

## **St Mary Magdalen's Catholic Primary School**

**Minutes of the meeting of the Governing Board held at the school on  
Thursday 1 February 2018 at 7.30pm**

### Constitution and Membership

<b>Membership Category</b>	<b>Appointed By</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>End of Term of Office</b>
Foundation (7)	Archbishop of Southwark	Amanda Barrett (ABa)	21/9/18
	Archbishop of Southwark	Anna Brown (ABr)	31/8/18
	Archbishop of Southwark	Chris Hopkins (CHo)	31/8/18
	Archbishop of Southwark	Paul Kenny (PK)	31/8/18
	Archbishop of Southwark	Liam O'Connell (LO)	15/12/19
	Archbishop of Southwark	Serena Sexton (SS)	6/6/18
	Archbishop of Southwark	<i>Vacancy</i>	
LA (1)	Governing Board	Nick Gardner (NG)	6/1/22
Parent (2)	Parent election	Francis Keeling (FK)	11/7/20
	Parent election	Hannah Richardson (HR)	1/2/18
Head Teacher	Ex officio	<b>Helen Frostick (HF)</b>	n/a
Staff (1)	Staff election	Rachel Cooke (RC)	30/10/21

**bold = absent**

**Also attended:**

Catherine Hughes – Associate Member (CHu)  
Jan Hopkins – Clerk (JH)  
Canon Francis Moran – Observer (FM)

<b>1.</b>	<b>OPENING REMARKS AND APOLOGIES</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
<b>1.1</b>	The meeting commenced at 7.30pm with a prayer led by Canon Francis Moran.	
<b>1.2</b>	Apologies had been received from HF.	
<b>2.</b>	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>	
<b>2.1</b>	There were no declarations of pecuniary or personal interest for this meeting.	
<b>3.</b>	<b>MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING</b>	
<b>3.1</b>	The draft minutes of the full governing board meeting held on 19/10/17 had been circulated to all governors prior to the meeting. There were no comments on these minutes so ABr signed and dated them.	
<b>3.2</b>	Since the last full governing board meeting governors had approved the following: - CHu be appointed as an Associate Member of the full governing board for a four-year term of office commencing 8/11/17 - NG be reappointed as LA Governor for a further four-year term of office commencing 6/1/18	
<b>4.</b>	<b>CHAIR'S REPORT</b>	
<b>4.1</b>	The Chair's Report had previously been circulated. Highlights included: -	

<p>4.2</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.4</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.6</p> <p>4.7</p> <p>4.8</p> <p>4.9</p> <p>4.10</p>	<p>Canon Francis Moran, the new Parish Priest at St Mary Magdalen's Catholic Church in Mortlake since September 2017, was welcomed to the meeting as an observer.</p> <p>Rachel Cooke, the newly elected Staff Governor commencing 30/10/17, was welcomed to her first full governing board meeting.</p> <p>As HR's term of office as an elected Parent Governor ends on 1/2/18 ABr thanked her on behalf of the full governing board for her hard work and valuable contributions during her term of office and presented her with a card and a bouquet of flowers as a token of their appreciation. An election for a further Parent Governor will soon take place in the school.</p> <p>Benchmarking comments would be on the agenda for the next Curriculum Committee meeting.</p> <p>The comparative data regarding, for example, pupil progress and staffing, had been updated in December and would be on the agenda for the next Finance Committee meeting.</p> <p>The governors impact challenge and evidence folder located in the school office is a good resource if required during an inspection as it contains information regarding, for example, governing board committee membership, Code of Conduct, governor visits, for example SS's visit on guided reading. Data will overlap with other data we already have, and the evidence impact relates back to development planning.</p> <p>ABr regularly inspects the Single Central Record, which contains, for example, records regarding safeguarding and DBS certificates, recording when it is inspected, as this could be needed if a safeguarding query were to arise.</p> <p><i>Q When was the last Ofsted visit?</i> 2013. The criteria for an inspection is usually one or more triggers that may include, for example, a new Head Teacher, a fall in standards, a safeguarding issue, or a complaint.</p> <p><i>Q How far will Ofsted let a school go before coming in?</i> There is no limit, for example although it used to be a five-year gap we have had a seven-year gap in the past.</p>	<p>ABr</p> <p>CHo</p>
<p>5.</p> <p>5.1</p> <p>5.1.1</p>	<p><b>HEAD TEACHER'S REPORT</b></p> <p>The Head Teacher's Report had previously been circulated. CHu highlighted the following: -</p> <p><b>English Fluency/Proficiency in English</b> There is no data under English fluency. It could not be extracted from the system but remains relatively similar although one thing noticed is increasingly in-year admissions have a high proportion of EAL children and those with low levels of English fluency, for example three new children in Reception are all EAL; this is just something to be aware of.</p>	

5.1.2	<p><b>Safeguarding</b></p> <p>The safeguarding audit mentioned in ABr's report had been very valuable. Wendy Burns (WB), the school's Inclusion Manager, had decided to ask for this with HF, so we could ensure the school is doing all that we should in this area and improve practice if possible as this subject is such a focus for Ofsted and is the most important practice that the school carries out. The audit was carried out by Linda Sheehan, who is Ofsted trained, and gave very good feedback but the formal report is still awaited and can either be circulated to the full governing board or perhaps a small working party could be established to scrutinise it. It illustrated that the school has established best practice and highlighted areas for development and will be looked at in more detail once WB has worked on an action plan. A letter was being circulated to all parents tomorrow detailing the arrangements for both in and out of school in order to keep the children safe.</p>	
5.1.3	<p><b>Staff</b></p> <p>The situation is stable. Some students have recently joined the school, for example two Spanish students, and a student has just joined the Y5 class, illustrating the school's ongoing commitment to the teaching profession.</p>	
5.1.4	<p><b>CPD</b></p> <p>A fabulous Inset Day for the locality was held just after the October 2017 half term which was well attended and an opportunity to meet with people from other schools.</p>	
5.1.5	<p><b>Visits and Visitors</b></p> <p>Numerous trips and visits continue to take place.</p>	
5.1.6	<p><b>SDP</b></p> <p>This featured in the Head's report for autumn 2017 however it doesn't change much. Monitoring tasks have been undertaken and performance management completed by the end of term, although October is the aim.</p>	
5.1.7	<p><b>Liturgical Life of the School</b></p> <p>This is a huge strength. The school is currently awaiting an RE Section 48 Inspection which is on a five-year cycle, unlike the Ofsted Section 5 Inspections, so will happen sometime this year, and the school will be given two days' notice. The first section of a Section 48 Inspection looks at the quality of provision of Catholic liturgical life in the school, as well as leadership and monitoring which mostly relates to governors, for example attending Masses, taking part in liturgies, religious education. The second section looks at pupils' achievement and enjoyment, for example collective worship, pupils' contribution, quality of worship, leadership and monitoring, and they may also look at a Curriculum Committee meeting. Preparation for a Section 48 Inspection is carried out in the same way as for a Section 5 Inspection in that the school rates itself on an evaluation form although the format changed at the start of the year. CHu has spoken to the Diocese and FM and it is unlikely for the school to get a Section 48 Inspection while the Head Teacher is absent.</p>	
5.1.8	<p><i>Q Do Section 48 inspectors want to meet with Foundation Governors when they come into school?</i></p> <p>Yes. The Diocese tries to come in and see good things and provide challenge and scrutiny, but it isn't as combative as a Section 5 Inspection. It is still not easy, but it is an inclusive process; the tone is different.</p>	

5.1.9	<p><b>Community Cohesion</b></p> <p>Arts Week, Fair Trade Week and World Book Day are all coming up. The school has once again been offered the use of the Stag Brewery field for Sports Day and the Mortlake Summer Fair which is wonderful because it was unexpected, and the PTA are getting involved. Governors were encouraged to look at the Easigrass outside the Reception Class which is the talk of the school!</p>	
5.1.10	<p><b>Autumn 2017 Report to Governors by Jenell Chetty (SIP)/ Performance Summary Report 2016/17 prepared by Arbor</b></p> <p>Jenell Chetty's report contains data targets and objectives for this year. Jenell is the school's new SIP from AfC, and has lots of education experience, and is also a former Head Teacher. She works with the school to identify ways to make sure it maintains outstanding practice and had come in during the autumn term and carried out a learning walk with HF, observing all teachers apart from one who was absent. Jenell concluded that there were lots of strengths, with a couple of areas highlighted to consider. Training is being put in place to support, scheduled for this term, which she will do as well as reviewing the model of best practice within the school. The baseline data is being moderated for Reception Class; the children are assessed when they first come into school aged four, and all targets have been agreed in the report. The school is looking at four key priorities.</p>	
5.1.10.1	<p><b>1) 19% on track to reach high standard of maths</b></p> <p>15 children are being targeted in the hope that they will improve. If this can be achieved it will give the school 57% at the higher standard at maths although realistically this will not happen. There is no more funding for individual tuition any more. There are a lot of staff in Y6 and their expertise is being used to target children and push them to do the best they can. The expectation is to get more than 32%.</p>	
5.1.10.2	<p><i>Q With regard to the Arbor Report, page 8 shows a perfect 100% Y6 pupils got across the board last year for expected standard, however it shows a lower percentage than other schools for higher standard so if a huge effort is being put into getting all children up to expected standard, is there a trade off?</i></p> <p>There is a caveat to this answer. It varies according to the cohort. If the school does not have low attaining children it can put effort into higher attaining, ie it is still possible to get 100% but this will not happen with the current cohort as some are low attaining and unlikely to get to that level. It has been decided to split the additional support, targeting to get to the expected level and the higher standard. According to the LA schools' ratings the school is 11% lower than Barnes Primary and other schools in the borough. The school recognised the needs of the current Y6 cohort and has put a lot of support in knowing that it will be needed; it is 100% more challenging than last year.</p>	
5.1.10.3	<p><i>Q Is it the case that a significant number of pupils only just missed the higher standard?</i></p> <p>The profile of the children is not quite as stark. There is a lot of data and if you look at the average point score compared to other schools there is very little disparity. A number of higher standard children all did really well, with some achieving the maximum possible score so the average points score looks high.</p>	
5.1.10.4	<p><i>Q Were the progress scores high?</i></p> <p>Yes. The second document illustrates this.</p>	

5.1.10.5	<b>2) Improve Writing</b>	
5.1.10.6	<p><i>Q Are pupils making good progress?</i>  Yes, there will be more information after half term as a summative assessment will have taken place.</p>	
5.1.10.7	<p><i>Q Is the gap narrowing?</i>  There is an issue with this. Reading and writing are not the same thing, they are qualitatively different. Reading does not require as many, or the same, skills as writing, although there is a large crossover. Reading a lot tends to be indicative of becoming a good writer but this is not absolute. Any school that rates writing higher than reading is not working in the natural order of things. Writing is teacher assessed and reading is not so the trend is for writing to be higher than reading.</p>	
5.1.10.8	<p><i>Q Are teachers sufficiently challenged?</i>  Targeted provision comes in place in Y2 and all through the school. The data shows progress as well as attainment. There is EYFS work taking place with the Reception Class teacher, and ongoing work for the rest of the year. A local EYFS outreach group is being formed, and this requires a lot of moderation and resources. The target is 77% (up 5% on last year). Assessment will be discussed at a later date.</p>	
5.1.10.9	<p>Page 6 of Jenell’s report looks at learning and progress and what we have targeted for the forthcoming year and is very much curriculum focused. It is based on the Fischer Family Trust (fft) and prior attainment. (fft looks at the school and pupils and then forecasts expectations necessary to become an outstanding school).</p>	
5.1.10.10	<p><i>Q What does “GPS” stand for?</i>  Grammar, punctuation and spelling. It was good when the new curriculum came in but by putting in statutory assessment children are learning grammar but not in the way they can apply it. It is important to integrate and contextualise it in their writing. It is assessment week next week and the children very much enjoy the grammar assessment.</p>	
5.1.10.11	<p>With regard to page 5 of the Arbor Report, all SEND children will eventually have an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) instead of an SEN Statement. All data on pages 4-5 will build up any emerging trends over time, for example more children with EHCPs, more PP, more Level 6, so that provision can be matched. It is good to look at trends over a five-year period. It compares to the LA and nationally, showing performance is excellent which is good news.</p>	
5.1.10.12	<p><i>Q How is the data selected?</i>  Sometimes it is to do with attainment, size, whether voluntary-aided, single form entry, demographic data, or location. Page 17 relates to wealthy/deprived areas. Page 8 shows the higher standard is not being expected but is excellent by comparison, so it is something to focus on and is useful data to have which the Curriculum Committee could bring to their meeting.</p>	

6.	<b>COMMITTEES</b>	
6.1	<b>CURRICULUM COMMITTEE</b>	
6.1.1	The minutes of the Curriculum Committee meeting held on 10/10/17 had been circulated to all governors prior to the meeting.	
6.1.2	The committee will meet again sometime in the next half term.	ABr
6.2	<b>FINANCE COMMITTEE</b>	
6.2.1	The Finance Committee had met on 1/2/18 and the draft minutes of this meeting will be circulated in due course.	
6.2.2	CHo reported that ten months into the year the current state was £1,300 revenue carry forward to the next year which basically means about £24,000 of reserves will have been used. The end of March 2018 carryforward will be a positive balance going into next year. Rosemary McGuire (RM), the school's Finance Officer, will work on the budget for the coming financial year and then the committee will discuss it in March. It will be challenging but it is the same for all schools. Income will be relatively flat regarding per pupil funding, and there will be cost rises, for example 2% staff salary awards are expected.	CHo
6.2.3	<p><i>Q Of the £24,000 extra spent this year, were there any exceptional items?</i></p> <p>There are always a few, for example a one-off £3,000 had to be repaid to the borough as they had made a Borough-wide mistake the previous year regarding supply teacher insurance. Staff sickness and issues such as the boiler breaking down can all have an impact.</p>	
6.2.4	<p><i>Q Is there provision for the kitchen?</i></p> <p>Yes, because the new contract doesn't include cover for kitchen equipment any more. The school has been lucky so far with the kitchen maintenance funds of £12,000 being able to be diverted into other areas but it may have to be put back. There are a number of items that HF and RM can scrutinise.</p>	
6.2.5	<p><i>Q The £24,000 figure, how does that compare to previous years?</i></p> <p>It is not unusual. The school has had to dip into its reserves in the last couple of years. Five or six years ago low budgets tended to be set, and extra money would come in during the year. Money is still needed from the PTA and a grant is coming for the extra class provision – a one-off payment of £40,000 to a school that takes an extra class - some of which is needed because Reception Class is more expensive.</p>	
6.2.6	<p><b>Finance Audit</b></p> <p>The biennial audit of the unofficial fund passed with flying colours. There had also been a complete financial audit last term by the borough auditor with no major issues arising although there were some minor ones that the school must respond to.</p>	

6.2.7	<p><b>GDPR</b></p> <p>This comes into effect on 25/5/18 and there are various things to be done. The school is subscribing to GDPR in Schools (GDPRiS) which provides a lot of useful things, for example they vet the processors the school uses regarding parents, pupils and staff data. It is important to adhere to this otherwise the school is liable and there are safeguards in place. The cost is £250 so it is worth doing. The school is also joining forces together with six other schools to pay a seventh of £950, that being the cost to get a Data Protection Policy drafted specially for schools and also a Privacy Notice to go on the website, the latter needing to be incredibly detailed. CHo advised that he was attending the LA training session, How Will the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) Affect Schools? on 27/2/18 and will report further to governors on this subject afterwards.</p>	CHo
6.2.8	<p><b>Whole School Pay Policy</b></p> <p>The committee had reviewed the draft Whole School Pay Policy circulated to all governors prior to the meeting. It had been updated to reflect the actual pay rates in place since September 2017. A clause had also been added to cover how overtime for support staff is managed. Governors approved this policy.</p>	
6.2.9	<p><b>Whistleblowing Policy</b></p> <p>The committee has reviewed the draft Whistleblowing Policy, based on the LA model, circulated to all governors prior to the meeting. The draft will be passed to WB, before finalising.</p>	CHo
6.2.10	<p><b>Roles and Responsibilities Document</b></p> <p>It was proposed to incorporate the Personnel Committee with the Finance Committee and call the new committee the Finance &amp; Resources Committee, so a new draft Roles and Responsibilities document had been circulated to all governors prior to the meeting. The meeting acknowledged that this would be beneficial as personnel issues relate directly to the budget.</p>	
6.2.11	<p><i>Q Are there any confidentiality issues with this arrangement?</i></p> <p>No, panels can still be convened as and when. Most schools have these two spheres of interest under the umbrella of one committee. The governors approved this new arrangement.</p>	
6.2.12	<p>The next meeting of the Finance &amp; Resources Committee will be held in the school in March 2018, the date and time to be confirmed.</p>	CHo
6.3	<p><b>PERSONNEL COMMITTEE</b></p>	
6.3.1	<p>The Personnel Committee had not met since the last full governing board meeting.</p>	
6.4	<p><b>PREMISES COMMITTEE</b></p>	
6.4.1	<p>The Premises Committee had not met since the last full governing board meeting.</p>	
6.5	<p><b>ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE</b></p>	
6.5.1	<p>The Admissions Committee had not met since the last full governing board meeting.</p>	

<p>6.5.2</p> <p>6.5.3</p> <p>6.6</p> <p>6.6.1</p> <p>6.6.2</p>	<p>The next Admissions Committee meetings had been provisionally agreed to take place in the school on Wednesday 21/2/18 and Tuesday 27/2/18 at times to be advised. Sixty places are available for the Reception class intake 2018-19 and the meeting was advised that two days before the deadline there were already 84 applicants, so the situation was looking better than last time with hopefully lots of first preferences. HF had put lots of provision in place, for example twenty families had attended the open morning and six families had attended the open afternoon.</p> <p><i>Q How do you know applicants have put the school as their first preference?</i> You don't, you just know how many applications there are in total, although all siblings will be first preference. There is more data about preference if there is an appeal.</p> <p><b>PAY COMMITTEE</b></p> <p>The Pay Committee had not met since the last full governing board meeting.</p> <p>Performance Management of the Head Teacher had taken place on 20/11/17 carried out by ABr, CHo and LO, followed by a meeting, and ABr was completing the paperwork for this.</p>	<p>NG</p>
<p>7.</p> <p>7.1</p> <p>7.2</p>	<p><b>MORTLAKE LEVEL CROSSING UPDATE</b></p> <p>This subject was last reported to the FGB on 19/10/16. The following documents had been circulated to all governors prior to the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Network Rail Mortlake Level Crossing Risk Assessment dated 26/7/17</li> <li>- Hamilton-Baille Associates Ltd Sheen Lane Report dated January 2017 commissioned by Thomson House School</li> </ul> <p>PK explained that the Network Rail report assessed the dangers and qualities of Mortlake Level Crossing, and the report by Hamilton Baille, who were traffic environment specialists, had been commissioned by Thomson House and had come up with proposals to improve the environment of Mortlake Level Crossing. Two years ago, PK had met with Thomson House and a local councillor and all acknowledged that the crossing was dangerous but no one wanted to get involved. A minor achievement has been the recent work carried out to tidy up the pavements leading to the crossing and the general area. The key points are that Network Rail acknowledge it is a dangerous crossing – the fourth most dangerous in the South Western Railway area – and there are many ways it could be improved, for example CCTV, moving the sides of the crossing back, and they have looked at a variety of possibilities however none pass their cost benefit criteria, ie they cannot justify carrying out any work. The Hamilton Baille approach would be to restructure the whole of Sheen Lane, from the Sheen Lane crossroads to Mortlake High Street, involving traffic calming measures, better visibility, and better integration between pedestrians and road users. Their report is quite impressive, as are some of the measures they have implemented elsewhere, however Richmond Council would not be prepared to spend those sums of money, and the issue is complicated further by the fact that Network Rail would have to be involved, and if the work stretched as far as the South Circular, then that would involve Transport for London as it is part of a 'red route'. However, the Stag Brewery Redevelopment will change this as one issue that is emerging from that study is how will the area cope with the</p>	



	<p>increased weight of traffic as the developer had identified that the pedestrian traffic using the crossing to/from the station will increase so it is possible that if the redevelopment does go ahead then it might earmark funds to deal with this issue. It is a long process but Thomson House, who are more directly involved than us as they are next door, are holding meetings with the council. PK has tried to contact Cathy Tilley, Thomson House's Business Manager, on this issue, but has so far not been successful. It is interesting to note that when Thomson House was still being proposed Network Rail had objected because they said it would be too close to the railway. They had completed an analysis report of how many people jump over the barriers, drive through the crossing at high speed etc so it is an interesting report to read. Governors heard how British Transport Police occasionally has a member of staff dressed as a white rabbit to encourage children to use the footbridge rather than the crossing. The biggest problem was that the crossing is closed for somewhere between 40-47 minutes in every hour. The issue remains ongoing.</p>	<b>PK</b>
<p><b>8.</b></p> <p><b>8.1</b></p> <p><b>8.1.1</b></p> <p><b>8.1.2</b></p> <p><b>8.1.3</b></p> <p><b>8.1.4</b></p> <p><b>8.2</b></p>	<p><b>TRAINING</b></p> <p>Since the last full governing board meeting the following training had been undertaken:</p> <p>CHo:  15/11/17: Online Safeguarding for School Governors*  28/11/17: Analyse School Performance Briefing (Primary)*  29/11/17: Academies &amp; MATs – Exploring Models &amp; Structures*  * A report on these training events had been circulated to all governors prior to the meeting.</p> <p>PK:  29/11/17: Academies &amp; MATs – Exploring Models &amp; Structures</p> <p>FK:  27/1/18: Getting to Grips with Governance (Intensive)</p> <p>JH:  21/11/17: Clerks' Briefing</p> <p>Governors attention was drawn to the extensive training programme offered by the LA, the details of which are available through their website.</p>	
<p><b>9.</b></p> <p><b>9.1</b></p>	<p><b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b></p> <p><b><i>BARNES PRIMARY SCHOOL EXPANSION CONSULTATION</i></b></p> <p>CHu had attended a meeting of local schools on this subject and a further meeting was planned for next week led by Lowther Primary. East Sheen Primary, St Osmund's, Kew Riverside, Sheen Mount and Thomson House are all not objecting to the proposal but are taking queries to the local authority as to the rationale behind this proposed expansion given that many schools are not full. Barnes Primary is already a two-form entry school and the proposed expansion will see it increase to a three-form entry school, and its position as the fourth best school nationally obviously affects other schools. The meeting noted that East Sheen Primary is also becoming a three-form entry school. CHu is unable to attend this meeting due to a clash with parents evening that day but the meeting was advised that a governor can attend. The meeting is</p>	

