



MINUTES of the GARRAS LGC MEETING

Wednesday 7th February 2024 5.30pm @ the school

Item	Subject	Action
1	<p>Governors present: (V = virtual attendance)</p> <p>Miriam Bagshaw – (MB) Nathaniel Hobbs – Chair (NH) Laura Murgatroyd (LM) Catriona Pennell – Vice Chair (CP) Emma Rayner – Staff governor (ER) Lisa Williams (LW)</p> <p><i>Also present:</i> James Sturges – Head of School (JS) Pat Nicholas – Governance Professional</p>	<p>Apologies:</p> <p>Linda May</p> <p>A warm welcome was extended to MB.</p>
2	Conflicts of Interest	
2.1	Staff governors declared an interest as paid members of staff. No new interests were declared.	
3	Approval of minutes from the last meeting 9.11.23	
3.1	The minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 9 th November 2023 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Chair.	
4	Matters arising	
4.1	There were no actions from the last meeting.	
4.2	There were no matters arising.	
5	Head teacher’s report - verbal	
5.1	Data – covered under item 6.1 Pupil outcomes.	
5.2	<p>SILC visits 4th December and 17th January</p> <p>The visit on the 4th of December was successful, with many of the targets identified met already. Staff are currently working on a new rolling programme for the school, explained for the governors.</p> <p>The visit on the 17th of January was to be a SILC+ visit but was postponed as the Ofsted inspector consultant couldn’t attend. The SILC+ was rescheduled for June, but the 17th of January date was retained for another SILC visit. JS queried why there was a need for 2 SILC visits in quick succession; it was explained that as a school new to the Trust, Garras is ‘out of sync’ with the normal school improvement process.</p> <p>This was a less positive report and has been circulated among the staff. The actions identified are already in hand. JS explained some of the points raised during the visit.</p> <p>Q: Is there a conflict of interest for LM as EHT and the school’s SIP?</p>	

	<p>A: Governors agreed to raise this as feedback to the Trustees.</p> <p>Governors expressed their concern around the 17th of January SILC visit as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That there was no process for recourse on the final report and felt strongly that the HOS should have had an opportunity to comment on the draft, especially as there are inaccuracies. 2. More general concerns around the process on the day and the associated outcome of the SILC visit. 3. The impact on staff wellbeing in the days after the visit; governors agreed to monitor this closely. <p>Q: Were there any positives from the visit? A: Children spoke eloquently and were genuinely excited to speak to the adults about their learning. JS informed the meeting that the staff professionalism and organisation was exemplary throughout.</p>	
5.3	<p>After school childcare</p> <p>The school continues to seek an after-school club lead. There had been no interest expressed in the latest recruitment round.</p> <p>Another recruitment drive will be started after the half term break.</p>	
5.4	<p>Update on security fencing & lease renewal.</p>	
	<p>There were no updates on the security fencing.</p> <p>The school is no longer a tenant of the Trelowarren estate; the school site is now owned by the DoE.</p>	
	<p>NH thanked JS for his report.</p>	
6	<p>Pupil outcomes and the curriculum</p>	
6.1	<p>Data</p> <p>The data information for governors was circulated before the meeting. The main points were.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PP and SEND attendance are higher than most other Trust schools; overall attendance is also very good. • Combined RWM (Reading, Writing, Maths) figures were discussed. Maths 'greater depth' (GDS) numbers are comparatively low against others in the Trust. <p>Q: Why is progress for Y5 and Y6 not as good? A: Governors heard that the disruption for upper KS2 (UKS2) has had an impact, with 5 different teachers in the KS2 class since 2019. There have been other changes, too, such as the change of Trust, Covid, and the introduction of a new tracking system.</p>	

	<p>Q: How does the new tracking system impact? A: There have been some discrepancies in the assessments, and teachers have had issues aligning the new assessment criteria with the old. In addition, with the White Rose maths assessments, not all units had been taught in class at the time of the test.</p> <p>JS explained that progress issues will be addressed by quality first teaching from ER for all her year groups, and SATS club for Y6 was already very successful. Interventions are already in place for specific children. The 'Maths Whizz' and 'TTRS' competition between the 5 hub schools started in the previous week; governors heard that Garras are top of the table already.</p> <p>Q: Is the chart reflective; have these year groups regressed? A: No, this is just the impact of the changes in the assessment criteria.</p> <p>Q: Is White Rose maths effective? A: Yes, very good. A full year has been completed, and with some fine tuning, the teachers are aware of what units they need to focus on. Children understand the process, and White Rose is used by most schools in the trust.</p> <p>Q: Has Accelerated Reader (AR) had an impact yet? A: There has been a 'bumpy' start for all staff and pupils, but progress has been made. Staff have completed the required training, and the school will invest in more books. AR also includes 'MyOn', which is an online library the children can access at home.</p>	
7	Safeguarding	
7.1	SCR review by Natasha Pollard – there is no news on the review as yet.	
7.2	The school will be moving to CPOMS (Child Protection Online Management System) by the summer term for recording of safeguarding and other concerns.	
7.3	LW offered her apologies for the late submission of her safeguarding report.	
8	Governor monitoring	
8.1	SDP 17.11.23 LM/CP	
8.2	SEN 21.11.23 LM	
8.3	<p>Staff wellbeing 13.12.23 CP</p> <p>The monitoring reports were received and noted by the meeting.</p> <p>JS offered his thanks to all governors for taking time to come into school. The wellbeing visit was particularly positive.</p> <p>This term's monitoring was discussed and agreed.</p>	
9	Governor training & recruitment	
9.1	<p>Election of vice chair</p> <p>CP was nominated as Vice Chair; the nomination was accepted, seconded and the vote was unanimous.</p>	
9.2	<p>Terms of office</p> <p>LM term of office ends on 26/02/2024. LM agreed to renew her term.</p>	

9.3	<p>Governor network 20 Feb and 20 Mar</p> <p>The Tuesday 20th February network meeting will be on Safeguarding, and the Wednesday 20th March meeting on SEND.</p> <p>Action: PN to check if the dates are accurate.</p>	PN
9.4	<p>Successful meetings</p> <p>The '12 suggestions for improving your governing board meetings' document was received and noted.</p>	
10	Trust updates	
10.1	PN informed the meeting of her (GP) governance professional performance review with KB.	
11	Governors impact on the pupils	
11.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Monitoring standards by carrying out regular governor visits and implementing the monitoring plan for this academic year. ● Monitoring staff wellbeing by keeping in touch regularly with the staff and Head of School. ● Ensuring effectiveness by actively seeking and recruiting new governors. ● Improving skills and knowledge by attending relevant training and wider trust meetings. ● Ensuring succession planning by appointing a vice chair. 	
12	Feedback to the Trustees	
12.1	Governors received and noted the letter from the Chair of the SIG committee.	
12.2	<p>The meeting agreed the following questions to be put to the Trustees.</p> <p>Governors wish to better understand the system, if there is one, that the Trustees use to review governor monitoring reports. As a key function for local governors, if this is not reviewed by Trustees, then why are these visits carried out?</p> <p>Governors expressed concern about a potential conflict of interest for LM. LM is the executive head of the small schools' hub, but recently participated in a SILC visit at Garras School as SIP. In this case, can LM be fully accountable?</p> <p>Governors wished to record their concern about the finalised SILC visit report that was sent to the Head of School (HOS). It appears that there was no opportunity for the HOS to review the report in draft and correct any inaccuracies.</p> <p>Governors wish to understand the Crofty MAT attitude overall toward SILC and SILC+ visits in the context of wider staff wellbeing issues. How does the Trust seek to mitigate the impact on staff wellbeing of these visits?</p>	
	<p>AOB</p> <p>None.</p>	
	<p>Dates of next meetings:</p> <p>Wednesday 13th March 2024 at 5.30pm.</p>	

	Meeting finished at 7.35pm	