



Colne Valley Local Schools Board (LSB)

Date: Tuesday 20 April 2021

Time: 5.30pm

Virtual details: Meeting held by MS Teams

Clerk: Elizabeth Murphy

Quorum: One half of the numbers of the LSB rounded up which must not be less than three

LSB Members

Other attendees:

Cathy Shergold (Chair)	
Emma Flin, Head of St Andrew's Primary, Great Yeldham	
Julie Sarti, Head of Colne Engaine Primary	
Danielle O'Connell, Head of Belchamp St Paul Primary	
Kirsty Stuart, Head of Ridgewell Primary	
Claire Kearney	
Godfrey Evans (Vice Chair)	
Nigel Benwell	
Richard Hopkins	

Meeting Summary for Vine Trust Board

Key issues discussed

- Plans for a proposed two-year rolling cycle of policy distribution to schools
- Plans for the review of the Scheme of Delegation by the trust
- How staff and pupils were settling in after the lockdown
- The LSB would plan to have key foci at meetings over time to support school improvement
- Assessment data and triangulation through monitoring visits
- What safeguarding checks were undertaken by the trust
- Completion of the four Head's PMRs
- SBM involvement in LSB meetings

Actions/Decisions taken

- Minutes from 2 March 2021 meeting approved
- The Trust to be approached about undertaking a survey of all schools about the whole remote learning experience during lockdown to identify the positives and negatives so that this information could be shared more widely and schools could benefit from the good publicity
- A framework to be developed so that relevant information the LSB required from Heads Reports could be provided
- The Trust to be approached about resolving the method of extracting the SOAP data which was very inefficient

Items requiring Trustee Approval

None

Issues outstanding



- Clarity between the roles and responsibilities of the Community Boards and the LSBs required– **The Vine Trust Board needed to provide clarity** (Carried forward from March meeting)
- Governors questioned whether the LSB would have the right to veto any changes made by schools to model policies but there was nothing in the Scheme of Delegation to advise on this so clarity on accountability was needed – **The Vine Trust Board needed to provide clarity** (Carried forward from March meeting)
- It was unclear who would sign off policies that were models that could be adapted or unique to schools – **The Vine Trust Board needed to provide clarity** (Carried forward from March meeting)

Minutes: Summer 1

No	Agenda Item	Action
1	Welcome and Opening Prayer Governors were welcomed to the meeting. It was agreed that the meeting could be recorded, which would be deleted once the minutes had been agreed by the Chair.	
2	Apologies for Absence None. Richard Hopkins was running late due to some technical difficulties.	
3	Declaration of Pecuniary and Business Interests No business interests or conflicts of interest were noted nor had any gifts or hospitality been received.	
4	Any Other Business <i>Richard Hopkins joined the meeting at 5.40pm</i> Governors agreed to discuss involvement of the SBMs in the meetings.	

Business

5	Minutes from 2 March 2021 Governors approved the minutes of the meeting which would be signed by the Chair and provided to the Clerk. ACTION 1 Copies would be sent to each Head for the public record, the Clerk to the Trustees and CEO's PA. ACTION 2	Chair Clerk
6	Matters Arising All governor actions were discharged .	



	<p>Governors were still awaiting a response from the Trust to the three actions that were raised at the last meeting as follows i.e., a, b and c:</p> <p>(a) Clarity between the roles and responsibilities of the Community Boards and the LSBs required– The Vine Trust Board needed to provide clarity</p> <p>Governors were advised that the Chair and Vice Chair were on a new trust working party to consider the Scheme of Delegation and determine the Community Boards’ remit. In the meantime, Nigel Benwell was supporting Ridgewell and Belchamp St Paul (BSP) primaries whilst no Community Boards were in place and was thanked for this. The Vice Chair agreed to provide support here too as required.</p> <p>(b) Governors questioned whether the LSB would have the right to veto any changes made by schools to model policies but there was nothing in the Scheme of Delegation to advise on this so clarity on accountability was needed – The Vine Trust Board needed to provide clarity</p> <p>(c) It was unclear who would sign off policies that were models that could be adapted or unique to schools – The Vine Trust Board needed to provide clarity</p> <p>Julie Sarti advised that she was working with the trust to get a system in place for managing the review of policies. There would be three types of policy; some statutory policies that would be adopted by all schools, some models that could be adapted to individual schools and then specific individual policies relating to individual schools. Governors debated how this might be organised in view of the delegated responsibilities currently in place and how the LSB might be able to drive change for the benefit of all. It was agreed that a timetable would need to be determined to ensure that all schools were reviewing the same policies around the same time to avoid constant revisions and help inform agendas where specific focus was planned, and Julie confirmed that a 2-year rolling plan was the expectation. Governors agreed that whilst a final plan was awaited the model and school unique policies would go to the Community Boards for review and then recommendations for approval would be provided to the LSB and it was hoped that this approach might be adopted across the trust in due course. Governors agreed that it would be helpful for the LSB to be instrumental in driving the changes needed.</p>	
7	<p>Chair’s Update/Governance Matters</p> <p>Various informal discussions had occurred between governors to share information.</p> <p>The Heads had collaborated to produce combined notes under agenda items 7 – 10 which had been shared with governors in advance of the meeting.</p>	

School Improvement



8	<p>Update on Impact of Covid-19: attendance/remote learning/ recovery strategy/staff and pupil wellbeing and school reopening</p> <p>The following information relating to all schools had been provided to all governors ahead of the meeting:</p> <p>1st 3 weeks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>a time to regroup, rebuilt sense of community and made 'low risk' assessments to gather information about learning</i>• <i>More vulnerabilities coming back after this lockdown – friendships and social skills had needed to be a priority – re-establishing core values and appropriate social skills.</i>• <i>Parent/carer weariness with 3rd lockdown – very hard time for them all and a number of families were anxious about the learning experiences they had been able to provide for their children, so lots of reassurance and support offered</i>• <i>Staff returned for these 3 weeks as strong team – ready to get back into the swing of things but exhausted! Needed to take time to regroup as a team</i> <p>After Easter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Much more positive return- more energy, staff and pupils! Rest has done everyone good.</i>• <i>Staff keen to think strategically across whole school – SDIP have been revisited and there is a drive to get back on track with everything.</i>• <i>Some focus now on revisiting classroom codes and uniform codes etc – things have understandably slipped over lockdown.</i>• <i>Ridgewell and BsP new restructured team working well.</i>• <i>We continue to focus on strong communication channels between Hub HTs, staff and families</i> <p>Questions and comments were sought.</p> <p>Governors noted that Ridgewell and BSP had recovered well after some particularly difficult times.</p> <p>Governors questioned whether Heads had been able to make many changes since the start of the new term. Each school had tried to organise some sessions outside such as singing in assemblies, which had not been possible before but on the whole restrictions were being maintained for now. Careful planning was underway for opening up especially as government lockdown restrictions eased e.g., sports days, transitional arrangements etc.</p> <p>The Vice Chair suggested that the whole remote learning experience during lockdown had promoted across the nation a much deeper understanding of how important schools were as physical places and as a social construct and</p>	
---	--	--



	<p>how irreplaceable were the adults who worked with children and supported their learning. It would be a useful exercise to undertake an audit across the trust to identify the positives and negatives so that this information could be shared more widely and schools could benefit from the good publicity. Governors agreed that this was a good idea and it would be put to the trust.</p> <p>ACTION 3</p>	<p>Vice Chair</p>
<p>9</p>	<p>Headteachers' Reports including staffing / pupil numbers / standards data / SEND / impact of PPG & Sports Premium grants / curriculum / behaviour / Christian values and ethos</p> <p>The following information relating to all schools had been provided to all governors ahead of the meeting:</p> <p><i>Headteachers would like to discuss with the LSB how to best structure HT reports. Do they give you all the information you need? What is most useful as the verbal report? Would the LSB like there to be more of a specific focus on one aspect at different meetings? E.g., a focus on PPG, or SEN etc?</i></p> <p><i>Not much has changed since previous report as only 3 and a half weeks in school since then so each HT will give a brief report verbally at meeting only on anything that has changed since previous HT report on 2.3.21</i></p> <p>Questions and comments were sought.</p> <p>Governors felt that to add value to schools and support school improvement a deep dive focus on specific planned subjects would help explore ideas and good practice that could be shared. The Vice Chair advised he had prepared some draft agendas on this basis and the Chair was to consider this before sharing more widely. Governors also discussed the need to undertake some monitoring in schools to triangulate this information too where individual governors might provide reports to the LSB following such visits; however, to avoid too much impact on schools it was felt that some of this work might be undertaken by the Community Board members . Governors agreed that these were good ideas that should be pursued once schools had had more time to settle back into some sort of normality.</p> <p>Heads were keen to establish what governors were seeking from the Heads' Reports so that the relevant information could be provided in a timely manner. Again, some focus areas were needed e.g., subject leadership, SEND, disadvantaged pupils etc and it was agreed that a framework was needed, possibly to be in line with the proposed new policy review system so that focus was synchronised where possible, and so this would be drafted and shared so that agreement could be reached.</p>	



	ACTION 4	R Hopkins
10	<p>Assessment Data</p> <p>The following information relating to all schools had been provided to all governors ahead of the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>We have provided School on a Page report that has been revised by Pupil Asset to be more useful for LSBs We would appreciate your feedback on this report and whether it gives you enough information.</i> • <i>We all have our own data analysis processes at school level, which we are ready to discuss with our Community Board – is this deeper level of analysis something you would like to discuss at LSB level?</i> • <i>All school leaders hold pupil progress meetings with their class teachers to look at individual outcomes and progress as well as any trends across groups.</i> • <i>As things settle down, it is our intention to look at any possible assessment trends, areas for support or successes to share across the Hub, to develop self-supporting CPD and school improvement.</i> • <i>Assessment data was drawn together at end of 3-week period of return.</i> • <i>Used low risk assessments based on KPIs to inform Spring 2 Data Drop.</i> • <i>As School on a Page report will show - cross all 4 schools we have found writing outcomes, Maths reasoning and problem solving and Greater Depth outcomes are lower across all groups, post lockdown.</i> • <i>EYFS outcomes differ across schools- much depending on the children’s personal, emotional and social development skills. Where cohorts entered school with a stronger set of PSED skills and have strong parental support and good networking with other families in cohort, they have managed remote learning well and seem to be more or less on track.</i> • <i>Where there is a more varied cohort – perhaps with some high need speech and language, SEMH and ASD challenges, this has impacted on prospective GLD outcomes.</i> • <i>We continue to focus on learning stamina and aspiration – we want children to ‘dig deep’, to reach for the best they can be.</i> • <i>Greater depth learners now need the experiences to demonstrate higher level thinking skills.</i> • <i>Maths fluency another focus.</i> <p>It was added that schools had previously had governing body committees to consider the data and wanted to know if the information provided was sufficient for the LSB and if so how the information would be used.</p> <p>Questions and comments were sought.</p> <p>The Community Boards would have a key role and it was hoped that they could look at the data in detail and identify any key points that could then be passed to the LSB to consider or note, an example might be the impact of summer born children. It was important to identify any trends from the data</p>	



Final Business

13	<p>Approve Local Policies/Adopt Trust Policies None.</p>	
14	<p>Finance Summary No reports received so far.</p>	
15	<p>Communication to and from the Vine Trust Board (Including sections of the SIP and Diocesan Advisor Reports when available)</p> <p>Governors noted that the Heads' PMRs had been completed by the Chair and Vice Chair and shared with the Trust lead, who had been very complimentary about all four Heads and felt that the documents were very supportive for the interviews coming up, for the Acting Head's of Belchamp St Paul and Ridgewell primaries, to be made permanent positions.</p> <p>Governors thanked the clerk for suggesting the summary section at the top of the minutes which was felt to be very helpful.</p>	
16	<p>Any Other Business (a) Involvement of the SBMs in the Meetings</p> <p>Governors noted that the Scheme of Delegation showed the LSBs to have minimal involvement in finances in schools and this was unlikely to change. Whilst SBMs played a very valuable role in the schools and in reporting to the trust, detailed financial information was not required at the LSBs as other bodies within the trust oversaw this aspect. Once the Community Boards were fully up and running across the LSB key financial information could be reported through the new Finance on a Page (FOAP) supported by information from the Community Boards following their meetings with SBMs but this had yet to be confirmed and Heads felt that they and the SBMs could agree how this might be channelled effectively. Should it become necessary a slot might be provided at specific LSB meetings so that SBMs were able to share information but this was thought to be a rare occurrence. Governors agreed for the time being that SBMs would not receive the LSB agendas, minutes, supporting papers or be invited to meetings.</p>	
17	<p>Date and Time of Future Meetings</p> <p>Governors noted the next meeting was booked for 22 June at 5.30pm.</p> <p>Governors discussed whether meetings should start to be face-to-face in future. The clerk suggested that governors might wish to consider the wellbeing of the Heads in them being able to go home to have a virtual meeting and not stay on in school after a long day. Also, any governors who</p>	



	<p>wished to meet might be able to have group monitoring sessions to allow for this. She added that she might not be able to support the LSB in the future if they moved to full face-to-face meetings due to the distance and time to travel involved. Governors agreed to share their thoughts with the Chair.</p> <p>ACTION 7</p>	All
	<p>Closing Prayer The meeting closed with a prayer.</p>	

The meeting closed at 7.10pm

Drafted: 210421

Issued: 230421 (inc. Trust)