

## NURTURING EXCELLENCE



**HAPPY** to learn **PROUD** to succeed

### Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors held on Wednesday 15<sup>th</sup> March 2017 at 7pm at the school

**Present :** Ray Humby (Chair)  
Diana Anthony  
Liz Bromfield  
Neil Coleman  
Anita Edmunds  
Mandy Rush  
John Walker  
Mike Wooderson  
Susan Johnson (Clerk)

**In Attendance :** John Cliff (Spring Partnership Trust)  
Clive Lees (Spring Partnership Trust)  
Jo O'Leary (Interim Deputy Head Teacher)

<b>1.</b>	<b>Apologies for Absence</b>	
	<p>RH opened the meeting by welcoming Clive Lees and John Cliff from The Spring Partnership Trust and Jo O'Leary the Interim Deputy Head Teacher. Apologies were received and accepted from Natasha Peto.</p> <p>RH suggested five minutes prior to continuing with the agenda for attendees to read through the Head Teachers Report which was provided in addition to documents circulated in advance of the meeting.</p>	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Declarations of Interest (Pecuniary &amp; Business)</b>	
	<p>No further changes in relation to interests were declared.</p>	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Spring Partnership Trust Update (<i>Agenda order changed</i>)</b>	
	<p>CL thanked the meeting for inviting him, welcomed everyone to the Trust and explained the following :</p> <p>The reason for his attendance was to be visible, answer any questions and outline any plans. The principle issue for the Trust is to settle into a new structure with a period of consultation before expanding again if appropriate. Important issues to be dealt with include reviewing jobs across the Trust to ensure similar jobs are paid the same. Some areas also need coordinating and making more sophisticated, such as Safeguarding (MR may be the lead within the trust) to spread good practice. JC may become the director for safeguarding within the trust). Working together is also an important area and a Head Teachers Executive Group may well be set up with minuted meetings. Plans are in their early stages and are all a process of seeing what works for everyone.</p> <p>CL went on to explain that local governance can follow either an Academy Council model in which the local level does not do very much or a Local Committee model where the</p>	

<p>school level has a great deal to contribute. Initially within the trust it had not been clear which model would be followed but the Academies Council has now been firmly rejected. Directors of the trust are busy and therefore need an effective job to be done at local level by people who can be involved with the individual schools. The way in which the local level and the directors will interact is a work in progress. The Teaching &amp; Learning and curriculum can be managed at school level with an oversight at director level. How finances will work is still being confirmed and will be considered further in the summer term, especially as budgets are determined. The current scheme of delegation is based on the one in place at Leasons from William Willett Learning Trust (WWLT).</p> <p>A governor raised the question of Jo Brinkley's (JB) job description which had previously raised concerns. CL confirmed that this area has been reviewed but needs to be looked at again in September when it will be clearer what JB's role will be. <i>(Note CL added after the meeting – MAT's in general are distinguishing two senior posts: firstly, an Executive Headteacher overseeing education (i.e. the quality of teaching, learning and outcomes for children) and secondly, a CEO, 'running the business')</i></p> <p>CL outlined the aim in relation to policies. All statutory policies have been reviewed and approved by the trust recently. Some were written as a set of principles based on statutory requirements which allow schools to have their own procedures by which they implement these principles. Non-Statutory policies were confirmed as being down to each school and as many can be in place as deemed necessary. The aim is that schools will be encouraged to get together to see where reviews of such policies could be shared.</p> <p>CL confirmed that the trust website is due to go live very soon. Each school will have a link to policies directly to the trust documents so that they only needed to be uploaded once if updated/amended.</p> <p>A governor enquired as to whether they would be known as a Local Committee and CL confirmed that this was the formal terminology in various trust documents. CL envisaged the possibility of reverting to the phrase 'Local Governing Body' and 'Governor' in the future.</p> <p>A governor then identified the problem of knowing what local governors should do and that this was still an area of confusion. CL responded by suggesting that with further collaboration this should hopefully be clarified further. It is an evolving process and CL stated that it was hard to confirm at this stage. The governor requested that an organogram be provided showing the structure of the trust so that the local level governors could see where they sit in the trust. CL noted the request recognizing the need for clarity. CL added that 4/5 months ago the trust consisted of just two schools and so the directors could oversee everything. Now that the trust has 6 schools things have already moved quite a long way but things are still in development, the movement is towards local level with directors being more focused on strategic issues.</p> <p>MR stated that the management team around finance etc. was not understood and that the structure was not clear. The concern was raised that if agreements had been made about how finances would work that had not been fed down to school level and was causing concern. The operational side of how things would work at local level was not currently clear. CL agreed that something needs to be done immediately and suggested that a Head Teacher's executive committee in the future would deal with such issues. MR requested face to face meetings rather than emails in order to get things in place as although the pace has been taken off in relation to other areas, that has not been the case with finance. CL agreed to look into this and suggested that a link director (as well as himself) could be a useful point of contact. MR requested a collaborative approach. <i>(Post meeting note added by CL : CL attended to these various issues the next day and meetings between Leasons and TSPT occurred shortly thereafter)</i></p> <p>RH thanked CL for his attendance and useful feedback. <i>(CL left the meeting)</i></p>	<p><b>CL</b></p>
--	------------------

<b>3.</b>	<b>Minutes and Matters Arising</b>	
	<p>3.1. The minutes of the meeting held on the 23<sup>th</sup> November 2017 were approved and it was agreed that they could be signed as a correct record of the meeting.</p> <p>3.2. The following Matters Arising from the meeting (not covered elsewhere in the agenda) were considered:</p> <p><u>7. Edubase</u> – RH queried whether anyone had heard the outcome of the High Court debate on the matter of personal data but no one had an update. It was however confirmed that currently no detailed governor data at local level was visible on Edubase for Leeson since joining the trust.</p> <p><u>8.5. Behaviour</u> – At the last meeting it was confirmed that a decision was awaited regarding alternative provision for a child. To update this it was confirmed that the LA had been contacted and that the other provision (Harris Orpington) was being viewed by the parents with a view to a phased start before Easter and a possible start after Easter.</p> <p><u>8.6. EAL</u> – RH enquired as to whether this area was still a problem in relation to support, MR confirmed that it was despite an EAL teacher being employed. A governor suggested that training could be looked at in order to involve existing staff. MR raised the concern of staff workloads. It was suggested that ideally all staff should be trained so that interventions could be used in the class rooms.</p> <p><u>10. Governor Visits</u> – RH highlighted the need for the workload of visits to be more spread across members.</p> <p><u>11.1. Admissions Policy</u> – The policy is trustwide and MR has an amendment that she wishes to present to the trust.</p> <p><u>11.3. Pay Policy</u> – This is also a trust issue. MR stated that Bromley has suggested a 1.2% increase for support staff and she would be pushing the trust to follow suit. LB added that she would be attending the pay committee this month and would also take that forward.</p> <p><u>Summary of Ofsted 20 Questions</u> – Since the recent visit from Ofsted it was not deemed necessary to discuss these at this meeting.</p> <p><u>Safeguarding Sign Offs</u> – SJ confirmed that with the exception of her own these were now all up to date.</p>	<b>SJ</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Committee Reports</b>	
	<p>5.1. Monitoring &amp; Curriculum Meeting – The minutes of the last meeting (20.01.17) were circulated prior to this meeting and were accepted. The next meeting will be held in May.</p> <p>5.3. Resources Committee – The meeting scheduled for the 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2017 was postponed as a result of the visit from Ofsted. The meeting has been rescheduled for 30<sup>th</sup> March 2017 at 9.30am.</p> <p>The budget figures circulated prior to this meeting were due to be looked at by the resources committee. A governor raised a query with the accuracy of the figures and it was agreed that they were not clear and should not be submitted to the trust. The resources committee will review them on the 30.03.17.</p>	
<b>6.</b>	<b>Chairman's Report</b>	
	RH had circulated his report prior to the meeting and highlighted the following points.	

	<p><b>Parent Questionnaire</b> – RH enquired as to whether governors felt that this was still necessary in view of the collection of views from parents collected for Ofsted (which had been overwhelmingly positive). A governor stated that due to the lack of time provided some parents had not been able to provide their view for Ofsted and therefore it was still useful to go ahead with the questionnaires at parent evening. It was agreed that these should go ahead on the 22<sup>nd</sup> (RH &amp; JW) and 23<sup>rd</sup> March (RH &amp; LB).</p> <p><b>Governor Training</b> – RH highlighted that training provided by Bexley is now available through the trust. 4 governors attended the Ofsted session which was very useful. LB has now attended two courses on Raise Online and recommends the Inspection Dashboard which is in the public domain and shows data in a very clear format, a summary of which will be circulated.</p> <p><b>Governor Visits</b> – Visit Reports (6) were circulated prior to the meeting and all agreed and signed by governors. LB commented on how the School Development Plan was really seen in operation in the school. She highlighted the need for the issues in Year 5 (13 of 31 on the SEN register) to be taken into account in relation to staffing for next year and is a key consideration when looking at data. It had also been suggested previously that the redistribution of TA's could be used. LB was keen to emphasize that things need to be implemented to give this group of children support.</p> <p><b>Code of Practice</b> – The trusts code of practice was circulated prior to the meeting but was deemed not to be as comprehensive as the one in existence at Leasons which is based on the NGA Code of Practice. All agreed to the current Leasons Code of Practice to remain.</p> <p><b>Ofsted</b> – RH wished to express huge thanks to MR and the whole team. MR added that it was certainly a huge team effort and wished to thank Natalie Talbot (NT) who goes above and beyond in managing the school on a daily basis and takes the brunt of the frustrations of others. LB stated that the assessment system is <del>so efficient</del> effective and MR highlighted the depth of knowledge that NT has where the national curriculum does not allow for monitoring of progress in a short space of time.</p>	<b>SJ/LB</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>Head Teachers Report</b>	
	<p>MR circulated her report at the start of the meeting, Contextual Data, Safeguarding and Attendance Reports had been circulated prior to the meeting. (Post meeting note - incorrect data was included in the Spring term contextual data report re exclusions - correct data to be provided at the next meeting)</p> <p>MR requested questions from governors. In relation to Safeguarding a governor asked whether the changes in the LA had caused any impact. It was confirmed that a named person was allocated to each school (LADO – Local Authority Designated Officer – Rita Dada) and that a safeguarding audit (designed by Head Teachers) was being carried out across the borough. MR added that the schools Child Protection Policy states that Bromley was deemed inadequate by Ofsted.</p> <p><b>Attendance</b> – MR highlighted that attendance is still above last years and broadly in line with the national average. A query was raised with regards to the lower attendance figures for Birch class (Year 4). It was confirmed that the figure includes a child on the child protection register with 30% attendance, a court case is currently in progress. Another child with persistent absence is also in this class but not with such a high instance of absence.</p> <p>RH expressed his thanks for the report.</p> <p><b>School Improvement Plan Update</b> – MR directed the meeting to the progress indicators on her report and highlighted the key areas to be considered in order to see “where we</p>	

	<p>are". A governor queried the nursery provision status (red) and MR confirmed that the nursery provision is unlikely to be in place for 2017. A governor queried the red entry on the strategic aims on page 4 relating to "Develop alternative ICT tracking assessment tools". MR explained that this was red as the tracker that SPT had requested be used was not going to be adopted and that this would be removed from the next report. MR added that some progress aims were amber merely because of the fact that it was only half way through the academic year.</p> <p>A query was raised regarding the progress of the building project. MR explained that there had been two tenders but that one had not been considered due to an issue with the credit checks and therefore only one tender stood when there should be four. Rob Bollen accepted the situation in principle but it needed to go to the Planning committee whose next meeting is not until the 23<sup>th</sup> April 2017. The meeting date may be brought forward in view of the time constraints of the building project. MR is meeting with Simon Goodburn on the 20<sup>th</sup> March 2017 and the Resources Committee will be updated with the outcome of the meeting. The temporary classrooms remain a priority for July in order to be ready for September.</p> <p><b>SEF</b> – MR stated that this is a work in progress and is ongoing. Ofsted were only interested in current progress.</p> <p><b>School Funding</b> – MR mentioned that the school funding crisis was expected to affect London schools but not Leeson. Patrick Foley (Head Teacher – Southborough Primary School) is on the Heads Forum and has written to local MP's to raise awareness and Bob Neill has responded.</p> <p><b>Newsletters</b> – MR circulated at the meeting the school Newsletters from September for the governors information.</p> <p><b>Ofsted</b> – MR confirmed that the inspection had gone well. MR has the only copy of the report which has been checked by LB/NT and JO. A small amendment has been requested. The school came out as a strong good. Discussions with middle leaders and governors went well and by 12 noon the inspector suggested that the inspection would be completed within the day, this was confirmed by 2.30pm. The inspector heard children read. One member of staff was absent but books were located. A governor commented on how it was nice to hear the inspectors commendations. It was added that it was great to have the feelings about the school being qualified by the inspector. MR stated that the inspector was very well informed and had looked at the data and the inspection was rigorous and robust. The report (when released) would be shared with staff and governors first.</p> <p>MR commented on how the inspector had a deep understanding and was very fair and consistent and was also very calm which made for a pleasant experience. She wished to thank the whole school team for their continued commitment and to thank the governors who came at short notice.</p>	
<b>8.</b>	<b>Policy Reviews</b>	
	<p>It was agreed that any of the policies listed on the agenda that had not previously been mentioned in the meeting where due for review were either trust policies or had been reviewed with very little changes or they had previously been agreed by committee. It was proposed that this be accepted. <b>All agreed.</b></p>	
<b>9.</b>	<b>A.O.B.</b>	
	<p>The date of the next meeting was confirmed as Wednesday 5<sup>th</sup> July 2017. A request was submitted to the clerk for the rescheduling of the next Monitoring &amp; Curriculum Meeting (16.05.17), those involved will be emailed with a proposed revised date.</p>	

All business being concluded, the meeting was declared closed at 8.50pm.

Signature of Chairman.....

Date.....

Documents Circulated Prior to the Meeting

Minutes of the GB Meeting held on the 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2016.  
Minutes of the M&C Meeting held on the 20<sup>th</sup> January 2017.  
Monthly Monitoring Report Jan 2017  
Chairman's Report  
Spring Code of Practice  
Governor Visit Reports (6)  
Contextual Data 05.09.16-03.03.17  
Safeguarding Information Reported to Governors (Dec 16 – Feb 17)  
Absence Report Autumn & Spring Term (Jane Costin)  
SEF (Date of Evaluation – Jan 2017)  
Accessibility Plan 2016-2017

Documents Circulated at the Meeting

Head Teachers Report to Governors 15.03.17  
SEND Overview – Reporting Evidence 2016-2017  
Leesons News – Sept 2016 – Feb 2017