



**MINUTES OF THE LOCAL GOVERNING BODY MEETING
AT MILTON PAROCHIAL PRIMARY SCHOOL
PART OF PETERBOROUGH DIOCESE EDUCATION TRUST (PDET)
WEDNESDAY NOVEMBER 9TH 2016 AT 7.00 PM**

Present: Maria Rix (**Chair**); Neil Goram (NG); Peter Heffron (PH); Pat Parker (PP); Lisa Witheyman (LW); Steve Hollingshurst (**Headteacher** - HT); Sue McPherson (SM); Peter Jones (PJ);

In Attendance: Erica Wilson (Clerk to Governors).

No	Subject	Action
1.	<p>Opening Prayer, welcome and apologies. PH opened the meeting with a prayer.</p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies were received and accepted from Matt Oakley. Neil Goram had sent apologies for a late arrival.</p>	
2.	<p>Declarations of pecuniary interest. There were no interests declared.</p>	
FOR AGREEMENT		
3.	<p>Minutes of the previous meeting held on 22.06.16</p> <p>a. Approval. The public and confidential minutes of the meeting held on 21.09.16 were accepted as a true and accurate record and signed by the Chair subject to the following amendment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Under 'present' on both sets of minutes PB should read 'PP'.</i> <p>b. Matters Arising</p> <p>(38.16) It was confirmed that NG had started discussions with PDET around the Critical Incident Plan.</p> <p>(39.16) SM and the HT were yet to meet to discuss mental health issues</p> <p>(37.06) Foundation Governor. Governors were advised of a potential future parent who was interested in this position and was being met with on Friday. It was noted that they would need to be appointed by the Diocese, and any necessary steps would be undertaken by PH.</p> <p>Governors commented that they liked the new format for the minutes.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>NG arrived at this point.</i></p>	
4.	<p>Headteacher's Report – questions and discussion from governors</p> <p>The HT explained that he had used the PDET recommended format for his report and had found it quite useful. He noted that it was less wordy and was easy to populate the basic information and it should give more time for discussion and questions. As there was no area for Finance in the template the HT said he would not include this unless there was something specific to report. Governors agreed that the format was an improvement. Governor questions and additional information were as follows:</p> <p>Pupil roll.</p>	

No	Subject	Action
	<p>Do we share year groups in classes? The HT explained that there were 7 year groups across 4 classes. He referred to the 7 pupil vacancies which were mainly down to the issue with admissions and a family that had moved away. The HT drew attention to Year 5 and the significantly changed cohort and said they would need to be aware of this with tracking and with targets. He said there were less children, more needs and a reduced budget.</p> <p>Can we advertise these vacancies in places other than the website and what is the process if a family moves in to the area? The HT advised that if someone moved in locally, if the school had under 15 in the year group they could join the school but they and the school needed to be mindful of sibling links. If already at another school, this would entail a conversation with them and with the other school, as sometimes a 'managed move' could benefit a child.</p> <p>Are estate agents aware of the vacancies? The HT responded that although the school should advertise places, they did not want the vacancies to appear as negative. He noted the late allocation by NCC admissions which had contributed to the reduced roll and said he was having to do more with potential families this year. The HT spoke of the geographic spread (they were all local) and said he had encouraged people to call schools if they did not get the school they wanted. There was a need to fill the reception places to ensure a fuller cohort as they moved through the school.</p> <p>Staffing. The HT referred to the unexpected staffing changes and the impact this had on staff. He recorded his thanks to staff on the way in which they had worked with him to resolve this situation. The HT particularly noted the professionalism of Lisa Witheyman in moving to another class and formally thanked her for this, as it impacted on her other work. The HT asked parent governors if they considered that there had been a negative impact from these changes and it was commented there had not and parents may not even know there had been issues. Support staff was as in the report. The HT noted that there may be changes to where people worked according to pupils' needs. He clarified that Rachel Dunn worked in class as well as doing PE, with a focus on physical development with the pupils.</p> <p>Staff absence. As in the report and in normal ranges. The HT said new staff were to be made aware of the Staff Absence Policy and this needed to be reviewed at the F&P committee.</p> <p>Attendance. Regarding Sywell, if we were to say they were only to be in for one session rather than two, what would the impact in attendance be? The HT said that he could not code these pupils as 'not on roll' so all schools that did part time attendance for reception would have similar figures. The HT also noted that reception pupils did not start at the beginning of term and the home visits had to be carried out and this had always been an issue. The HT said PDET had requested attendance figures without reception included and had been happy with this. The HT noted that he was always very open with future parents about this so parents were aware and could plan accordingly.</p> <p>Governors asked about the 3 pupils who had 'below' 85% attendance and if this was related to illness. The HT said it was both illness and holiday and he had written a formal letter to the parents noting the absence and the related performance. Is this having a knock-on effect in the classrooms as there is no 'catch up' time? The HT clarified that parents had been made aware that there was no catch-up time. He said the attendance was of a particular concern for those children already below 80% attendance as it was still the first term.</p> <p>Racial Incidents. None at the time of the report, but the HT reported he was currently investigating an allegation involving children.</p> <p>Accidents. The HT noted that since joining PDET and reporting H&S through Plumsun, the school was now required to report accidents and incidents at the end of every week. He said he had not had a sensible answer on what to log. He noted that since the start of term 84 incidents had been recorded but once put into context these were not so bad i.e. a nose bleed but no impact. The HT noted that if it was narrowed down to incidents requiring an ice pack or</p>	

No	Subject	Action
(10)	<p>parental reporting, it reduced to single figures. Due to the unnecessary workload that this reporting was causing, the HT proposed that the school just reported incidents involving first aid. Governors asked if there was an accident book and the HT said there was. <i>As the HT had to review the accident log it was suggested that he highlight those to be reported.</i></p> <p>Safeguarding. The HT noted that this would be included in the HT report. Action: clerk to add 'to include safeguarding' to the HT report agenda item.</p> <p>The HT reported that there were now nine concerns and advised that these 9 concerns could be for just 1 or for 9 children as it was any concern that was reported by any staff member about any child. The HT reported that he had advised staff to just record the facts and not to discuss it with anyone (if in doubt, write it down). The HT noted that there had been a referral made by another agency about a pupil in the school so had chased this until he had been advised that it was NFA 'no further action'. Is there a follow up for a pupil if there is a referral? The HT said he recorded and logged everything. Who might the agency be? The HT said it could be any professional association that worked with the child such as a doctor, social worker, childminder etc.</p> <p>PDET Safeguarding Policy (agenda item 10) was taken at this point.</p> <p>The HT advised that this had been received since the last GB meeting and had been updated in line with new Keeping Children Safe in Education (KCSIE) guidance. He clarified that he had been through the policy and would ensure that the training appendix was completed. All staff had been trained on one of the training days in September or October. The HT said 2 staff needed to attend revalidation training in their working hours and the DSLs were up to date. The policy was approved and signed at the meeting.</p> <p>Building issues.</p> <p>The door entry systems had been rescheduled for Friday and this was a matter of urgency. The school had only received one quote to date for £1,450. It was noted that this was a short-term fix and would need longer term consideration. Governors were advised that David Parker had asked the surveyor sent by PDET why the school did not get the funding it had bid for and had been told that bids needed to be over £20k to be considered.</p> <p>NG commented that DP had suggested that in terms of H&S, with a phone in each class, staff could be warned not to leave the class i.e. if there was an intruder on site.</p> <p>Fire Drills. The HT reported that several drills had taken place in the last few months to introduce the sound of the alarm bell to reception children. They had taken place during class and lunch time. LW noted that she had not been in the school for any of the fire drills so this needed to be considered. Regarding the evacuation time out of the building and roll call, the last one was 2 min 3 secs including the roll call. The HT reported that they had also deliberately kept people behind and people had noticed they were missing. LW clarified that the fire drill register included the adults. Is the alarm connected to the Fire Authority? The HT said it was not and the school had to make the call.</p> <p>Standards and target setting.</p> <p>The HT was asked if the system had targeted any gaps and how these would be addressed. He reminded governors of the 'catch up' work taking place due to the SEND and cohort issues and the fact that the biggest gap was for Years 5 and 6. He noted that as children went through the school they would generally come through higher and this could now be proven from the SATs and Target Tracker now that it had been in place for over a year. He said that all the systems in place correlated, which had been recognised by PDET who had asked Milton to support other schools.</p> <p>Scaled score of 100 (the 'magic number'). 'Secure' correlated to 6S so it was evident that Target Tracker was in alignment. If pupils were secure in Year 2 they would be a 2S. The point scores for each year group for secure was noted. The HT said there was enough data in Target Tracker to projected how the data would look if pupils gained 6 points each year. The HT</p>	HT c/f

No	Subject	Action
	<p>circulated anonymised data to governors and went through it as follows:</p> <p>Year 2. The chart showed projections from now until the end of Year 6. Score 71= 6S = the magic 100. The school would look at the percentage of children working at 'greater depth' and these children would need to get more than 110 to be a higher achiever. The HT said the difficulty was in how to put a numeric value to the data. LW noted that she had not updated the data for Y2 T1</p> <p>Year 4. The HT explained the issues within this cohort and the fact that they could not catch up massive differences, but could reduce this gap and improve outcomes. Over 3 years they could make a big impact and accelerate progress with the right interventions. He advised that when setting targets, they looked at it as a whole staff, including TAs. He noted that one teacher had already put together a plan of interventions for her class. There would be a target for every child, and these targets may be higher for pupils with a deficit.</p> <p>Year 6. The accelerated progress for this year group was noted. The HT said there was a story behind every pupil and a full history, and they should be able to move them on to secondary with the right support.</p> <p>Support to/from other schools. The HT was asked if he had time to support the new PDET HT and whether this might be detrimental to the school. The HT said he did not feel it was detrimental, and noted the support he had received as a new HT. He also referred to the support received by the school for EYFS. LW noted how the schools could share and support each other in and out of PDET.</p> <p>The HT was asked if there had been any feedback from PDET's Chaplain visit. The HT said there would be no written feedback as this was an informal wellbeing and catch up visit. He said she had been very positive about the developments around the school and had liked the values rainbow. There was concern about the pressure everyone had been under as they had been firefighting regarding staffing and the HT noted that it was good to have someone to listen to him rather than just challenge. The HT said it was also good to have affirmation from someone external who was both an ex HT and clergy.</p>	
5.	<p>Approval of SEF</p> <p>The HT advised that he had tried to write this in line with the agreed PDET format. Gill Broughton had supported him to condense it, and ultimately he would like it to be a 4-page summary document, summarising the school's self-evaluation/ judgement. He noted that when the Ofsted call did come, they would want to see this fairly immediately.</p> <p>Regarding data, the HT said that some would be removed from the SEF once training had been given on RAISEonline. Frances Le Pla would deliver this once she in turn had been trained. The HT said he had judged the school as good, with elements of outstanding practice, not as outstanding, as the goalposts and rules kept changing. He said the school was 'solidly good' and he had triangulated evidence to prove this. The data backed up the lesson observations and what was being written in the books. A governor asked for clarification on the Ofsted gradings. The HT explained the gradings as 1 outstanding, 2 good, 3 requires improvement and 4 inadequate. He clarified that there were no category 4s amongst the 17 PDET schools. The governors approved the SEF.</p>	
6.	<p>Safeguarding update. SM to meet with the HT to review actions from the safeguarding audit.</p>	SM/HT
7.	<p>Committee reports</p> <p>a. Premises H&S. As on the LP+. NG advised that there were 47 active items on the action plan and thanked Peter Jones for all his work on this as it was very helpful. He said that the and PJ would also go through the premises list.</p>	

No	Subject	Action
b.	<p>Finance and Personnel (including Pay Committee). <i>The Clerk advised that the confidential item in the minutes should be recorded separately.</i> It was noted that the minutes should make it clear that these were individual opinions, but not to attribute names to them. NG said they had deferred reviewing the Terms of Reference as they were questioning the unclear wording. NG advised that he was not happy to make any decisions on pay until PDET and clarified the ToR and sent the Pay Policy through.</p> <p>Action: <i>HT to chase PDET for a Pay Policy as it was not on the portal.</i></p> <p>Letter from PDET. The HT referred to the letter the Chair had received in August from PDET which the Finance Committee had responded to by recorded delivery. He said the previous day he had received a response by email after chasing this up which he shared with governors. The HT proposed this was delegated to a small group of governors who would meet with PDET. The HT said that he did not feel that the school had submitted a deficit budget; it was a balanced budget with some additional expenditure from retained earnings. He referred to the issues with the timing of the budget training and the implication that the bursar was at fault, and said he considered a 5-year plan to be strategic, not operational. The HT requested a day off site to prepare for this and to prepare a presentation with a group of governors. He noted that this had already taken up a disproportionate amount of his time. The lack of knowledge within PDET on the 5- year budget tool was noted by governors and the HT referred to the fact that he had specifically requested budget training, but the training had not been good enough. The HT said the 5-year budget plan was potentially a good tool with the right training, but there were certain assumptions on future pupil numbers which were unknown.</p> <p>It was noted that this was also about working relationships and asked for a Foundation Governor to attend the meeting with PDET. It was noted by a governor that the treatment of the senior leadership, let alone governors, by PDET was morally wrong. It was suggested that it would be good to know what other schools were doing. Action: <i>Chair to get a date from PDET for a meeting. The GB agreed to delegate this to the HT, the Chair, SM and PH</i></p>	<p>NG</p> <p>HT</p> <p>HT/MR SM/PH</p>
c.	<p>Curriculum and Foundation meeting to be rescheduled.</p>	
8.	<p>Approve sub-committee Terms of Reference (ToR) The Premises ToR were approved. The other ToR were deferred to the next meeting.</p>	c/f
9.	<p>Policy Approval PDET Safeguarding Policy. Taken under agenda item 4.</p>	
PROCEDURAL ITEMS		
10.	<p>Governing Board matters (vacancies, training, clerk's items)</p> <p>a. Foundation Governor Vacancy. PH was addressing this.</p> <p>b. Parent vacancy. The HT noted that there were two interested people, and the HT asked if the second could be co-opted if they had the desired skills in-line with the skills gaps (<i>NG to check</i>). The clerk said they could be if the constitution allowed it and <i>she would check this.</i></p>	<p>NG Clerk</p>
11.	<p>Any Other Business. There were no items of AOB.</p>	
12.	<p>Items identified for the next agenda. ToR and c/f items.</p>	
13.	<p>Date of the next meeting: 25th January 2017.</p>	

The Chair thanked all Governors for attending. The meeting closed at 9.19 pm.

Minutes were **approved** at the meeting held on 25.01.17 and signed by the Chair with amendments.