

The Charter School East Dulwich

Minutes of Local Governing Board Meeting

Thursday 9th May 2019 at 6.30 pm at Jarvis Road, London, SE22 8RB

Alex Crossman (ACN)	Headteacher	Present
John Godfrey (JGY)	Chair of Governors	Present
Rosamund Jones (RJS)	Vice Chair of Governors	Present
Tim Naik (TNK)	Governor	Present
Catherine Rose (CRE)	Governor	Apologies
Laura Duffell (LDL)	Governor	Present
Gwen Sinnott (GST)	Governor	Present
Stephen Potter (SPR)	Governor	Present
Celia Johnson (CJN)	Governor	Apologies
Philippa Jupp (PJP)	Governor	Present

In attendance:

Rebecca Hardy (RHY)	Deputy Head Teacher
Glyn Griffith (GGH)	Acting Trust CFO
Shalene Varcoe (SVE)	Clerk

AGENDA ITEM	MINUTES	ACTION NO. AND OWNER
1	<p>Apologies and Declaration of Interest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and the Chair welcomed governors to the meeting. There were apologies from Catherine Rose and Celia Johnson There were no declarations of interest. The meeting was quorate. 	
2	<p>Minutes of Meeting of 14th March 2019</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The minutes were agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting, with no amendments. <p><u>Matters Arising from the Minutes</u></p> <p><u>ACTION:</u> Clerk to share new governor details with HR Director for DBS checks</p> <p>Actions from 14/03</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> All new governors DBS checks have been actioned Joint LGB day agenda feedback on agenda item 3 Dates for Southwark exclusion training shared by the clerk – 25/06 – GST confirmed she was booked onto it. All governors encouraged to attend if they can Climate Emergency Declaration – final document to be shared at future meeting ASD unit will be added to agenda when appropriate next year Parent forum feedback on agenda item 5 Staff survey results on agenda item 5 Questions for school council – all to send to questions to CJN ASAP (very few received) MLT meeting with governors postponed until after half term <p>All remaining actions were complete or in process.</p>	

	No other matters arose from the minutes.	
3	<p><u>Chair's Update</u></p> <p>Joint LGB Training Day feedback The Chair thanked everyone for their contribution to the training day. He added that possibly too much was scheduled for just one day and that in future the Chairs would try and allow time in the schedule for more guided group working sessions to allow governors from both schools to work together.</p> <p>A governor added that there was a need identified by several governors across both schools to be able to gain a better understanding of each other's LGBs as they had quite different cultures.</p> <p>ACTION: The Chair and Vice-Chair to speak to their ND counterparts to see how this can be facilitated for next year</p>	1. Chair/ VC
4	<p>Finance Report</p> <p>Acting Trust CFO, Glyn Griffith was introduced to the group.</p> <p>The 3-year plan spreadsheet and the Budget Monitoring Report (BMR) had been shared with governors ahead of the meeting.</p> <p>a) 3-Year plan GGH explained that the spreadsheet models income against expenditure over the next three years based on current assumptions. The actual budget for 2019-20 (year 1) was released in March but years 2 and 3 are based on forecast budgets.</p> <p>He also highlighted that the forecasts assume that all staff stay in the school throughout the three years and are subject to either known or assumed pay progression and pension increases. This makes year 3 look relatively expensive in terms of staffing costs. This is a worst-case scenario, however, as in reality staff will leave during that period. The year 1 budget forecast return will be submitted to the DfE on July 31 and as the deadline for teaching staff resignations is in the next half term the figures can still move before then.</p> <p>He highlighted the following considerations to the governors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One of the challenges facing TCSED was managing the premises costs, in terms of what elements come under the original build costs and what become in year costs. - Y3 figures have factored in 120 students in 6th form (£576K). Associated 6th form staffing costs have also been factored in, but these are very much a work in progress at this stage. - Current forecast is in year surplus amounts of Y1: £161K; Y2: £226K and Y3: £125K <p>Q: A governor asked if the school did not spend these surplus amounts would the school receive less funding? A: GGH responded that this was not the case and that any in year school budget surplus reverts to the Trust as the legal entity.</p> <p>Q: A governor asked if this was a comfortable 'cushion' for the budget to be at? A: GGH responded that, in reality, the Y1 forecast surplus would be much less (£30 - £40K) as the Headteacher would have additional expenses to consider that had not yet been accounted for.</p> <p>Q: The Vice-Chair asked what the forecast surplus could be spent on in year? A: The Headteacher replied that this was not decided yet, adding that it was prudent and responsible for the school to run with a small surplus, a position that many schools would envy given the current financial squeeze on school budgets nationally. He added that TCSND are not</p>	

	<p>in the same position and that the Trust may allow one school to run a deficit so long as it did not exceed any forecast surplus at the other school.</p> <p>Q: The Chair asked if these forecasts considered the new school’s needs and asked if there were any additional equipment or premises items that may be required?</p> <p>A: The Headteacher replied that the Trust would look at spending priorities in both schools before deciding on how to spend Trust reserves.</p> <p>Q: A governor advised that in many MATs the principle is that the Trust takes a top slice and that any surplus then remains at school level. They then asked if it was the intention for the Trust to move towards this model?</p> <p>A: The Chair responded that it was a strong desire that any money received by TCSED should be spent on TCSED students but there was no plan currently to change the financial set up of the Trust.</p> <p>b) Budget Monitoring Report</p> <p>GGH advised the governors that this report went to the Headteacher monthly and to the Trust Business and Audit committee termly. This document is a live document checking the budget submitted against any in year adjustments and monitor how accurate forecasts were.</p> <p>He highlighted the following lines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The General Annual Grant (GAG) is the money received from the DfE and based on pupil numbers - High Needs Funding (HNF) comes from the local authorities to support students with EHCPs. The original forecast was £82K but this was now expected to be £150K due to the increased number of students with EHCPs accepted by the school - Pupil Premium Funding – this is a fixed amount received per PP student on roll. <p>Q: The Vice-Chair commented that HNF must be spent on the pupils it is designed to support.</p> <p>A: The Headteacher confirmed that this was the case but added that the actual costs of supporting students with EHCPs was higher than the funding received, highlighting the £35K overspend on LSAs.</p> <p>GGH also highlighted the £93K overspend on staffing costs (budget £2.76m) adding that this was manageable and was as a result of maternity pay, staff sickness and cover costs – items which are much harder to predict and forecast accurately.</p> <p>The current in year surplus forecast is £81K</p> <p>Q: The Chair asked if this figure moved on a monthly basis.</p> <p>A: GGH confirmed that this was the case. The Headteacher added that the forecast is usually quite accurate, adding that it was the school’s intention to spend any surplus.</p> <p>GGH left the meeting</p>	
5	<p>Community feedback</p> <p>a. staff survey</p> <p>The Headteacher summarised that overall the survey was quite positive, and any negative feedback was down to a handful of individuals (as the number of staff is relatively small). Since the survey there has been a follow up meeting of Senior leaders and HR in school looking at three key areas:</p> <p>1. Workload:</p> <p>21% of staff indicated that they disagreed with Q15 on the survey. The meeting agreed that this was a perception issue and that in reality the workload on staff at TCSED was not as onerous as</p>	

at other schools (for example TCSND). Specific actions were agreed though to help overcome some of these perceptions as detailed in the accompanying document looking at rotas and staff facilities

2. Communication:

Some staff had commented that communication was perceived to be not especially effective in school. The Headteacher advised that there were robust systems in place regarding the sharing of key school information and that this would be reinforced.

Q: The Vice Chair asked if there was also a communication issue around the response to Q11/All staff consistently apply school policies, where 50% of staff disagreed? Is this because staff don't understand the policies?

A: The Deputy Headteacher replied that SLT know that more work is required around consistency.

Q: The Vice Chair asked if this should be changed to teaching policies but the Chair then asked if it referred mainly to the behaviour policy?

A: The Headteacher responded that staff discontent in this area often arises when students don't change their behaviours.

Q: The Vice Chair asked if the questions on the survey question were fit for purpose and if they could be changed in order to make them more relevant and informative?

A: The Deputy Headteacher replied that the questions were largely aligned with TCSND's surveys and followed the Ofsted guidance but could be added to or tweaked.

Q: The Vice Chair asked how the responses from TCSED compared to those from TCSND?

ACTION: Deputy Headteacher to produce a comparison on responses with those to TCSND surveys for governors.

2.RHY

3. Behaviour:

The school has run a staff training session to reset expectations. This will be run again soon for LSAs.

Q: The Chair asked if the school promotes a culture of consistency and if this was the real issue with some of these responses?

A: The Deputy Headteacher replied that individual's perception was key and that the wording of some of the questions may need to be re-examined. The Headteacher added that response times for the behaviour team to incidents in class is just minutes in most cases and occasionally individual's perception can be inaccurate or unrealistic.

b) Student Survey

The Deputy Headteacher summarised that the school were very pleased with the results of the student survey with 88% of students stating that they felt safe at school; 80% were happy at school and 97% had made new friends at school. She also highlighted the 67% who responded that they had made friends outside their own year group which was testament to the vertical tutoring system.

The Deputy Headteacher highlighted the following areas for focus

- Only 17% of pupils felt that the work was challenging 'sometimes' or better.

Q: The Vice Chair commented that the word 'challenging' was quite a difficult one for students to respond to, in terms of what that means to them as individuals.

A: the Deputy Headteacher agreed that the wording could be looked at for next year.

- Only 63% of students felt that they had regular verbal feedback – this may be a symptom of students not understanding all the various forms of feedback and this was something the school would be working on.

	<p>- 69% of students were aware of people being bullied. School staff have spoken to the school council about this and the school council ran assemblies during the previous week to talk about bullying and what constitutes bullying and what doesn't (banter). Again, the school are working with students to help them understand that silly and inappropriate comments are not acceptable but do not constitute bullying per se. The Vice Chair added that you may only need a small number of incidents in a relatively small school cohort for all students to become aware of them.</p> <p>The Deputy Headteacher added that students were being reminded of the resources and programmes in place to help those who might be worried including student mediation, staff champions, rewards etc.</p> <p>Q: a governor commented that questions around bullying in student surveys always score the lowest and suggested that clear explanation around what the question refers to would be useful.</p> <p>A The Deputy Headteacher agreed that more work could be done ahead of the surveys to ensure clearer understanding.</p> <p>Year group analysis:</p> <p>Q: A governor observed that Year 9 scored the lowest in the survey and commented that this year group have felt aggrieved in the past when school has implemented things and not involved them as the oldest cohort in the school. He asked if the student council was a strong enough voice and representation for them?</p> <p>A: The Headteacher replied that the school council had just held their 4th meeting of the year after some issues around the school council coordinator position. The Deputy Headteacher added that Y9 do seem happier than they had in the autumn, possibly because of the extra care around the options process and careers work.</p> <p>Q: The Chair asked if the options process was finalised.</p> <p>A: The Headteacher replied that it was almost complete but that a few final students were being spoken to about changes to their options.</p> <p>A governor commented that it was good to see that the school was documenting the actions from the survey findings and follow any concerns up.</p> <p>c) Parent Forum</p> <p>The Headteacher reported that the recent Parent Forum had been much better received and attended with about 80 parents attending. This was put down to better promotion, increased interest now the school was in its permanent home and ease of travel to the site.</p>	
6	<p>Headteachers report</p> <p>a) Challenge Partners Report</p> <p>Q: The Vice Chair asked what the challenge partners review was?</p> <p>A: The Headteacher replied that Challenge Partners were a peer review system comprising about 400 schools. Each school gets a visit from senior colleagues from other schools in the scheme supported by a colleague who is also an Ofsted inspector. They jointly observe lessons with members of SLT and provide a report, which aligns with Ofsted and is an extra source of evidence for the school SEF.</p> <p>The Headteacher advised that the review team had observed most teaching staff during their visit. They had commented as to the high level of respect between staff and students and the overall good behaviour observed. School Improvement Strategies were graded as outstanding and the overall estimate was good.</p> <p>Q: A governor asked what the action point were following the review.</p> <p>A: the Headteacher replied that these were picked up in the SDP and the PP strategy.</p>	

	<p>These include the development of the middle leaders, especially as over 50% had not had ML positions before. The Headteacher confirmed that a programme was in place to develop this cohort.</p> <p>Q: Regarding the e.b.i's for the quality of T&L and assessment, a governor asked if the findings indicated a need for more specific training for staff.</p> <p>A: The Headteacher confirmed that the school was reviewing this but that some feedback had already been given to individual staff.</p> <p>ACTION: Headteacher/Deputy Headteacher to feedback to governors on progress of actions following on from the review</p> <p>The Chair commented that this was a good response to the recent Ofsted report and congratulated all staff involved.</p> <p><u>b) and c) Achievement data</u></p> <p>Document had been shared with governors ahead of the meeting detailing attainment and progress for each year group for the Spring term.</p> <p>The Headteacher referred to the commentary sheet regarding benchmarking and advised governors that predicting grades at KS4 was difficult as the grades were likely to be volatile following the introduction of new GCSEs – even English and Maths are only on their 3rd run under the new system this summer. He advised that 'securing' for a Y9 student would mean that they are on target to achieve a Grade 5 at GCSE. The progress score is measured based on how much progress is made between KS2 and KS4.</p> <p>He highlighted that nearly 100% of HPA students are on course to achieve both English and maths at a grade 5 or above. The figure is 14.63% for LPA students but this compares favourably with national figures. However, the school recognises that this needs to improve.</p> <p>Q: The Chair asked if there were any other schools nationally that had similar demographics that TCSED could be compared with.</p> <p>A: the Headteacher responded that this would not be possible until the first set of GCSE results.</p> <p>Gender differences – The HPA cohort in Y9 are mainly female and are very hard working which leads to the gender gap. The Headteacher admitted it was quite a gap to close but added that the new terminal exams do tend to favour boys so this could shift.</p> <p>Other concerns raised by the Headteacher include Y8 PP/BME and MPA students who appear to be underperforming. This was recognised by all staff and a focus of SDP/SEF/PP.</p> <p>Q: A governor asked if the rates of progress in maths were enough to close the attainment gap between that subject and English, when the school would want both to deliver similar levels of attainment? Was the school doing everything it could to ensure that attainment in maths was raised?</p> <p>A: The Headteacher responded that none of the data points suggest underperformance in maths – as in there were no structural issues around T&L. He added that intervention sessions were already running for some students.</p> <p>Q: A governor commented that in order to achieve resilience in maths some schools employ an extra maths teacher and they asked if this would be something that TCSED would consider?</p> <p>A The Headteacher replied that maths already effectively had extra staff and that teaching was in smaller groups than some other subjects but reminded governors that there was a chronic shortage of good maths teachers making vacancies very difficult to fill.</p> <p>Q: The Chair asked if there were any other interventions that should be considered?</p> <p>A: The Deputy Headteacher replied that these needed to be identified depending on where the need was.</p>	<p>3.HT/ DHT</p>
--	---	----------------------

	<p>Q: A governor asked what the analysis looks like for level 4 and above? ACTION: Headteacher/Deputy Headteacher to run analysis for level 4 and above and share with governors.</p> <p>d) and e) SEF and SDP SUM1 updates Both documents had been shared ahead of the meeting for information. The Headteacher advised that most of the SDP areas were 'green' as most of the work had been done at this stage of the year. PSHE was still amber and would likely remain so until September when the PSHE specialist starts. Careers was now ragged as green thanks to hard work by JKR with help from TCSND</p> <p>f) PP Strategy The document was circulated for information ahead of the meeting. The Headteacher advised the meeting that one area that needed action was the area around the quality of independent learning and the rate of completion of tasks (homework). He advised that this had improved since the introduction of prep time – students can be added to this group or can graduate depending on the quality of independent work. It is compulsory for most in the group, but other students can attend if they want extra support.</p>	<p>4.HT/ DHT</p>
<p>7</p>	<p>Governor Business</p> <p>a) Comms – report The Vice Chair asked if everyone was aware of the Trust Communications Policy and whether everyone was following it?</p> <p>Governors raised concerns that a clear timeline of the progress of policies through the Trust/LGBs was not being followed: where is the policy going; what happens after a working party; when are policies issued to LGBs; when are they fed back up to the Trust? ACTION: Chair to raise with Trust</p> <p>b) Link governor meeting – Data GST fed back to the group following her meeting with the Headteacher and Chair. The aim of the meeting was to gain a clearer understanding of how data is collected, how it is used, what are the areas of concern and what is the impact of interventions. Her summary was that there is an embedded cycle of data scrutiny; there are interventions embedded in all departments and all these feed into the quality assurance.</p> <p>There are some challenges: - No benchmarks at KS3 ACTION: GST to share report via google drive ACTION: GST to look at what other schools might be doing to benchmark data at KS3 ACTION: Chair/HT/Clerk to ensure data cycle in school aligns with LGB meetings data→leadership→LGB</p> <p>Q: A question was raised around what interventions were in place to ensure that reading ages were in line with chronological ages for all students and how effective they were? ACTION: Headteacher to feedback on literacy programmes and impact</p> <p>Q: A question was raised about the format of the data reports for governors and how governors can be given guidance so that they can understand these ahead of meetings? Also, how different will KS4 data look and how can we prepare governors for that?</p>	<p>5. Chair</p> <p>6.GST 7.GST 8.HT/ Clerk/ Chair</p> <p>9.HT</p>

	<p>A: A governor suggested that it may be useful for those governors who are interested and available to have a pre-meeting to look at the data ACTION: Chair/Clerk to look at suggesting dates for any governors interested ahead of the next data set ACTION: Clerk to advise when the next Southwark ‘understanding data’ training session is</p> <p>All governors were asked to note that data should form part of the conversation in any visit to the school and that they should feel comfortable and confident speaking to teachers about the assessment process.</p> <p>c) Governor portfolio MLT meeting has now moved to June ACTION: Vice Chair to confirm date to Clerk</p> <p>d) Timing of meetings The LGB explored the idea of moving the timing of the meetings to a 6pm start but it was agreed to keep it as 6:30pm with a view to reviewing in the future as more staff members join.</p>	<p>10. Chair/ clerk 11. Clerk</p> <p>12. VC</p>
8	<p>AOB The next meeting is currently scheduled for 13th June. The Trust board meeting is July 2nd. ACTION: HT/Chair to confirm date and time of next meeting</p> <p>The meeting closed at 8:30pm</p>	<p>13. HT/ Chair</p>

**Action points arising from the LGB meeting of The Charter School East Dulwich on
Thursday 9th May 2019**

No	Action	By	When	Status
1	The Chair and Vice-Chair to speak to their ND counterparts to see how greater understanding of each LGB can be facilitated for next year	Chair /VC	Before end of term	New
2	A comparison of survey responses with those to the TCSND surveys to be prepared for governors.	DHT	June meeting	New
3	School to provide feedback to governors on progress of actions following on from the Challenge Partners review	HT/ DHT	October	NEW
4	School to run analysis for level 4 and above data for attainment and share with governors.	HT/ DHT	June meeting	New
5	Chair to raise concerns regarding Trust comms policy at Trust level to ensure that it is being adhered to. Clerk to circulate policy to all LGB members.	Chair / clerk	Trust meeting 2/7	New
6	GST to share link governor report with LGB via google drive	GST	ASAP	New
7	GST to look at what other schools might be doing to benchmark data at KS3	GST	October	New
8	Agendas to ensure data cycle in school aligns with LGB meetings data→leadership→LGB	HT/ Chair /Clerk	Next year	New
9	Report on school literacy catch up programmes and impact to be produced for governors	HT	June meeting	New
10	Dates to be circulated for data analysis meeting for governors ahead of the next data set	Clerk/ Chair	Ahead of next data	New
11	Clerk to identify and circulate dates for any governor understanding and interpreting data training	Clerk	ASAP	New
12	Confirm date and attendees for June meeting with MLT	VC	ASAP	New
13	Date of next LGB meeting to be confirmed	Chair	ASAP	New