

PRESENT: Stuart Wood (SW) Chair
 Mike Fish (MF)
 Chris Flood (CF)
 Shelley Monk (SM)

APOLOGIES: Prue Rayner (PR)
 Alex Smaridge (AS)

IN ATTENDANCE: Kerrie Jones (KJ)
 Stuart Hales (SH) Clerk

Action Log

Item	Action	Resp.
10.	KJ to ask trust for SW and SM to do safer requirement training	KJ/SW/SM
10.	Governors conditionally approved Safeguarding Policy subject to changes made during the meeting	MF
10.	Governors conditionally approved Positive Behaviour Policy subject to changes made during the meeting	MF
12.	SW, MF & SH to agree meeting dates for 2022-23 before the next LGB meeting in June.	MF/SW/SH

No	Description	Resp.
1.	Welcome from the Chair SW welcomed all to the meeting.	
2.	Apologies and Quorum There were two apologies, and the meeting was quorate. Steve Dawson (SD) did not attend the meeting.	
3.	Declarations of interest There were no declarations of interest for any items on the agenda.	
4.	Agree minutes of previous meeting – 7th March 2022 The minutes had been circulated in advance of the meeting and were agreed as an accurate record. The paper version would be signed by the Chair when he met with the Clerk.	
5.	Matters arising and actions from previous minutes It was agreed all actions had been completed.	
6.	Chairs Report The item was not discussed.	
7.	Project Update Pupil Numbers – MF advised there were currently six reception children with a further ten starting in other year groups – all children had been offered places. The families of two children from out of catchment had requested their children join the school. MF suggested a possible class structure based on current pupil numbers. A governor queried as the design of the school did not allow for parental parking, how would families from out of catchment drop off and pick up children? SW advised there would be a new passage between the development and the adjacent park and ride site. He also advised that there were more families living on the development who had not made their final choices yet – hopefully this would change when the school was complete and it was clear that it would be open in September. A governor queried how many children would start in yr6? MF advised currently two.	

Signed By:	Date:

	<p>SW advised he had met with the Head of a nearby local school last week who was nervous of the effect of the new school on its pupil numbers – there had been clear marketing that the school would first prioritise on children from the Marleigh development, but as it is parental choice, it is very difficult.</p> <p>A governor queried if any children with an EHCP had requested to start? MF advised there had been one, but PR had suggested to the family that a new school would not be the best setting for their child.</p> <p>MF advised the school had decided on a purple theme for its uniform, and he would meet with suppliers on 26 April to discuss this further.</p> <p>School Opening – CF advised the practical completion of the school would be on 26 June and of a recent meeting regarding plans around the formal opening of the school in March 2023. To coincide with the Platinum Jubilee the Market Square would be renamed Jubilee Square and the marketing team from Hill would organise an event on the square on one of the last two weekends in June and CF queried if the school should have a presence there to generate interest? SW & MF responded that it would be good to be there.</p> <p>CF advised the development had always planned to progress with a multi utility provider and SW advised of possible problems as the Trust's central team would like to relocate to the school and required a BT connection to access their systems. Richard Mayer was dealing with this at the Trust.</p>	
8.	<p>Recruitment and Finance Update</p>	
	<p>Recruitment – SW advised that MF had now officially started as the Headteacher. MF then advised of a priority to prepare for the Ofsted pre-opening inspection as well as recruitment. An office manager and site manager had now been recruited both to start in June, after half term. The school would next focus on recruiting teachers for the first three classes, then nursery staff and support staff. There had been a strong field for the teaching posts and after shortlisting, it was hoped to get down to six candidates to be interviewed over 28 and 29 April.</p> <p>A governor queried where lesson observations as part of the interview process would take place? MF advised either at Fen Ditton CP School or alternatively at the teacher's current schools although this could be problematic if they were relocating from another part of the country.</p> <p>Finances – SW advised the DfE had released finances and MF added that PR and himself had met with them on 22 April in preparation for the Ofsted pre-opening inspection.</p> <p>A governor queried if the received finances would be dependent on pupil numbers? MF understood it to be a set amount and SW added the local authority had underwritten the funding for three teachers for the first two years.</p> <p>A governor queried if the Ofsted pre-inspection visit would be on site? MF advised it would be paper based.</p>	
9.	<p>Review of Action Plan</p>	
	<p>The item was not discussed.</p>	
10.	<p>Policies</p>	
	<p>Safeguarding – A separate document was distributed prior to the meeting and governors briefly went through it responding to MFs queries highlighted in yellow.</p> <p>MF advised that under section 0.7, TAs would be known as Teaching Mentors Under section 2.2, SW agreed to be safeguarding governor.</p> <p>Under section 2.1.1 and 2.2.2 a governor queried if the term should be Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL) and Deputy Designated Safeguarding Lead (DDSL)?</p>	

Signed By:	Date:

	<p>It was agreed that governors who had completed safer recruitment training would be included under section 4.3 – SM noted she had not attended a top up safer recruitment training from the local authority and KJ advised this could be arranged via the trust. Action: KJ to ask trust for SW and SM to do safer recruitment training</p> <p>A governor queried that within section 2.5, there was an inconsistency of language. Under section 3.9, a governor asked that the definition of FGM be included. Under section 4.2, a governor queried the trusts QA process in reviewing the SCR? KJ advised as well as the trust’s reviews, all schools should have a separate audit completed by the Head and safeguarding governor. MF added that at first, the SCR would be maintained by the central team and would transfer to the school in September. A governor queried how long section 8 would be included within the policy? KJ advised that when the policy was next reviewed relevant guidance at the time would be included.</p> <p>Under section 4.18, MF proposed maintaining electronic records for low level concerns. A governor queried should the DSL not be at the school, who would have access to safeguarding records? A governor suggested that MF and the Office Manager could both have access to these records. MF advised he would discuss this further with Camilla Saunders. Action: Governors conditionally approved Safeguarding Policy subject to changes made during the meeting</p> <p>Positive Behaviour – A separate document was distributed prior to the meeting which MF advised had been based on the local authorities STEPs guidance. A governor queried whether the policy only referred to behaviour within the school grounds and whether a statement should be included around behaviour expectations outside of the school at the beginning and end of the school day? MF suggested this could be included as 4.1.5 A governor queried how children would be informed of the behaviour expectations? MF advised they would be reviewed in class at the start of every year and also discussed during assemblies. A governor noted that the meaning of the acronym MPA should be included under 1.1 and not 1.2 A governor queried if the statement in blue were hyper-links to other documents? MF advised highlighted words connected to a glossary at the end of the document. A governor queried if the document should at first be reviewed after one year and then every three? MF agreed to this. A governor queried how behaviour expectations would be discussed within the nursery to very young children? After a brief discussion it was agreed to include a statement on the front page of the policy to consider this when the policy was next reviewed. Action: Governors conditionally approved Positive Behaviour Policy subject to changes made during the meeting</p> <p>General Comments – MF asked if policies could be signed off remotely? SW advised statutory ones could be, but policies personalised to the school would need to be reviewed by governors. A governor queried if comments could be added to policies on SharePoint? MF advised he would be happy for this as well as receiving comments during governor meetings. Governors briefly discussed the storage of approved policies and KJ added the trust were currently working on a new collaborative platform, which would hopefully enable governors and staff to access the same folders, rather than having to store policies in two places.</p>	<p>KJ/SW/ SM</p> <p>MF</p> <p>MF</p>
11.	Governor Matters	
	<p>Governor Recruitment – MF advised of one parent who had expressed an interest in joining the LGB. KJ advised the trust would be happy for there not to be an election and to co-opt the parent. SW advised that he had made contact with the parent, but as there had been other positive conversations with local residents and parents, he suggested holding off until the start of September and then inviting expressions of interest.</p>	

Signed By:	Date:

	<p>SW & KJ advised of a local councillor who had been suggested as a governor. SW was yet to hear from this person.</p> <p>SW & MF advised that the appointed site manager has been serving as a staff governor at his current school and would probably be willing to do the same at MPA.</p> <p>SW advised SD had been seconded from Fen Ditton and once his term of office ended there, he would have to be reappointed at Marleigh if he wished to continue as a governor.</p> <p>A governor queried if there should be a skills audit to address any weaknesses in governors' knowledge? SW advised that one of the parents expressing an interest in joining the LGB had SEND and Safeguarding experience. He also advised that he was keeping a few spaces available so that come September, this work could be done when it was clear what skills parents and staff governors had.</p> <p>Training – The item was not discussed.</p>	
12.	Standing Items	
	<p>Trust Matters – It was agreed this had already been discussed.</p> <p>Fen Ditton Primary School – SW advised at Fen Ditton there were two LGB's per term with full Agendas – one at the start and one at the end of term; They had also got into the habit of including another meeting mid-term which was used for training, and any other matters that would help take the pressure off the other two meetings – equally, they could be cancelled if there wasn't a need. During the 2021-22 year, they had also had an away morning in the autumn term. The trust was considering a similar half day away in 2022-23. It was agreed LGBs next year would be on Mondays in person with no formal sub-committees. CF noted he was a member of the civilian committee of a local air cadet squadron that met on Mondays, but with due notice, he could make the meetings work.</p> <p>Action: SW, MF & SH to agree meeting dates for 2022-23 before the next LGB meeting in June.</p>	MF/SW/ SH
13.	Any other business	
	There was none.	
14.	Review of meeting	
	There was nothing further to add.	
15.	Date of next meetings	
	<p>LGB – Monday 20 June at 6.00pm (at Marshalls)</p> <p>LGB – Monday 11 July at 6.00pm (at school)</p>	
	Meeting closed at 7.30pm	

Signed By:	Date: