

## MINUTES of the CARCLAZE LOCAL GOVERNING BODY MEETING

15 November 2017, 5.00

Item	Subject	Action
	<p><b>Present:</b>  Sophie Bertholon (SB)  Annabelle Coad (AC)  Guy Herrington (GH)  Kevin Johns (KJ) - Chair  Helen Knight (HK)  Karen Littler (KL)  David Moseley (DM)  Simon Pollard (SP) – Head</p> <p><i>Also present:</i>  Jeremy Alder (JA) – Clerk  Julie Seyler (JS) – Trust Director / Vice Chair <i>items 1-6 only</i>  Paul Towe (PT) – Acting CEO</p>	
	<p><b>Apologies / Welcome</b>  KJ welcomed SB to her first governor meeting, and PT to this meeting.  Carlean Rowe has resigned as a governor.  Apologies: Sara Moulton, Ann Teague.</p>	
1	<b>Conflicts of Interest:</b> no additional interests declared.	
2	<b>Previous minutes</b> of the 4 October 2017 were accepted as an accurate record.	
3	<b>Matters arising</b>	
3.1	<p>4.1 RSC's Office visit  Governors noted that the written report received from RSC's office was more frank than had been reported verbally during the visit, notably the comment on behaviour.</p>	
4	<b>Reports back</b>	
4.1	<p>RSC's Office visit.  PT briefly summarised the role of the RSC and how they operate.  They picked up on the fact that 5 of 7 trust primary schools were below the national average for progress at KS2. The visit here focussed on Y5 and Y6.  They identified a need for the Trust to standardise documentation, and queried the lack of challenge.  Trust is negotiating date for a return visit – but expected to be during the spring term.</p>	
4.1.1	<p>Both the CEO and the Board need to know what is going on at school level and will attend meetings to understand what is happening.  JS stressed that one difference for Carclaze is that it is the length of time it is taking to show improvements which is a key issue, pointing out that as a founder school they have had more time within the Trust than some other schools.  PT stressed that schools need to show external inspectors what is happening <i>now</i> – so even if most recent data is not as good as you want it can make the difference to their overall judgement.  Governors asked if there were any common themes across the Trust? Yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disadvantaged children.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality of teaching and learning.</li> <li>• Attendance.</li> </ul>	
4.1.2	<p>The meeting discussed attendance. PT pointed out that Ofsted have a very different view from the DfE / RSC. We need to demonstrate we are doing everything possible. Governors asked if penalties act as a deterrent?</p> <p>PT felt only in some circumstances.</p> <p>SP summarised what the school already does, and the circumstances when a fixed penalty notice would be triggered. He stressed the need to ensure every parent knows and understands about attendance.</p> <p>Governors questioned how many parents <i>really</i> understand the absence implications?</p> <p>PT reported how other schools are translating the percentage attendance figure into the time equivalent eg 80% is the equivalent of only attending 4 days a week for the whole time the child is at school.</p> <p>He added that the biggest problem is when holiday absence is combined with sickness absence as well.</p> <p>Governors discussed the idea of displaying the average attainment for good vs poor attendees to help get the message across.</p>	
4.1.3	<p>Governors raised their concern about not being able to adequately answer the inspector's question about challenging the Board / Trust about what the school gets for its top slice contribution.</p> <p>PT and JS agreed that it was the Board's responsibility to explain this, and the new SLAs between the central team and schools will help local governors monitor this in the future.</p> <p>Governors noted that by the time the inspector returns the school will have had the next Challenge Day and peer review.</p> <p>SP summarised what other support the school receives from within the Trust.</p>	
4.1.4	<p>Governors asked how a school requests support rather than being told what to do? PT confirmed any school can ask for support. The Board would also expect the school to use all available resources – including reserves – to achieve a solution.</p> <p>SP reminded governors that this is how the school is funding the School Improvement post.</p> <p>JS commented that this scenario highlights some of the issues and tensions between how governance works between Board and LGBs. She confirmed the Board has approved other schools using their reserves to turn things around as well.</p> <p>PT shared an example from St Mewan. They are using reserves to employ a third teacher for Y6 this year because they know this cohort is not as strong as in previous years.</p>	
4.1.5	<p>SP highlighted the need for all teachers to use the data tracking system correctly. Inconsistencies only become apparent when we drill down into the data.</p> <p>They need to give accurate predictions of what proportion of pupils are expected to make the expected levels.</p>	
4.2	<p>RAP meeting 6<sup>th</sup> November</p> <p>This was the group's first meeting and data was the priority. The meeting discussed how the school monitors and records drop-in sessions. A new trust-wide process is to be introduced but SP does not expect it to be very different.</p> <p>He confirmed he is still adding actions to the meeting notes.</p> <p>Everyone agreed it would be useful for all governors to see a summary from each meeting.</p> <p>SP proposed sharing Justine's notes – agreed.</p>	<b>SP</b>
4.2.1	<p>JS asked SP if this approach is helping? Yes.</p> <p>Governors asked if the school is trying to do too much?</p>	

	<p>SP pointed out that the timescale means we have to implement changes rapidly, and similarly react quickly if they don't appear to be working.</p> <p>The meeting discussed the need for very clear priorities.</p> <p>SP stressed the school cannot just focus on Y2 and Y6, and what we do for Y3/4/5 will help with future Y6 groups.</p>	
4.2.2	<p>PT repeated his point that this is an area where the school can bring in more capacity using reserves. He highlighted the risk of placing too much reliance on any one individual but particularly the headteacher.</p> <p>GH confirmed that this had been discussed at the meeting.</p>	
<b>5</b>	<b><i>“What do we mean by high expectations?”</i></b>	
5.1	<p>SP distributed some documents to inform next week's discussion at the Standards meeting.</p> <p>JS commented this was an issue for the Board and the whole Trust as well.</p>	
<b>6</b>	<b>Risk Management training</b>	
6.1	<p>SP reported that the Executive Leadership Team (ELT) had received more training yesterday.</p> <p>He shared copies of the Trust's Strategic Risk Register and Risk Management Strategy. The training has highlighted some aspects of the school's Operational Risk Register do need changing.</p>	
<b>7</b>	<b>Budget monitoring</b>	
7.1	<p>SP confirmed this year's budget is on track.</p> <p>A deficit position is forecast from next year and is predicted to increase year on year unless action is taken to address this.</p> <p>How PP funding is shown in the budget is changing, to reduce the risk of showing too high an expected level of grant.</p>	
<b>8</b>	<b>Budget Task &amp; Finish group</b>	
8.1	<p>The group identified a need to get more benchmarking data both from Mount Charles and St Mewan plus outside of the Trust.</p> <p>SP is waiting for a copy of Mount Charles' staffing structure to compare with our own.</p>	
<b>9</b>	<b>Staff Performance Management update</b>	
9.1	<p>SP explained how the system has changed from past practice.</p> <p>The Trust has introduced a one page summary which goes to the Chair of each LGB and lists the number of staff who progressed and the number who were not allowed to progress.</p> <p>Provides assurance to governors that the process is taking place across the whole school, relevant staff have been trained, and what quality assurance processes are used.</p> <p>Teaching staff PM has been completed (required by October half-term).</p> <p>SP confirmed that the Trust is looking to improve PM for non-teaching staff.</p>	
<b>10</b>	<b>Vice Chair appointments</b>	
10.1	AC explained she chose to withdraw as instead she will be able to offer two half days to support EYFS from next term.	
10.2	Governors voted unanimously to appoint GH and DM as Vice Chairs.	
10.3	<p>JA explained that one of the two parent governor slots was now vacant, and the simplest solution is to transfer an existing eligible governor into that slot prior to any future decision over recruitment.</p> <p>Agreed JA to arrange this.</p>	<b>JA</b>

<b>11</b>	<b>Roles and Responsibilities</b>	
11.1	<p>SP handed out a sheet with two possible approaches to sharing roles between governors. The first was based on existing responsibilities and current membership of the RAP group, but SP confirmed he had found it difficult to allocate names to the whole list.</p> <p>The second approach was based on a suggestion from JA and mirrored the Three S's. JA summarised other advantages to taking this approach including succession planning, mentoring, integrating with other responsibilities (eg risk register) and a greater focus on current priorities.</p>	
<b>12</b>	<b>Skills Audit analysis</b>	
12.1	Governors received the collated results of the updated Skills Audit and noted that there were no obvious skill's gaps to address.	
<b>13</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
13.1	Waiting to hear from Tesco about a possible grant.	
13.2	Work finally commenced on perimeter fencing.	
	Meeting finished at 7.05	

Signed	Date
--------	------