

**DRAFT MINUTES**  
**of the meeting of Teignmouth Community School Local Governing Body held on**  
**Thursday 5 December 2019 at 6 pm in the Library, TCS, Exeter Road.**

Present:

Name	Title/Role	Initials
Karine Davies	Governor	KD
Mark McCarthy	Governor	MMc
Vic Millard	Chair of Governors	VM
Sarah Minty-Dyke	Governor, Staff, ER	SMD
Mark Moore	Vice Chair of Governors	MM
James O'Connell	Principal, ER	JPO
Katy Quinn	CEO/Principal ML	KQ
Sarah Sabourin	Governor Responsible for Safeguarding	SS
Annabelle Thomas	Head of School, ML	AT
Luke Williams	Governor, Staff, ML	LW
Gaby Willis	Clerk	GW

**Action**

VM opened the meeting at 6.04 pm and welcomed everyone.		
<b>05.12.01</b>	<b>Apologies for Absence:</b> Mike Stean (MS) Sarah Sabourin (SS)	
<b>05.12.02</b>	Declarations of Interest: None	
<b>05.12.03</b>	<b>Resignation of a Governor:</b> MS has notified the Clerk and Chair of his wish to resign from the LGB. Proposed SMD, seconded MMc. <b>ACCEPTED.</b>	<b>GW</b>
<b>05.12.04</b>	<b>Minutes of previous LGB Meeting and Matters Arising (18.9.19):</b> 180904 Reserves Policy: VM informed the LGB that it was agreed at OLT that the target for reserves across the Trust be set as £350k. Current reserves level of £170k. TCS (ER and ML) had historically achieved an acceptable reserve of £200k, although this had been impacted in the last 3 years by unbudgeted events. Bearing this in mind, with a now expanded trust, it is felt that a figure of £350k is reasonable to cover contingencies and risk.	
	Page 2 suggestion from MMc of inclusion of Strategic Intentions in the LGB handbook. KQ: Agreed that this is a 'live' document - in its early stages and for this early phase of the Trust will be regularly reviewed and updated. Will look at this suggestion. <b>Action for GW to c/f.</b>	<b>GW</b>
	Linking SI's to Principals reports. <b>Action: GW to send TCS SIs to AT and JPO.</b>	<b>GW</b>
	180906 Website. KQ: ML website has had many improvements made and is now looking good. Accept that compliance, Osprey and inter school links still require attention. In January it will be a priority for Jo Hussain to look at these areas. VM: Might it be a good idea to invite Jo Hussain to present plans and ideas to a future meeting? <b>Action: GW to invite Jo Hussain to the March LGB.</b>	<b>KQ</b> <b>GW</b>
	180909 SI on safeguarding action supporting wellbeing of students. MM think committees should reflect SIs and may be a matter for that new committee to consider and propose relevant SI's. <b>Action: SS as Chair of SPDB Committee to look at this.</b>	<b>SS</b>
	180910 <b>Action: GW to correct 'provision' mapping wording from 'revision' mapping.</b>	<b>GW</b>

	180912 Meeting cycles – on agenda for this meeting.	
	<p>Recruitment of further governors: KQ: work has been done around the recruitment processes for governors and directors. We now have a new governor application form and process. This will be ratified by the OLT Board at its next meeting on 16 December.</p> <p><b>Action: GW to add advert from KQ on Devon Governor portal and school website for Jan 2020.</b></p> <p>VM: The CEO and I (and others from board and LGB) have interviewed potential new recruits and there are more we are planning to meet. Reassure LGB that we are giving considerable time to this and are confident that there will be progress. Helpful that we now have a proper and clear process in place.</p>	<b>GW</b>
	Minutes of previous meeting <b>AGREED</b> and signed by VM as Chair.	
<b>05.12.05</b>	<p><b>MAT Training Review:</b> Discussion and debrief around this review, which most governors had attended on 16 Oct. General agreement that the session was useful. KQ -feedback from other LGBs was that it was found very useful also. Another planned for February. This to be more of an interactive meeting and evaluation of progress and issues – what is going well and EBI. Julie Stechbury Ullha (independent specialist) will facilitate the session. The objective being to agree and plan what is needed to be achieved in the next 12 months. KQ welcomed any comments. None made.</p>	
<b>05.12.06</b>	<p><b>One/Two Schools:</b> VM: This matter was discussed within Part II at last meeting. Agreement at that Part II was we should evaluate the status quo of the workings and effectiveness between the 2 schools, bearing in mind that the ‘one school’ approach had been notionally in place for several years but showing questionable effectiveness. It was also agreed at that meeting that a full staff survey be put into effect. The results of this survey are in the governors documents. By launching the survey, the matter was now in the open domain. Having now had time to consider all aspects, including the staff survey, <b>the consideration is whether to continue with the current strategic and operational ambition of one school or should we move to a de-coupling of ML and ER?</b> Believe we must accept that to continue as we are is not an option. We must either develop a workable plan for reinforcing and developing what is currently a largely notional ‘one school’ or put in place a plan for decoupling. Invite school Leadership to start the conversation and to include the results of the staff survey. JPO: I’ve not had the same investment as others will have due my length of time with the school so am well placed to give an impartial view. Have raised point with KQ and VM previously that I don’t think we have one school. We have two Heads, two Leadership teams, two staff bodies. If we were to be truly one school we would need to restructure properly with one Head over both schools and a number of roles across both schools. This would be ambitious and challenging. This would provide continuity from Year 1 to Year 13, but there is also the factor that we now have three other primary schools – how would roles fit in the MAT? Believe that with the current challenges at ER it would be very risky to move to a proper one school at this stage.</p> <p>KQ: Have been involved prior to the move to one school and throughout the efforts to make it effective. ‘Heart’ invested in one school vision we once had, wouldn’t have brought about the change we did at Inverteign (ML) without the wider structure and support and challenge from the secondary school. There are educational benefits, but my ‘head’ says both better served as two separate institutions but within the family of schools that is now the OLT. Still closely</p>	

collaborate, share and work on projects already in place but ER and ML are at different points. About sharing things to make a difference but operating as two separate entities within the OLT. In the staff questionnaire the transition question is the one that stands out as strongly important to staff.

SMD: Totally agree. Wider structure of support you refer to is now the MAT. Transition is a Teignmouth-wide transition, all feeder schools, not just ones in the MAT, are involved. Can see that the challenges and issues at the two schools at present are very different. Concern as to how other primaries in MAT would feel.

KQ: The other schools that have joined see us as separate already.

SMD: A lot of time and resources would have to go onto making a true one school.

KQ: JPO has important school priorities to focus on at ER and work and time needed for this wouldn't be proportionate.

MMc: Demonstrate to other schools separate entities as now 5 schools, so becomes a positive message. *All agreed.*

This was touched on in FHRE Committee as to how to share expertise, there would need to be cautious to ensure we don't lose this.

AT: It was very positive at the beginning and helped ML to improve but we do see it working quite separately now. Separate policies that don't really tie up and can be an issue. We have built good relationships which will continue.

LW: Benefits to children and staff would still happen because of the MAT.

MM: Reasonably significant support amongst the staff body for aspects of one school so important to hear that and ensure we maintain those good aspects going forward. We said providing an all through school was very important in SIs and this is one of the things that is different and special about TCS. Procedural around SI which is out of date and needs to be changed. Second is in committing to all through spoken about Early Years and Sixth Form and we remain committed to that. This early cross-working is very important and needs to be maintained. Would like to hear more at a future meeting as don't feel at moment we have structures in place to see how we can share across the MAT to ensure we maintain what is important to the LGB and staff.

VM: Do the LGB feel comfortable with the information available and views expressed? Do the LGB believe we have sufficient information and considered opinion to decide a way forward?

MMc: What would that look like? Separate governance structures? A change would be following another recent and large change.

VM: Issues of governance and other structural and operational matters should come after the key strategic decision. If governance processes were to be a challenge should that be a reason not to decouple? Short term answer to that would be continue with one governance structure until such time we felt it should or could be split. From what has been presented so far decoupling appears to be the direction of travel. View would be that should such a decision be made there then would follow the detailed planning for bringing it about.

MMc: I would be more cautious and like to see the model of what the aspiration is that the decoupled schools look like and understand what that is, rather than progress the decision and then ask what it is going to look like.

VM: That needs to be weighed against the current unacceptable uncertainty, fudge, and lack of direction that currently exists at all levels of the schools and the MAT.

MMc: That trades one uncertainty for another.

KD: What is the implication of decoupling?

KQ: From a governance viewpoint if two schools that would be two LGBs so the decision is whether we split this LGB and governors choose which one they wish

	<p>to sit on, as we did with the OLT Board and TCS LGB, or seek to set up another LGB and this group stay with one. Have to be separate governance structure so those staff would attend committees for issues around their own school. This would reduce the length of time of meetings and allow more depth of focus around key issues.</p> <p><b>KD: Is there any financial implication?</b></p> <p>KQ: We are one entity, as we are one learning trust, so one bank account, with funds separated between each school. Funds are coded so we do look at them individually - so it is an easy system. Complexities around policies and some staff.</p> <p>MMc: Other unknown is how we ensure we maintain those non-financial and human collaborations. Unsure if that is going to be there.</p> <p>VM: We know what is not working currently, and there is a great deal as one school. Not persuaded that issues outlined by MM create any risk of detriment. The current benefits of transition are well embedded and of benefit to both ML and ER.</p> <p>MM: The concern is those issues that aren't necessarily in the interest of either school and could fall by the wayside when people are very busy. I'm looking for some reassurance around that. Would like to say come back to us with a plan. Persuaded conscious uncoupling is right way to go at moment for both. Comfortable with small level of complexity it will take. Happy to agree and ask for plans to be made and presented.</p> <p>KQ: Collaboration is a mind-set. Since JPO has been in post we have talked and planned more together than occurred in 2 years preceding. Mind-set is shared with JPO, KQ and AT and not influenced by being one or 2 schools.</p> <p><b>KQ: Happy to put together decoupling and collaboration plan.</b></p> <p>VM - Understand feeling of need for caution by some and don't want to push further than we should at this stage. <b>Believe that we have reached a point of considering whether we move forward with a plan to decouple, but that the final decision would require agreement on a detailed plan?</b></p> <p>MMc: Yes absolutely.</p> <p>VM: I ask the LGB to vote on the principle of agreeing to decouple ER and ML, but to look closely at a detailed plan for this (at the next meeting) before actioning. <b>All in favour, no abstentions.</b></p> <p><b>Action: KQ and JPO to bring action and implications plan to the next meeting.</b></p> <p><b>MMc: Presumably work for Trust board is to how to fill the potential gaps in governance?</b></p> <p>KQ: Trust board could decide they don't want another LGB and could look at a different committee structure. Recommendation to Trust board has to come from LGB.</p> <p><b>Action: VM to raise at OLT Board.</b></p>	<p>KQ</p> <p>KQ/JPO</p> <p>VM</p>
<p>05.12.07</p>	<p><b>Principal's Report ML:</b> AT gave presentation, including feedback and actions from mock Ofsted. Knowledge Organisers are used for different subjects and at ML for different topics, linking in key vocabulary and looking at who the audience is. Information is on the website.</p> <p><b>MMc: Curriculum items on website is a really good example. Need to raise awareness of parents being notified it is on there.</b></p> <p>AT: Looking at linking this in with the school app. Aim to be mostly paperless by September.</p> <p>Noted high level of FTE, context of which was discussed at EOC Committee.</p> <p><b>VM: For 4 year trend on exclusions does the same criteria apply, as it appears the last 2 years has an upwards trend?</b></p>	

	<p>KQ: AT has presented whole year figures for the others and this is just for one term.</p> <p>AT: Similar cycle as 4 years ago. EP said we have a high need at school in terms of behaviour, and we manage this very well.</p> <p>KQ: A lot of FTE around children being physical against staff and other students. Use many interventions, some students are in the wrong provision and takes time for pathway and process.</p> <p>MM: <i>Aware of experience in ER about too many FTEs. It is operational, but question as to whether we can provide a degree of support and get involved as governors to provide reassurance and can demonstrate this to Ofsted?</i></p> <p>KQ: Don't feel it is higher than it has been before. Tend to have peak of exclusions before and after Christmas. Not unduly concerned about trajectory of these exclusions as know other things are to be in place for these students soon.</p> <p><b>Action: Closer monitor on this in the SPDB Committee.</b></p> <p>VM: <i>Where does ML stand as national comparison?</i></p> <p>KQ: Above national for PP, SEN, EHCPs, and there is a story behind all the data.</p> <p><b>Action: AT to put national comparison data on for next time.</b></p> <p>SMD: Must put into context that local authority SEN team are failing. In other cities with more funding they may have places available for young people that need to be in a different provision.</p> <p>Noted that the Mock Ofsted report was shared at EOC Committee.</p> <p><b>Action: Share this with LGB. GW/AT</b></p> <p>KQ: We may need to be better at feeding back to LGB views of EPs. Successful phonics session, local community activities such as lantern making for town parade. Talked about Quest days that have been shared from Kenton Primary. Noted that LW attended Kenton parent forum recently. Attendance 96.45% so above Devon and national. Noted that Reception new legislation full time place from September but as a school promote phased transition into reception so if later birthday won't be included so Reception is never included in attendance figures.</p> <p><b>Action: AT currently doing NPQH around first slide reading from KS1 to KS2 and for this is required to do a presentation to governors which has to be recorded. AT to do this at next LGB and take questions at the end. GW to add to agenda.</b></p>	<p>SS/VM</p> <p>AT</p> <p>AT/GW</p> <p>AT/GW</p>
<p>05.12.08</p>	<p><b>Principal's Report ER:</b> JPO shared presentation, with update to SIP and action plan.</p> <p>VM: <i>In terms of change to BFL strategy is it an actual procedural change and rewrite or is it a change of emphasis?</i></p> <p>JPO: Interactions and behaviours. We are not changing the system, it is about culture and ethos, training and getting everyone on board with consistency.</p> <p>VM: <i>Can you give a timescale on marketing strategy for Sixth Form?</i></p> <p>JPO: In terms of the basic system probably good to do this as a separate item <b>and invite the Head of Sixth Form to come and talk about this at next meeting.</b></p> <p><b>Action: MM action from EOC Committee on GW's agenda cycle.</b></p> <p>JPO discussed proposal to review curriculum. JPO: Some ideas have been shown previously to governors and talked about very openly with staff, and Heads of Faculties are still feeding back. Staff feedback largely in favour of two-week timetable. Against is possible confusion with students about when to bring PE kits etc. Enables more flexibility in the curriculum and the weeks don't have to be completely different. Move very much towards two-week timetable and five one hour lessons. Biggest factor that staff recognise is less time wasted in changeovers on such a big site. Have had no negatives from staff. Small</p>	<p>JPO/GW</p> <p>MM/GW</p>

	<p>consideration is that double lessons are two hours, which is someway counterbalanced with two-week timetable. Possible in January creating a junior TLR post for running the PHSE team. Invite questions on the proposal.</p> <p>VM: On the question of accountability my understanding is that governors have joint accountability for curriculum reviews together with Leadership. Whilst I am fully supportive of this proposal it is important that the LGB consider their role in needing to approve this or otherwise.</p> <p>MM: Looked at this in EOC with a view of its fitting in with culture, and ethos of school. Had some discussion around KS3 and 4 as clear advantages with pupil engagement and felt JPO gave compelling data. Didn't feel as a committee any issues with this proposal.</p> <p>SMD: When we went to 3 year KS4 the exams and curriculum structure was very different and a lot more coursework based, so 3 year fitted with that better but that is not the case now. Like that the choices are made in Year 9 rather than Year 8.</p> <p>KD: KS3 needs to be properly thought about as it is felt as a 'waiting area' to start and strengthening of skills for students to learn is needed.</p> <p><b>Action: JPO to come back to LGB with more detailed curriculum plan and intent statements – summary from every area and plan from Year 7 to 13 about what they do and how. First intent by January and overview by March.</b></p> <p>MMc: Asked about this at a parent forum previously and some parents spoke in favour of current model, but there was not enough time to explore this.</p> <p>KD: Think way it was presented possibly skewed feedback.</p> <p>JPO: There is no set of evidence data for either approach, but there are good arguments both ways.</p> <p>MM: You mentioned one lesson after lunch? Are you changing the duration of the day? Also, procedurally, knowing actions are in motion do you need approval from us at this meeting?</p> <p>JPO: Need to communicate with Year 8 pupils we are not running options in January. We are not changing time of school day. Will build times around what we have and would have to consult parents if not. Need to get options data and choices out if sticking with KS4 as is, and in terms of planning to get KS3 learning and curriculum stronger we need to be starting in January.</p> <p>MM: Vulnerability there around the year in transition currently. Need to be careful.</p> <p>SMD: Five one-hour lessons on a class of thirty is one hundred and fifty less students through one door in a week which will impact positively on marking and teacher workload.</p> <p>JPO: Will have time to do more, and better.</p> <p>MMc: Did you come away with any particular steer from parents' forum as to how they felt about these proposals?</p> <p>JPO: Move to building phase into registration time good, enrichment days mixed feeling. Didn't get strong sense of feeling about the one-hour lessons etc.</p> <p><b>VM: Would now ask LGB is it reasonable to seek approval or otherwise of JPO's curriculum proposals?</b></p> <p><b>ALL IN FAVOUR of accepting the Principal's proposal. No abstentions. AGREED.</b></p> <p><b>Action: JPO to come back to next meeting with progress.</b></p> <p>JPO: Exciting opportunities to develop links with MAT schools and feeder schools. Discussion around Strategic Intentions shown in presentation.</p> <p>MM: If setting direction, need to look at these.</p> <p>JPO: Biggest is school improvement, curriculum and culture and ethos.</p> <p><b>Action: JPO expressed desire to come back with national data for FTE if this can be obtained.</b></p>	<p>JPO</p> <p>JPO</p> <p>JPO</p>
--	--	----------------------------------

	<p>KQ: Feedback from Ofsted was children were being passive in lessons, that was negative behaviour, as not necessarily challenged in every lesson. In Ofsted eyes behaviour is about children’s learning behaviour.</p> <p>VM: Challenge is the Ofsted inspector unequivocally expressed that our FTE are high. Ethos is working, but would be helpful to have more information on national data.</p> <p>JPO: Do want FTE to reduce. Safeguarding fits into pattern of attendance and behaviour. Attendance becoming one of biggest priorities at ER. <b>Have strategic plan that will be shared with LGB.</b> Liaising with other local schools to share their best practice. JPO met with EWO yesterday who confirmed we are doing everything expected and our systems are very good. 94.7% national average; 94.2% last year but 3 years ago we were on 96%, Right people in place, culture needs to be stronger to reward and praise. Will launch from January with letters going out.</p> <p>KD: Your comments in letter to parents were very good with strong correlation and linking attendance to attainment.</p> <p>MM: <b>In the last 3 years the structure of exams has changed. Are students possibly a bit bored at the tail end of them?</b></p> <p>JPO: Or anxious or stressed?</p> <p>ER will have a smaller Year 7 next year, with currently about 170 in terms of first choices, so hopefully will come in on 180 PAN. Not planning at present to go over PAN as there is now a strain on our facilities and resources with the large years that the school has taken in previously.</p>	<b>JPO</b>
<b>05.12.09</b>	<p><b>Committee Meetings Schedule:</b> VM: With establishment of Trust Board the financial accountability has largely moved there and creates an opportunity to reduce the frequency of that committee, including the areas of HR and Estates, from 6 to 3 meetings per year. Also, the Safeguarding requirement is to report to LGB once per term. (Currently in place twice per term). The issues around such a reduction have been discussed between the relevant committee chairs (SS and VM) and Leadership. The consensus is that all matters can be fully and suitably covered with this reduced frequency. However, the feeling from the EOC committee is that, with all pressures of new curriculum and Ofsted outcomes, there is a need to remain at 6 committee meetings per year. Questions invited.</p> <p><b>Vote taken on proposal to move to this schedule of committee meetings. All in favour. No abstentions. AGREED.</b></p> <p><b>Action: GW and VM to work out schedule.</b></p>	<b>GW/VM</b>
<b>05.12.10</b>	<p><b>EOC Committee – Key points from minutes:</b> MM: Self-explanatory from minutes. Actions were BFL changes and request this be picked up at SPDB. Important to note raised current apparent underspend in SEN area. VM confirmed Jon Newman (CFO of OLT) has picked this up and is reviewing. Believe that document does not fully include spends. KQ: Fund analysis - FHRE Committee asked Jon Newman to pick this up for SEN and PP for both schools so actual figures will be presented at the next meeting.</p> <p>MM: Spoke about SEN and that ML were looking at putting together a plan. Data cycle and clear expectation from Ofsted is to be less reliant on in-house data and not burdening staff. We are looking at data coming to this committee once a term. GW researched whether we can do this less often and confirmed that we can.</p>	
<b>05.12.11</b>	<p><b>FHRE Committee – Key points from minutes:</b> VM: Advise Alive/Astro being re-launched in January. Now accountable to Trust Board but onsite at ER and therefore of interest to the LGB. New manager has been appointed this week who looks very strong with a good background in gym and understanding of commercial side of operations. Optimistic that re-launch will turn poor</p>	

	<p>performance around at least back to where it was when launched, and also with a new focus on astro. Period 2 LGB management accounts were looked at in detail by the FHRE Committee and pleased to advise look well controlled with staff spend showing a slight saving against budget. Appraisals were covered under Principals Reports. Process worked well and resulted in clear guidance for the Pay Review Committee recommendations. Communications and website update: to reassure the LGB that has been covered in some detail at the committee, and that KQ, Jo Hussain and leadership are working hard to get the website where it needs to be. Still work to be done, particularly for OLT and school links. For information, significant capital expenditure at ER with regard to the boilers. They are in some need of action and spend of £70k is needed to bring them up to date.</p> <p><b>SMD: What is the detail of the potential fire risk shown in the minutes?</b></p> <p>KQ: A large loft space needs to be split.</p> <p><b>Action: VM: Current development plans will need financial costings signed off at this committee. JPO and JN.</b></p>	<b>JPO/JN</b>
<b>05.12.12</b>	<p><b>SPDB Committee – Key points from minutes:</b> VM: In SS absence, believe the issues have been covered in various earlier reports. SMD offered to answer any questions. Agreed that most information had been covered. No questions arising.</p>	
<b>05.12.13</b>	<p><b>Governors Training and Attendance in School:</b> MM attended governors update at Ashburton. Interesting information around Ofsted. Expectation as funding formula sorted, most school budgets should be rising next April. For us as governors interesting document raised “No Need to Exclude”. JPO confirmed this is in PEX folders and is used here. MM: Also went to a primary curriculum training session. Ofsted report called Bold Beginnings which felt useful as CPD and reading. Interesting points, in terms of challenges, that new framework is presenting around Devon for people now being asked to account for subjects as curriculum leads for relatively junior staff. KQ and AT confirmed they have picked up on this and have organised relevant staff into teams and are having people together not alone. Deep dive questions shared, lots of things about mental health on less experienced staff and NQTs. MM: Interesting from Ofsted inspector that focussing on lowest achieving 20% in reading.</p> <p><b>VM - reiterate the need to keep GW informed of attendance at training and in school.</b></p> <p><b>KD: Do Ofsted come back within in a year?</b></p> <p>JPO: 2.5 – 3 years.</p> <p><b>KD: What is the normal timeframe?</b></p> <p>JPO: Think requires improvement grade 2.5-3 years. A ‘good’ would be 5 years. If there are issues that come about they can come back at any time. Likely to be revisited in 2022 spring.</p> <p>SMD: Conscious of fact that as came off EOC Committee was not currently sitting as a governor on a committee. Agreed to re -join the EOC committee.</p> <p><b>Action: GW to advise SMD of next EOC Committee meeting date.</b></p> <p><b>Action: MM to email regarding informal social evening.</b></p>	<b>All</b>
<b>05.12.14</b>	<p>Moved to Part II at 8.17 pm. GW, AT, LW and SMD left the meeting. <b>VM to produce confidential minutes.</b></p>	<b>GW/SMD MM VM</b>