

ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

DRAFT MINUTES OF ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL LGB MEETING HELD ON  
THURSDAY 01 FEBRUARY 2018 AT 16:00  
AT ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

**PRESENT:** Ann Critchley, Joe Ennis (Vice Chair), Chrissy Hornby (Co-Chair), Gill Mond, Chloe Palmer, Wendy Parker, Anna Pattenden (HT), Roma Pearson, Laura Probert (Co-Chair).

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Fay Cordingly (DHT), Natalie Hobbs (MAST Clerk), Hilary Sanders (MAST CEO)

Item	Main discussions and agreed actions	
1	<p><b>Opening Prayer</b> A Governor opened with a prayer.</p>	
2	<p><b>Apologies for Absence (accepted / not accepted)</b> All Governors and the MAST CEO were present.</p> <p><b>Confirmation of Quorate</b> Quorum is 3 or 1/3 (one third) of the number of appointed directors, whichever is highest.</p> <p><b>The meeting was quorate.</b></p>	
3	<p><b>Declaration of Business Interests</b></p> <p>A Governor confirmed that she was still the Chair of Governors of Noah's Ark Preschool within Christchurch Luton School in Chatham.</p>	
4	<p><b>Governing Body Membership</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Update of Vacancy</b></li> </ul> <p>The Co-Chair stated the LGB still have a vacancy which following the last meeting was registered on SGOSS. The SGOSS advertisement did not result in any suitable candidates for the vacancy.</p> <p>A notice was placed in the community magazine Action Forum which resulted in four interested parties. The Vice Chair gave a brief outline of the potential candidates.</p> <p>Candidate 1 – Candidate 1 is a Head teacher in Medway. He is not known to any member of the LGB. <i>The Vice Chair raised the question of a potential issue with serving Heads becoming governors at other schools and if this was advisable. There is previous history here, when a serving HT joined the LGB and then had to leave, due to Medway's ruling on HTs not serving as governors for other schools. The Co-chair advised that we should refer to the MAST's Scheme of Delegation. This was actioned and there was no reference to this. It was then agreed to meet the individual for an interview.</i></p> <p>Candidate 2 – Candidate 2 used to work as a TA at St. Margaret's until her recent retirement.</p>	

ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

DRAFT MINUTES OF ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL LGB MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 01 FEBRUARY 2018 AT 16:00 AT ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

	<p>Candidate 3 – Candidate 3 is a recently retired actuary.</p> <p>Candidate 4 – Candidate 4 is a recently retired lady.</p> <p>It was agreed to interview all four candidates. This would be conducted by the Co-Chairs and Vice Chair. – preferably on the same day.</p> <p><i>A governor stated it could be good for MAST for the LGB to interview all four candidates as we could sign post them to another school within the Trust. All present agreed.</i></p>	
5	<p><b>Chair's Correspondence</b></p> <p>The Co-Chairs had received a letter from the NAHT – thanking governors for the time and support they had afforded the HT in setting up the Medway Education Leaders' Association.</p>	
6	<p><b>Approval of minutes from last LGB meeting held on 23 November 2017</b></p> <p><b>Supporting docs: Previous Board Meeting Minutes and Confidential Notes 23 November 2017</b></p> <p>The minutes, and confidential notes, of the previous meeting on 23 November 2017, were approved as an accurate record and signed as such by the Co-Chair.</p>	
7	<p><b>Matters arising from the last LGB meeting held on 26 September 2017 not on the agenda</b></p> <p><u>Headteacher to speak to School Council re organising a Shoebox appeal for charity – this resulted in a number of boxes, which have since been collected.</u></p> <p><u>DHT to update Sports Premium on website within the description rather than within a PDF report - the DHT, Sports and IT Leads met and updated the website.</u></p> <p><u>Co-Chair meet with IT lead to discuss Website Compliance Report- the Co-Chair has prepared a report on the visit for Governors.</u></p> <p><u>Co-Chairs to present Monitoring Schedule – to be discussed at this meeting.</u></p> <p><u>CEO to liaise with IT lead re Governor Zone log on query - this query has now been resolved.</u></p> <p><i>The Co-Chair raised a question with the Clerk, which was not shared previously (with the other questions for the meeting), regarding including names within the minutes. The Clerk and the Co-Chairs are working together to ensure that no names are mentioned within the minutes.</i></p>	

ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

DRAFT MINUTES OF ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL LGB MEETING HELD ON  
THURSDAY 01 FEBRUARY 2018 AT 16:00  
AT ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

8	<p><b>Headteacher Report and SEF</b></p> <p><i>1. When would you expect NQTs to be classed as good? Does this also apply for the Teach First student?</i></p> <p>The HT stated she would expect NQTs to be classed as good by the end of the academic year at the latest. This also applies to the Teach First students as she is an NQT.</p> <p><i>2. How does progress and attainment in their classes compare to that of their colleagues?</i></p> <p>The HT responded that it is in line with their colleagues. The reason for this is because of mentoring and Heads of Year now have leadership time so they can oversee the data as well as the SLT. They also plan together as a team.</p> <p><i>3.If the impact on learning is not as it should be, what steps if any, will be taken to improve this?</i></p> <p>See above.</p> <p><i>4. Is the Coaching and Mentoring programme a regular feature on the timetable? How often e.g. termly?</i></p> <p>Yes, it is – it is directed time, once a term. They meet as teams and have objectives set over a year which are then sent to the HT and DHT.</p> <p><i>5. With regards curriculum development – has there been a report following the meeting of Science Leads on the 18<sup>th</sup> January?</i></p> <p>The Head of Science has fed back informally to the HT and DHT, however a formal report has not yet been provided. This will be ready for the next LGB meeting.</p> <p><i>6. What are the long-term implications for the school, with the IT Lead becoming the trust's GDPR?</i></p> <p>The HT confirmed that there will no impact on the school as the IT lead will be teaching Monday, Thursday, Friday as normal and will have Tuesday and Wednesday as additional hours across the Trust. The CEO confirmed that this was an initial plan as the additional hours should reduce once it is set up.</p> <p><i>7. Effective Leadership and Management is graded as 2 – what has this been based on?</i></p>	
---	--	--

ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

DRAFT MINUTES OF ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL LGB MEETING HELD ON  
THURSDAY 01 FEBRUARY 2018 AT 16:00  
AT ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

	<p>The HT stated that it was based on the fact that attainment is improving, progress is good and the monitoring regime is good and tight. The CEO does internal /external validation for the Trust. The school is to take part in Trust Wide Peer reviews.</p> <p><i>8. Has the member of staff's phased return to work now been completed?</i></p> <p>The HT confirmed that anyone who had been off long-term, is now back full time after completing a phased return to work.</p>	
<p>9-12</p>	<p><b>Attainment Analysis</b></p> <p>Prior to the Heads of Years 3 – 6 presenting their reports on attainment and progress, the Vice Chair presented his analysis of the attainment and progress data to the other Governors.</p> <p><i>The Vice Chair explained that in his preparation to be Ofsted ready, he had decided to focus on the progress of the disadvantaged groups.</i></p> <p><i>The Vice Chair stated that if the disadvantaged groups consistently made progress on a par with year groups or maybe even better progress than the year groups, the gap should not widen and would indeed narrow.</i></p> <p>The Vice Chair provided copies of his Term 1 data chart.</p> <p>Red circles show where progress equals or betters the year group.</p> <p><i>The Vice Chair explained that within:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Reading-Above Expected, the disadvantaged groups are really doing well.</i></li> <li>- <i>Writing-Below Expected within the disadvantaged groups is also better than the Year group equivalent.</i></li> <li>- <i>Writing-Expected – again good progress</i></li> <li>- <i>Maths-Above Expected shows amazing progress.</i></li> </ul> <p>The Vice Chair then provided the Term 2 data chart.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Reading-Above Expected shows there are 11/12 red circles. The only one where the disadvantaged group did not do as well was Year 6 PP.</i></li> <li>- <i>Writing-Above Expected – very good progress</i></li> <li>- <i>Maths-Above Expected – very good progress</i></li> </ul> <p><i>The SEN group Above-Expected Reading, Writing and Maths they are all making better progress than their peers.</i></p> <p>Finally, the Vice Chair showed his analysis on Terms 4 and 5 from last year and Terms 1 and 2 from this year.</p>	

ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

DRAFT MINUTES OF ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL LGB MEETING HELD ON  
THURSDAY 01 FEBRUARY 2018 AT 16:00  
AT ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

	<p>Governors agreed that the school is working to ensure this upward trend in progress for the disadvantaged groups continues.</p> <p>The CEO stated that there was no fault in the logic of the Vice Chair with his data analysis but requested green dots in future. The CEO also said to compare PP children against Non-PP children. It was also clarified by the CEO that the PP group will contain FSM and Ever Six children.</p> <p><i>1. The data indicates that Years 5 and 6 are further away from their targets. How confident can we be that their targets remain achievable? Is there anything more that could be done to help improve the likelihood of meeting the targets?</i></p> <p>The HT said that there has been an enormous amount of work going into helping Years 5 and 6. There are many activities and initiatives which have been put in place to help the children within both year groups (both have a large percentage of PP and SEND). Year 6 have not had the new curriculum as consistently as other year groups.</p> <p><i>2. Are targets set in stone? Are they end of year targets? So, regarding attainment, as in Year 4 where the targets in Writing are virtually met (-1% at Below and Expected but met at Above), are they reviewed and raised, especially based on the data at the end of term 2?</i></p> <p>The HT confirmed that targets are not set in stone and are being addressed in performance management meetings. She confirmed that tomorrow is the deadline for Term 3 data, so it would be interesting to see what the data shows.</p>	
9	<p><b>Attainment and progress data for Year 3 including data for vulnerable groups including PP and SEND</b></p> <p><i>1. What are the strengths and weaknesses in attainment? What steps are being taken to address areas giving cause for concern?</i></p> <p><i>2. What are the strengths and weaknesses in progress? What steps are being taken to address areas giving cause for concern?</i></p> <p>The Heads of Year for Year 3 presented provided a handout on attainment and progress.</p> <p><u>Attainment-</u> Maths is a strength for Year 3. It is actually an identical percentage to the Writing result however they have a higher percentage of greater depth within Maths so it has been summarised that way. The best area for PP children is Writing and the girls are outperforming the boys at this stage for Writing and Reading. EAL are also doing well; they are working at Expected or Above in all areas and the strongest area for SEND is also Writing.</p> <p>Obviously, they are proud of the girls' attainment however they are working to bring the boys in line with the girls, in terms of attainment.</p>	

ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

DRAFT MINUTES OF ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL LGB MEETING HELD ON  
THURSDAY 01 FEBRUARY 2018 AT 16:00  
AT ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

<p><u>Progress</u> -Writing shows the greatest progress for the Year 3 group. Maths and Writing are the strongest areas for the non-PPs. EAL children are making Expected or Above levels. Writing is also the best result for the SEND group. Therefore, Writing is looking a pleasing picture for Year 3.</p> <p><u>Issues with Reading</u> - It is difficult to get boys to engage in reading. Boy friendly texts are being read within class e.g. Dinosaurs. Boxes from the library have been available so there is more access to different texts. They are also encouraging home reading more and going out and speaking to the parents. Percentage system for encouraging children to read is working well. They have also set up a new system of Year 5 reading mentors to help the Year 3 children. Middle Ability Year 5 readers have been targeted and they feel special for being asked to help and the Year 3 pupils feel special to have someone new to help them.</p> <p>Precision teaching is taking place and with help from the HLTA, specific reading interventions are taking place to help with the finer points that may be proving tricky for some children.</p> <p>Lower ability children have been grouped into three groups, to take them through the different stages which are relevant to them, so they can access the curriculum at the right stage for them.</p> <p>The teachers are using resources to try and involve and engage parents in reading, for example bookmarks with questions on them which have questions they can ask their child about the text. They have noticed a positive response from parents since the push to involve them began, although TA judgements won't be in until tomorrow. Parents do appreciate it if they see the teachers trying something new for their child.</p> <p><i>3. Data for two classes showed the Above Expected in both Reading and Writing to be markedly higher for one compared to the other. Were there any thoughts as to why?</i></p> <p>With regards to the NQT class, it is a tiny bit weaker than the other classes but not significantly so. The Heads of Year have been mentoring and working with the teacher to increase her confidence when it comes to Maths.</p> <p>The impact of a high percentage of SEND pupils in one class has led to a very challenging start to the year. This could be down to lack of teacher experience and confidence in their own judgement, to move some children on to greater depth etc.</p> <p><i>4. The Co- Chair asked why there was no data for one of the classes?</i></p> <p>This was an oversight and the handout now had the data.</p> <p><i>5. The Co-Chair asked if there was still a waiting list for help e.g. support with phonics</i></p> <p>The Heads of Year confirmed this was the case. All Year 3 non-readers are getting help, however help is still being sought for the SEND and PP pupils.</p>	
---	--

ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

DRAFT MINUTES OF ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL LGB MEETING HELD ON  
THURSDAY 01 FEBRUARY 2018 AT 16:00  
AT ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

	The Co-Chair thanked the Heads of Year for their detailed summary.	
10	<p><b>Attainment and progress data for Year 4 including data for vulnerable groups including PP and SEND</b></p> <p><i>1. What are the strengths and weaknesses in attainment? What steps are being taken to address areas giving cause for concern?</i></p> <p><i>2. What are the strengths and weaknesses in progress? What steps are being taken to address areas giving cause for concern?</i></p> <p>The Head of Year for Year 4 presented on attainment and progress.</p> <p><u>Attainment</u>- they are very pleased with the attainment which has gone up significantly since Term 1. There were huge gaps and these have been addressed with the result that the combined percentages have improved.</p> <p>Combined percentage is 67% (target 69%)          Maths percentage is 74% (target 79%)          Writing percentage is 71% (target 72%)          Reading percentage is 74% (target 79%)</p> <p>They are most pleased with their Greater Depth Maths result of 21%. Writing was a concern during Term 1 as pupils struggled with higher level features, however hard work has led to improvement. In addition, Reading was 54% for Term 1 and this has jumped to 74% for Term 2 which is a great improvement (with greater depth at 20%).</p> <p>Year 4 have implemented the Power of Reading scheme which is a very inclusive scheme. Previously not all children were able to access the Year 4 curriculum but the scheme, encourages them to become engaged in the text. It encourages in depth reading. With all children being able to access reading and writing we are now pushing for them to develop higher level reading skills.</p> <p>With regards to Maths, in term 3, because MNP doesn't revisit topics already covered, the 'Five warm-up questions' help with maths fluency.</p> <p>With Writing, the teachers are always reminding pupils about using high level features e.g. subordinate clauses, advanced openers etc, across all subjects.</p> <p><i>3. Data for one class for Writing and Maths both at Expected and Above, is markedly lower than the other two classes. Any thoughts? What is being put in place to improve upon this?</i></p> <p>The Head of Year confirmed that the reason for this was that the KS1 results were a lot lower in this class with 40% working Below Expected at the start of the year. So it has been an uphill struggle. The teachers are working together to bring the children up to the level that would be Expected.</p> <p>The Co-Chair thanked the Head of Year for their summary.</p>	

ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

DRAFT MINUTES OF ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL LGB MEETING HELD ON  
THURSDAY 01 FEBRUARY 2018 AT 16:00  
AT ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

11	<p><b>Attainment and progress data for Year 5 including data for vulnerable groups including PP and SEND</b></p> <p><i>1. What are the strengths and weaknesses in attainment? What steps are being taken to address areas giving cause for concern?</i></p> <p><i>2. What are the strengths and weaknesses in progress? What steps are being taken to address areas giving cause for concern?</i></p> <p>The Head of Year for Year 5 presented on attainment and progress.</p> <p><u>Attainment</u> - The Head of Year outlined that the strengths for attainment; Reading is the strongest, Girls are outperforming boys across the Year and within EAL - Writing and Maths is looking quite strong.</p> <p>The weaknesses would be EAL Reading. There has been intervention for one pupil for Reading and that pupil is now at Expected. The other EAL students have not had this yet as they have been swimming but are expected to commence this soon.</p> <p>In addition, boys' Reading and Writing. The class has moved onto a boy-friendly text and this has helped with Writing. It seems to have really engaged them. Maths intervention groups are boy heavy at 2 :12 in the group. They are all accessing Year 5 curriculum but at a slower pace. The boys are outperforming girls in this respect.</p> <p>For all SEND and PP pupils, targeted support is in place to try and narrow the gap in attainment.</p> <p><u>Progress</u>- There has been outstanding progress with PP's for Reading and Writing (with adults hearing them read 3 x a week). In terms of progress Boys are outperforming girls.</p> <p>They has been good progress for SEND in Writing, helped by using Editing stations. In addition, some progress for SEND in Maths has been noted. Intervention is in place e.g. the use of multiplication ladders for them, as retention seems to be an issue. Maths fluency classes are also in place.</p> <p><i>3. If Year 5 are the best performing Year group, why is it their distance from target greater than other year groups? Is it because they performed well in Term 1 or is it because they are the first year to be taught the new national curriculum?</i></p> <p>The Head of Year responded that it was a bit of both. They did perform better however they also changed their targets to push them for outstanding progress.</p> <p>In Reading the majority of the children came up from KS1 as 2As or 3s so they have had to change their targets and really push them to ensure the attainment doesn't continue to be a problem. (41% at Level 3 and 29% at Level 2A). Aspirational targets</p>	

ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

DRAFT MINUTES OF ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL LGB MEETING HELD ON  
THURSDAY 01 FEBRUARY 2018 AT 16:00  
AT ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

	<p>have been set for the Level 3s and for some of the Level 2As. This explains the gap between their progress and their attainment figures and the distance to target. Again in Writing 24% Level 3 and 40% Level 2A and Maths 25% Level 3 and 42% Level 2A. It is a big jump for the teachers to make but they are trying.</p> <p><i>4.If it was right to assume that 100% in the below+ column means that every single pupil is working on the Year 5 curriculum?</i></p> <p>It was explained by the Head of Year, that the target had been changed and that the aim was to have all pupils working on the Year 5 curriculum by the end of Year 5. She explained that she is aware of 3 pupils in her own class that are not yet working on the Year 5 curriculum.</p> <p><i>5. It was great to see that the PP pupils progress was in line with the overall progress percentages and asked why the Head of Year thought that was?</i></p> <p>The Head of Year responded that it was down to the targeted support that has been put in place. They have been identified very early on in the year and they have made sure that they are on them all the time. If at any point it doesn't seem the pupil is accessing the support and the curriculum, they do pre-teaching, extra help with homework etc. This is sometimes during afternoon classes or during lunchtime.</p> <p><i>6.Is there was a reason why one of the classes has 3% of pupils Above Expected in Reading?</i></p> <p>The Head of Year confirmed that this was her class and that she was being overly cautious of marking them as Exceeding so early in the year, without being sure she had the evidence in the books to support this. Having looked over the last couple of weeks, the evidence is now apparent, this percentage is likely to increase to roughly 30%. The pupils are showing that they are Exceeding.</p> <p>The Co-Chair thanked the Head of Year for their summary.</p>	
12	<p><b>Attainment and progress data for Year 6 including data for vulnerable groups including PP and SEND</b></p> <p><i>1.What are the strengths and weaknesses in attainment? What steps are being taken to address areas giving cause for concern?</i></p> <p><i>2.What are the strengths and weaknesses in progress? What steps are being taken to address areas giving cause for concern?</i></p> <p>The Head of Year for Year 6 presented on attainment and progress.</p> <p><u>Attainment</u> -Looking at the data the Head of Year confirmed that girls are outperforming boys in all subjects. There is a 12% difference in Reading, 13% difference in Writing and an 8% difference in Maths. It has been noted that there is a 3% difference in attainment for FSM compared to non-FSM pupils.</p>	

ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

DRAFT MINUTES OF ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL LGB MEETING HELD ON  
THURSDAY 01 FEBRUARY 2018 AT 16:00  
AT ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

	<p>The Head of Year confirmed they need to look at PP and SEND children. They are not as high as non-PP and non-SEND children. Attainment overall is generally lower for these groups.</p> <p><u>Progress</u> - The percentages are broadly in line for boys and girls in all subjects. However, progress in Writing is still a problem for SEND and FSM children.</p> <p>The Head of Year confirmed that the TAs are taking intervention groups for Reading Comprehension (3 times a week), Grammar (3 times a week) and Maths (twice a week). These are with children who are mainly PP or SEND. The PP and SEND children are receiving additional help with Reading, Comprehension and Maths from teams within the school.</p> <p>In addition, the class teachers and DHT run Maths Booster classes during lunchtimes twice a week covering specific areas. Mental maths tests are conducted in class every week to help with mental arithmetic.</p> <p>The cover teacher 'pre-teaches' Maths concepts before they are covered in class so they have some idea beforehand.</p> <p>They do extended pieces of writing every week and teachers are using the DfE marking grids, so children know what is going well and what isn't. Each teacher takes a focus group for those having similar problems. The Head of Year has purchased a computer programme called Spag.com, a grammar programme with SATS based questions. It is something they can do in the computer suite – time permitting. Focussed reading takes place twice a week.</p> <p><i>3. What is behind one class, despite having 100% Below+ in Reading and Writing, having lower %s of Above expected (4%Reading and 0% Writing)?</i></p> <p>This class has significant emotional needs which are being dealt with (10/28) and this has impacted on their work. They haven't been writing in depth for the 3-point question and this is something that was being worked on. There seems to be a lack of confidence from the children of what they can and cannot include in their answers to attain 'greater depth'. The Head of Year also thinks there is some question around teacher confidence in understanding what constitutes 'greater depth'. The Head of Year has been supporting the teacher through this via moderation and the support of the DHT. Year group meetings are taking place once a week.</p> <p>The Co-Chair thanked the Head of Year for their summary. The Head of Year asked governors to complete a questionnaire for his work as RE Lead and the governors agreed.</p>	
13	<p><b>Pupil Premium</b></p> <p><i>1. What interventions have already been put in place? Are there still pupils on a waiting list for support? When will they start to receive this?</i></p>	

ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

DRAFT MINUTES OF ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL LGB MEETING HELD ON  
THURSDAY 01 FEBRUARY 2018 AT 16:00  
AT ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

	<p>The HT stated that as per the reports from the Heads of Year, there are many interventions taking place which cover all children including PP children.</p> <p><i>2. What support is in place for differentiation?</i></p> <p>The HT stated that differentiation is discussed frequently. It is also part of Quality First teaching, whereby teachers will roughly think about Lower Ability, Middle Ability and Higher Ability children. There are ranges within these bands also.</p> <p>For example - Higher ability children will be pushed to do challenge and extension tasks, Middle ability children see the challenge and decide if they want to do the higher task or remain doing the middle ability task.</p> <p><i>3. How many pupils do we have who are 'young carers'?</i></p> <p>The HT confirmed the school has 10 young carers.</p> <p><i>4. Are all PP pupils included when giving help with enrichment?</i></p> <p>The HT confirmed the enrichment activities are offered to all children.</p> <p><i>5. Are there 29 or 30 in Year 6?</i></p> <p>The HT confirmed there are 29 in Year 6 as 1 has just left.</p> <p><i>6. There doesn't seem to have been any movement in Maths, why could that be?</i></p> <p>The PP lead has confirmed that Maths is probably the easiest of the subjects to assess as its less subjective. If children are on track attainment wise, it can appear there has been no / very little movement. However, this only appears to be the case in Year 5 and the Head of Year explained this earlier in her report.</p> <p><i>7. Is Counselling and Play Therapy paid for by the PP budget?</i></p> <p>The HT confirmed that it does form part of the budget.</p> <p><i>8. Thinking about PP spend – what has had the most impact?</i></p> <p>The HT stated if you look at the SIMS you will see there is more movement when the intervention is teacher led. However, with those with emotional needs, they do well from using Play Therapy and or Counselling as it helps them to become more willing to learn.</p>	
14	<b>SEND attainment and progress overview</b>	

ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

DRAFT MINUTES OF ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL LGB MEETING HELD ON  
THURSDAY 01 FEBRUARY 2018 AT 16:00  
AT ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

	<p>The HT and Co-Chairs confirmed that the Heads of Year were all very clear on this in their report and there were no further questions from the Governors on the SEND attainment and progress.</p>	
15	<p><b>School Improvement Plan</b></p> <p><i>1. What percentage of teaching observed is good?</i></p> <p>The HT confirmed it was 100% of teachers e.g. this does not include NQTs. This does not mean the NQTs are all requiring improvement, they have elements of Good (up to 89%).</p> <p><i>2. Has the school met the target of 30% outstanding elements?</i></p> <p>The HT confirmed that they were not far off the target. It needs to be more consistent.</p> <p>The DHT confirmed that she believed all the NQTs would achieve Good by the end of the academic year.</p> <p>The HT confirmed that interim reports for each pupil went out in Term 2 and they would like to trial not sending out another report in Term 4 and instead provide a written report at Parents' Evenings which they would discuss.</p> <p><i>3. Are all interventions taking place in the afternoon?</i></p> <p>The HT stated that whilst TAs support Quality First teaching in the mornings; their interventions will be in the afternoon, for additional teacher led interventions; these can take place in the mornings as well.</p> <p><i>4. Are there to be any future workshops taking place at the school for parents?</i></p> <p>The HT confirmed that a Forum agenda had gone out this week and that Parent engagement was on the agenda.</p>	
16	<p><b>SIAMS / British Values</b></p> <p>There has not been time for the RE / Ethos Governor to conduct a monitoring report due to prior commitments however she will make a visit in Term 4.</p> <p>The Co-Chair confirmed that she had attended the Diocese meeting with the HT. The HT confirmed that herself and the RE lead were now booked onto the SIAMS training on the 23<sup>rd</sup> March.</p> <p>The CEO confirmed a potential date for a MAST wide SIAMS training was the 5 June 2018 at 3/4pm but this was to be confirmed.</p>	
17	<p><b>Pupil Questionnaire</b></p>	

ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

DRAFT MINUTES OF ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL LGB MEETING HELD ON  
THURSDAY 01 FEBRUARY 2018 AT 16:00  
AT ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

	<p><b>Q3. New School Values:</b> <i>there is wide variation here in respect of one Year 5 class with only 33% agreeing with these. Any thoughts as to why this could be?</i></p> <p>The HT confirmed that one Year 5 class were very disaffected at the end of the last academic year and this is reflected in their responses.</p> <p><b>Q4. Behaviour:</b> <i>even given that pupils' perception can be vastly different to adults, in one Year 6 class only 26% agreed and in a Year 5 and a Year 3 class approx. 39% agreed. Why could this be?</i></p> <p>The HT said there are one or two pupils who had individual reward systems and the class perceived this as unfair.</p> <p><b>Q9. Help:</b> <i>Are we happy that just under 10% of pupils don't know who to turn to if they need help? With one of the Year 5 classes with over 20% not knowing who to turn to. Do we know why this might be the case? Or do we need to take more steps to remind pupils? Or?</i></p> <p>The HT thinks they need to re-ask the question.</p> <p><b>Q6 School dinners:</b> <i>The consensus is the majority do not like the dinners. Was this survey completed before or after consultations with our caterers began? Would comments be more positive now? Incidentally, was it <b>only those</b> pupils who have school dinners that gave their opinion here?</i></p> <p>The HT confirmed this was before the consultation with the caterers. The dinners have improved with more choice, bread, salad and more for older pupils.</p> <p><i>1. There was one Year 5 class whose answers were among the lowest if not the lowest percentage for 6/10 questions. Is there any reason for this?</i></p> <p>The HT said that she didn't think the teacher directed the pupils to complete the survey.</p> <p><i>2. There was another Year 5 class where only 17 pupils completed the questionnaire. Why was that?</i></p> <p>The HT said that she didn't think the teacher directed the pupils to complete the survey.</p>	
18	<p><b>Safeguarding</b></p> <p><i>1. As the result of the review were any significant safeguarding issues identified and if so followed up as necessary?</i></p>	

ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

DRAFT MINUTES OF ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL LGB MEETING HELD ON  
THURSDAY 01 FEBRUARY 2018 AT 16:00  
AT ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

	<p>The HT checked with the school office and all actions had been completed. The IT technician was in today and had his DBS with him.</p> <p>The HT confirmed that with regards to the fitness for work section, it was confirmed that if the candidate wishes to declare a medical condition on the application form then that is fine.</p> <p><b>Child Protection policy</b></p> <p><i>2. Where are the written records, referred to in the policy, kept? And how exactly are they passed on?</i></p> <p>The HT confirmed that the Yellow Record of Concern forms are visible around school. Once completed they are passed to the Safeguarding team. The Safeguarding team meet once a week to discuss concerns raised. The forms are kept in a locked cabinet in a locked cupboard which is kept in a locked classroom– they are all fireproof. Obviously if the concern needs to be taken further, the correct action will be taken.</p> <p><i>3. In the section referring to the DSL – what if such a child is absent but WITH an explanation that may not be convincing?</i></p> <p>The HT confirmed that the Safeguarding team talk about every absence and concern. A member of the Safeguarding team will investigate further if the reason is not convincing.</p> <p><i>4. Is a record kept of PREVENT training? And have all governors completed this?</i></p> <p>The HT confirmed that the Office Manager is collating a list of those who have completed this training. Governors with the exception of our new governors have completed it. The Clerk will send the link round for new governors to complete.</p> <p><i>A governor mentioned that there were some typos within the policy which needed be rectified. TYPOS – at start there are two ‘The’s’. Instead of ‘the aim of the policy is’... should say ‘the aims of the policy are’ and there is ‘cjh’ for ‘child’.</i></p>	
19	<p><b>MAST</b></p> <p>No MAST documents were made available for governors in advance of the meeting due to sickness.</p> <p>The CEO confirmed that the concerns regarding the roof have been escalated further to the meeting the CEO and Chair of Directors had with the Deputy RSC. Medway have confirmed they have never received the letter with our concerns and were unaware of the school’s issues. The CEO has been asked to speak to Paul Clark from Medway.</p>	
20	<p><b>Governor Monitoring Visits and Schedule</b></p>	

ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

DRAFT MINUTES OF ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL LGB MEETING HELD ON  
THURSDAY 01 FEBRUARY 2018 AT 16:00  
AT ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

	<p>The Co-Chair distributed a copy of a draft Monitoring Schedule to those present. The first page has a list of SDP Priorities and Targets. The schedule also shows who would be responsible for each area. The Co-Chair mentioned that the schedule has curriculum areas with initials for certain subjects <i>however the Co-Chairs have suggested that the way forward would be for governors not to be tied to one aspect of school e.g. subject. A more flexible approach would meet the requirement to monitor the SDP.</i></p> <p><i>The Co-Chair suggested that a good way to get involved in monitoring, would be to attend Act of Worship. Everyone has been provided with a timetable of the Act of Worship taking place this term.</i></p> <p>Several monitoring visits that have taken place.</p> <p>Monitoring Reports included for this meeting are:</p> <p>GDPR/School Website Report – Chrissy Hornby Safeguarding Monitoring Report – Laura Probert SCR Part 1 Monitoring Report – Laura Probert SCR Part 2 Monitoring Report – Laura Probert Pupil Premium- Literacy – Laura Probert</p>	
21	<p><b>Training</b></p> <p>The Ofsted Readiness training will take place this evening following this meeting.</p> <p>The CEO confirmed that KAPE HR would be offering a Safer Recruitment course for £150 per delegate. The CEO was to contact other schools to see if they were interested too, then maybe it could be provided inhouse.</p>	
22	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>The CEO confirmed there is a vacancy for a Director on the Board and outlined the role. There will be about 10 meetings a year and the Director would be representing the Trust and making decisions for the Trust, not just the school. Finance Management, Personnel Management, etc. Meetings take place at St Margaret's school in the evening.</p> <p>A governor (Gill Mond) self-nominated and was seconded by the Co-Chairs. The LGB unanimously agreed.</p> <p>The HT / CEO then spoke about the results from Parent View which is an online survey tool. The data which is based on 10 from last year and 2 from this year has produced some very disaffected views. The CEO suggested that a reminder in the newsletter to all parents to add their views, would be useful, as it stands Parent View is not a true reflection.</p>	

ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

DRAFT MINUTES OF ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL LGB MEETING HELD ON  
THURSDAY 01 FEBRUARY 2018 AT 16:00  
AT ST MARGARET'S CE JUNIOR SCHOOL

	The HT spoke about the wooden play area which is not in use. The HT would like it removed or replaced. There are three quotes and these will be emailed to governors to get their view. It can be taken to the Board meeting in March.	
23	<b>Date of Next Meeting:</b> 8 March 2018 at 2pm	
24	<p><b>Confidentiality</b></p> <p>i. Of discussed agenda points Some discussions under agenda item 19 were deemed to be confidential and recorded as such. These Confidential Notes will be sent to the Chair only, to forward with discretion to Board Members.</p> <p>ii. Of supporting documents The Board agreed that all supporting documents were suitable for distribution, within the Trust.</p>	
25	<b>The meeting closed at 18:00</b>	

**Action Points**

Clerk	4	Add Declaration of interests for one governor to governor zone
Co-Chairs and Vice Chair	4	Interview prospective new governors to join the LGB
SIAMS governor	16	To monitor in term 4 and report to governors at next meeting -8 <sup>th</sup> March
Clerk	18	To send PREVENT training link to governors for completion
CEO	21	To look at feasibility to provide Safer Recruitment training inhouse.
HT	22	To forward quotes for play area to governors for consideration