monitored the number of after school meetings.</p> <p>EH: Were staff offered counselling? Yes, and newly qualified staff were allocated additional preparation and marking time if required.</p> <p>LB: The Head was well aware of the personal and professional needs of the staff and provided support as required.</p> <p>SC: Had the school considered offering training on mindfulness? Not at present; provision was in place where needed.</p> <p>The Trust had rated the school as “good” overall.</p> <p>There were significantly more safeguarding concerns at Westwood than at The Grove.</p>	
1.16	<u>Report on results</u>	
	<p>Governors received the following – separate reports for each school (copies in Minute Book)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suffolk School Improvement Summary • Key facts 2019-2020 • School Performance Summary 2018/19 • Data 2019 <p>See Item 1.15</p>	
1.17	<u>School Development and Improvement Plan</u>	
	Governors received a separate SDIP for each school (copies in Minute Book)	
1.18	<u>Governor Monitoring</u>	
	Governors agreed to attend a monitoring day later in the term, the date would be agreed at the end of the meeting.	
1.19	<u>Pupil Premium</u>	
	Governors received a Pupil Premium Expenditure Report for Westwood (Copy in Minute Book)	

	<p>Most of the funds were used to provide additional TA and HLTA time. Lunch time nurture clubs ensured children were calm and ready to learn in the afternoon.</p> <p>The Chair: Would the school choose not to repeat any interventions, having reviewed their impact?</p> <p>The Woodland School would not be purchased in future. The school had hoped that the outside learning would offer a nurturing experience, but it had not proved an effective intervention.</p> <p>The Chair noted that that Westwood PP pupils performed well in comparison to pupils who were not in receipt of the PP. The gap was more significant at the Grove; work was needed to “narrow the gap”.</p>	
1.20	<u>Primary Sports premium</u>	
	<p>Governors received a report “Increased Confidence, Knowledge and Skills of all Staff in Teaching PE and School Sports” There were separate reports for Westwood and The Grove (copies in Minute Book).</p> <p>Sarah Rogers had been appointed as the PE lead for both schools.</p> <p>Most of the funds were spent on the “PE Shed” and tournaments. Sending pupils to take part in tournaments boosted confidence and self-esteem.</p> <p>To represent the school, pupils had to attend practice regularly and meet behaviour expectations.</p>	
	<u>PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT</u>	
	See above.	
	<u>FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE</u>	
1.21	<u>Budget monitoring report</u>	
	<p>Governors received an Income and Expenditure Report for Westwood Primary (copy in Minute Book)</p> <p>The Chair reported that the LGB had no role in monitoring or approving budgets. Governors were asked to shred copies of financial information after reviewing the data.</p> <p>The Head met the Bursar and the Finance Director twice a year to review expenditure.</p>	
1.22	<u>Benchmarking report</u>	
	<p>Governors received the following reports (separate copies for The Grove and Westwood, copies in Minute Book)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALT Schools Financial Benchmarking • School Financial Benchmarking Service 	

	It appeared that Westwood had a high number of staff at SLT level, this was because the Deputy Head was on maternity leave and a colleague was “acting up”.	
	<u>RISK MANAGEMENT</u>	
	Governors received separate Risk Registers for The Grove Primary and Westwood Primary (copies in Minute Book). The school could only predict and prepare for certain types of events e.g. the need to update aging ICT equipment/ boilers. Changes in government policy were harder to predict.	
	<u>SAFEGUARDING AND HEALTH AND SAFETY</u>	
1.23	<u>Keeping Children Safe in Education (KCSiE) 2019</u>	
	Governors noted the requirement to read the relevant parts of Keeping Children Safe in Education and agreed to inform the safeguarding governor when this had been done. The safeguarding governor would keep a record confirming this. The Chair had recently attended Safeguarding training.	All gov
1.24	<u>Review of Safeguarding Policy</u>	
	Governors reviewed and approved the new Safeguarding Policy in line with KCSiE 2019. The Policy applied to both schools (copy in Minute Book).	
1.25	<u>Report from the safeguarding governor</u>	
	The Chair noted that Mr Clarke, safeguarding governor was now a Detective Inspector with Suffolk Constabulary.	
	<u>COMPLIANCE</u>	
1.26	<u>Policy Review Schedule</u>	
	Most school policies were provided by the Trust; the Trust ensured policies were reviewed at the required intervals.	
1.27	<u>Policies for review or approval</u>	
	See Item 1.24.	
1.28	<u>Trust Policies</u>	
	No policies were presented.	
1.29	<u>GDPR</u>	
	The Trust ensured that schools were compliant by sending guidance. The Deputy Head at The Grove and the Business Manager at Westwood were	

	<p>the leads on GDPR. A “Privacy Walk” had taken place at both schools, to monitor compliance with GDPR.</p> <p>[LB left 6.05 pm]</p>	
1.30	<u>Website update</u>	
	LB regularly checked that the website included the required information, including governance information.	
1.31	<u>Educational Visits</u>	
	No visits required approval.	
	<u>REPORTS FROM GOVERNORS’ MONITORING</u>	
1.32	There were no reports.	
	<u>GOVERNOR HEADLINES AND THE KNOWLEDGE</u>	
	No items were discussed.	
	<u>REFLECTION ON THE MEETING</u>	
	<p>Governors discussed the impact of the meeting on the local governing body’s strategic priorities.</p> <p>SC suggested it was important that both schools were fully considered at each meeting. It was essential to maintain distinct audit trails for the two schools.</p> <p>The Head suggested that, as The Grove Primary improved, there were more similarities between the schools and less need to highlight issues specific to the Grove.</p>	
	<u>DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS</u>	
	<p>Governors agreed to cancel the LGB meeting planned for 5 December and carry out a joint monitoring programme that day.</p> <p>Governors would observe lessons and scrutinize workbooks.</p> <p>EH: Did monitoring visits always follow this pattern? No, there were a range of ways to arrange the visits.</p> <p>Feedback from the visits would be received at the January LGB.</p> <p>Governors agreed the programme of meeting dates for the 2019/20 academic year as follows:</p> <p>10th December <u>NB meeting on 5th December cancelled</u></p> <p>23rd January</p> <p>9th March</p>	

	12 th May 13 th July :	
The Clerk would update the school's regular Clerk.		

The meeting closed at 6.20 pm

Signed

.....

Date

.....

The following items had been circulated

- Safeguarding Audit/Review Westwood 3/4/2019
- Being a Governor within the Active Learning Trust
- What is FGM?

Action Log

Agenda Item	Action	By Whom	By When	Status
1.14	Follow up possible skill audit	Chair	asap	
1.23	Read revised KCSIE/inform SC	All gov	asap	
	Advise usual clerk re date change	Clerk	asap	completed