



**GORSEY
BANK**

PRIMARY SCHOOL

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF
GORSEY BANK PRIMARY SCHOOL
HELD AT THE SCHOOL ON 5th DECEMBER 2017, 6.15pm**

Governors Present: Estelle Goodwin (EG) Vice Chair
 Lisa Woolley (LW) Head Teacher
 Linda Magrath (LM) CEO Laurus Trust/Observer
 Timothy Munro (TM)
 Catherine Barber-Brown (CBB)
 Sally Stedman (SS)
 Joe Maguire (JM)
 Alex Metcalfe (AM)
 Simeon Mellor (SM)
 Ryan Thompson (RT)
 Carl Windsor (CW)

Apologies: Colin Shepherd (CS) Chair
 Chris Stubbs (CSt)
 Elise Drake (ED) Observer

Also in attendance: Louise Collinge (LC) Clerk to Governors
 Grace Okyere-Fosu (GOF) School Services Manager
 Mark Johnson (MJ) Laurus Trust Finance Officer

PART ONE – NON-CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS

	Action
GOVERNOR TRAINING	
SMSC LEARNING WALK PRESENTATION	
<p>CBB had visited the school on Remembrance Day and shared her findings and photographs with the governors. CBB summarised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personal, Social, Health Education (PHSE) incorporates many aspects to ‘help your children become human’, including British values, cultural diversity, equality, kindness and co-operation. • Throughout the learning walk photographs were taken that evidenced a variety of PHSE learning and activities, including self-knowledge and the importance of being recognised for your achievements; different cultural traditions; respect for public institutions and events such as Remembrance Day; knowing right from wrong including democracy and law; accepting responsibility for your actions; experiencing fascination and appreciating the world around us. • The A-Z of respect display was noted for its artistic interpretation of individuals as they were all colourful and different and yet equally coherent and complementary. 	



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that children in one lesson were talking about their fears and how they could deal with them. This touched on aspects of mental health and well-being, which is a hot topic in education at the moment. • The overall feel of the school is one of warmth and kindness. Pupils demonstrated a thirst for learning and were polite and engaged throughout the visit. • Ideas for future development were for the school to explore the diversity of Britain within the local area; forge closer links to public institutions and bring charity events to life to enable children to see their impact. <p>Governors were informed that the PSHE curriculum had seven strands which were taught in rotation throughout the year. These included e safety and mental health.</p> <p>Governors thanked CBB (and Sam) for their time and effort in putting together the presentation.</p>	
1	GOVERNANCE	
1.1	<p>APOLOGIES</p> <p>Apologies were received and accepted from Colin Shepherd, Chris Stubbs and Elise Drake.</p>	
1.2	<p>AOB ITEMS</p> <p>Additional items of AOB were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GDPR (LW) • Website Audit (CW) 	
1.3	<p>CONFLICT OF INTEREST</p> <p>There were no conflicts of interest declared for the business to be discussed at the meeting.</p> <p>Governors were asked to advise the school of any changes to their annual declarations asap and to update their profile on The Trust Governor (TTG).</p>	All Govs – update conflicts of interest
1.4	<p>REGISTER OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS</p> <p>Governors were asked to advise the school of any changes to their annual declaration of pecuniary interests and update TTG.</p>	All Govs – update pecuniary interest info
1.5	<p>GOVERNOR CODE OF CONDUCT</p> <p>Governors were reminded that a copy of the latest NGA Code of Conduct had been uploaded to the TTG website and that they should read and agree to it. There is a check box within TTG (My Profile/Edit)</p>	All Govs – check TTG/My Profile



	to confirm this. Governors to ensure they complete this asap. Q) Do we have a MAT wide Code of Conduct? A) As a MAT we have subscribed to the NGA Code of Conduct.	
1.6	MEMBERSHIP To receive any changes to the membership of the Gorseley Bank Local Governing Board: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alex Metcalfe was welcomed to the governing board as a newly elected Parent Governor. It was confirmed that his term of office would be 07/11/17 to 6/11/21. GOF to ensure that AM's DBS Check is completed asap. There is a Staff Governor vacancy and a Staff Governor election is currently underway – LW to update accordingly. 	Clerk – update records & TTG GOF – AM DBS Check LW – staff gov election
1.7	APPOINTMENT TO ROLES It was noted that a suitable role for AM within the LGB will be assigned shortly – CS/EG/LW to discuss.	CS/EG/LW – AM Governor role
1.8	SCHEME OF DELEGATION The Scheme of Delegation for the Laurus Trust is available on The Trust Governor (TTG). EG, LW and LM had met recently to go through the Scheme and ensure that the LGB meetings were covering all matters within their remit. EG advised Governors to revisit the Scheme and also consider printing the key 'go-to' documents in preparation for an Ofsted inspection. Governors should access the previous Crib sheet on TTG for an appropriate list of the key documents and EG would also forward a list of she had prepared.	All Govs – revisit Scheme & Crib Sheet EG send list of docs to All Govs
1.9	MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING The minutes of the previous meeting dated 26.09.17 were reviewed. SM noted an incorrect initial on page 10 - Clerk to amend and add updated copy to TTG asap. The actions from the previous meeting were reviewed and updated on TTG. Of particular note was: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governor Succession Planning – CS needed to revisit the governor job description in light of the fact that a number of terms of office would end at the same time and also speak with individuals with regards to their future intentions. CS actions to be carried forward. 	Clerk – amend minutes Clerk – carry CS actions forward
1.10	LGB OBJECTIVES	



	<p>The LGB Action Plan 2017/18 had been added to TTG prior to the meeting and was reviewed as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link Governor visits - EG suggested that an additional point be added to this section that allows for a review of the schedule of reporting (how often/which terms) and also that the ROV form be amended to ensure that actions are updated and then reviewed prior to the start of the next review. • Pupil Performance – EG proposed adding an additional point in connection with the SIP report and other external advice/guidance. This would involve monitoring actions termly, particularly those relating to performance in core subjects through the use of SLT projections, Key Attainment and Progress Foci, Maths/English Development Docs etc. <p>Governors agreed with both additions as suggested. EG to formulate wording and update document for CS and review at next LGB meeting.</p> <p>Q) The Action Plan states we should consider an external review of the LGB in May 2018. Is this something we could do earlier?</p> <p>A) An external review is something that is recommended after a governing board has been in operation for some considerable time. This school has recently moved from LA to MAT, this is a big move and the new governing board will need time to bed in. EG and LW met recently to re-format the agenda and we should allow some time to see how our meetings work going forward before, perhaps carrying out an internal review. Agenda item for discussion at first summer LGB meeting in May 2018.</p>	<p>EG – update LGB Action Plan Clerk – Agenda item</p> <p>Clerk – Agenda item May 2018</p>
<p>2</p>	<p>MAT/LAURUS TRUST</p> <p>The Laurus Trust Report to LGB November 2017 had been circulated to governors prior to the meeting. LW summarised its contents as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The document is a summary of the November Laurus Trust meeting which mainly focused on results data. • The other item of interest was because the CHHS SCITT had received an Outstanding Ofsted Report and this meant that the School Centered Initial Teacher Training (SCITT) program could also be put in place at Gorseley Bank. This would bring great benefits in terms of quality teaching and increased funding. • The school is also looking to accommodate a Primary PGCE with a specialism in EYFS and/or KS3 in the future to support succession planning and cross phase working within the Trust. 	
<p>3</p>	<p>PERFORMANCE & ACCOUNTABILITY</p>	



3.1

GORSEY EVALUATION DOCUMENT (GED)

The GED had been uploaded on TTG prior to the meeting. JM presented the rationale behind the document:

- Over the half term staff had been busy reading the book 'Taking Control: How to prepare for inspection'. The book covered how to write a quality Self Evaluation Form (SEF) - a key document that the Ofsted Inspector would examine.
- The GED starts with the school's mission statement and the rest of the document sets about backing up that statement.
- Each section addresses the five core priorities that Ofsted will judge us on e.g. Overall effectiveness and quality of teaching, learning and assessment.
- We have opted to place 'Outcomes for Pupils' at the beginning of the document as we believe this would be the main focus of any inspection.

It was noted that Ofsted would judge the school on the day of inspection - what is being done to improve outcomes for the current cohorts. Last year's children have left and in the context of the school's historic results their progress scores can be seen as a blip. A review of current Year 6 projections later in the meeting would also evidence this.

The data documented under the 'Outcomes for Pupils' section had already previously been provided to governors. Historic RAISEonline data had been included to demonstrate that the school's attainment and progress had been consistently high for many years.

Q) On page 7, where it states 'a number of actions...', could we add governors to that too? Also should the list of SIP recommendations be placed in the list?

A) The GED is more of summary document and doesn't need to detail every single action we are taking to improve outcomes. The idea is that Ofsted ask us to expand on certain aspects of the document which the school would do by reference to the SDP, Action Plans, Maths Development summary, Key Attainment and Progress Foci, Projections etc.

SLT acknowledged that however exceptional attainment and progress were there would always be improvements to be made and governors suggested that the wording could be understood as having a subtext that read 'despite outstanding pupil outcomes, the school is implementing these initiatives to secure further improvement.'

Governors noted that if it stated governors had prioritised certain actions then they would all need to be confident that they had actually done this.



	<p>JM noted that the school's phonics screening pass rate was 98% last year and this exceptional result was in the top 3% of the country. The school had received a letter of congratulations from Nick Gibb MP in regards to this.</p> <p>EG stated that the text in the Personal Development, Behaviour and Welfare section was somewhat broken up and didn't flow particularly well. LW agreed but explained that the paragraphs had been cross referenced with the list of Ofsted requirements and would therefore make the Ofsted Inspector's job easier when working under strict time constraints.</p>	
<p>3.2</p>	<p>SDP</p> <p>The SDP focus for the meeting was on Optimal Conditions for Learning. RT advised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The school hoped that by providing the optimal conditions for learning they could enhance the marginal gains pupils made in progress and attainment.• By learning cognitive science techniques we can ensure teachers are able to teach to the best of their ability. By changing the way they do some small, simple things, teachers can make a big difference. For example, removing distractions from the learning environment.• One thing that has been introduced successfully in Science is the use of 'Knowledge Organisers'. These include key facts and subject terminology. The school aims to introduce the organisers across all of the core subjects in the future but for the present is concentrating on building up a bank of them in Science and ensuring effective implementation in this subject.• The staff are receiving ongoing professional learning in the area of cognitive science and memory and discuss impact on pupils progress as part of these regular training sessions. This focus is underpinned by a number of key texts and explored further by staff in a series of optional professional learning meetings. <p>Q) How has it been received by staff?</p> <p>A) Really well, the sessions are broken down in to manageable chunks and made engaging. Teachers themselves are now starting to bring their own ideas to the meetings and are sharing what works for them. Our teachers are always striving to improve and reflect on their practices. They want to learn from each other and this has been a great way to do this in a collective, team way.</p> <p>Governors thanked RT for providing valuable insight on optimal learning and agreed that the SDP focus for the next meeting should</p>	<p>RT – provide</p>



	<p>be 'To empower pupils to value the global and local communities to which they belong' as this followed on nicely from the PHSE presentation at the start of this meeting.</p>	<p>SDP focus at next meeting Clerk – Agenda item</p>
<p>3.3</p>	<p>SIP REPORT & RECOMMENDATIONS</p> <p>Two documents were distributed during the meeting. These were the Key Attainment and Progress Foci and the Maths Development Summary 2017-18. Both documents are also available on TTG.</p> <p>JM summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Should we have an Ofsted inspection the main aspect they will want to look at is pupil progress, particularly in maths. These two documents help demonstrate what we are doing to address those issues.• A key message from the SIP visit was to focus our efforts on what we are doing to accelerate the progress of pupils currently in the school and highlight the very positive projections for pupils in Year 2 and Year 6.• Governors should provide feedback on both the content and the format of the documents. <p>Q) Didn't the previous SIP find that one class was better at Maths than the other?</p> <p>A) Not exactly. There were differences resulting from planning and coverages but these were not born out in final outcomes. It was more to do with the timing of the data capture. Planning has been improved through the whole school use of the White Rose Maths Scheme. This has been developed by the Yorkshire Maths Hub and draws on the expertise of Maths specialists to map out a progressive sequence of learning for all mathematical concepts contained in the National Curriculum for KS1&2.</p> <p>Q) Do we need to separate the section of boys and girls and focus energy on Maths for girls and reading and writing for boys?</p> <p>A) We don't want to look at boys and girls separately like that as we don't believe that is where our focus should be at the moment. Our main aim is to gain the maximum progress from all of our pupils.</p> <p>Q) Do you agree that from a visual perspective, the section on boys and girls, because it only has two bullet points, makes it appear less important?</p> <p>A) The sections on the Key Attainment and Progress Foci have been ranked in priority order.</p> <p>JM suggested that the two bullet points from the girls/boys section be listed under the first section. JM to amend accordingly.</p>	



**GORSEY
BANK**

PRIMARY SCHOOL

Q) These documents don't provide an overall picture. What else do we need to know as governors to be Ofsted ready?

A) Ofsted won't question governors on every aspect of the school but they may well ask 'what do you think about the progress results?' and they will want you to demonstrate that you are aware of the issue, what the reasons were for the results (this was discussed at the Autumn 1 LGB meeting) and what is being done to improve them going forward. These two documents are an overview to be used in conjunction with the GED.

JM explained that governors can argue that over time progress has improved and the GED backs that up. There are lots of positive aspects school governors could talk about – our outstanding attainment results in KS1 and KS2, our exceptional Phonics results, our EYFS outcomes.

EG recommended that should any governor be available for the next SIP meeting they should attend. Governors would find the meeting extremely useful in helping them carry out their role effectively and as training in the uses of school data. Governors expressed the view that it would be helpful if they were given more detailed information with regards to the initiatives the school had employed to improve outcomes, the White Rose Maths Scheme for example. It was agreed that the decision on what schemes to employ was an operational one for the SLT. However as part of their role governors should be considering the cost of such initiatives and evaluating their impact.

SLT informed governors that they will be able to see some of the impact these strategies have already had when the latest data is shown later in the meeting and also at the spring meeting when the projections data would have been updated.

Q) How do you propose to present the impact of your actions at the next meeting?

A) You won't realistically be able to assess the impact of any one strategy as the gains are so marginal. However, after looking at the data today, you will be able to see if or how well students have progressed when they are compared to the data at the next meeting.

Governors therefore requested that 'projection tables' from this meeting be placed alongside those presented at the next meeting to help identify the level of progress and thereby the impact of the strategies.

JM displayed current projection data tables (anonymised) on the Interactive Whiteboard (IWB) and explained:



- Tables had been produced for both KS1 and KS2 with separate tables for reading, writing and Maths.
- The pupils (as a percentage) in the yellow boxes were already on track to make positive progress and those in the grey boxes will need to make further progress to meet the standard requirements.

Q) Do you also have aspirational FFT data?

A) We have done in the past but we are moving away from that approach now as Ofsted don't usually pay much attention to it and it is less reliable/helpful than it used to be.

Q) How confident can you be about the projection figures?

A) This data is taken from ongoing assessments backed up by data from the last 2 years SATs papers which the Y6 pupils have already sat and therefore it is very accurate. JM to date the tables for future reference/comparisons.

Q) Should we be thinking about having tables that focus on different groups, such as disadvantaged pupils?

A) We do this during SIP meetings but it would not be appropriate for discussion at LGB meetings due to the small numbers of each group and the need to be sensitive about individual pupil's personal information.

- JM showed two KS2 tables adjacent to each other, one from the 2017 cohort and one from the 2018 cohort. This was to highlight the differences and show that last year's cohort was an anomaly. For example in last year's cohort although 31% of pupils who had achieved a Level 3 in Reading at KS1 achieved the High Standard (and therefore had a positive progress score) in total 29% did not, most achieving the Expected Standard and 2% not reaching the Expected Standard. This year 49% of Level 3 KS1 attainers are on track to achieve the High Standard, with just 10% at the Expected Standard giving much stronger progress scores.
- Year 6 teachers have gone through their classes assessing each pupil. Since September pupils have taken two practice papers, including the 2017 SATs paper. This was an action from the Key Attainment and Progress Foci.
- SLT have taken some tough decisions around timetabling and the breadth of teaching, including ring fencing core curriculum time and prohibiting peripatetic teaching in the mornings but we have to be smart and ensure we are targeting support where it is needed.

Q) Can you predict what the Scaled Score will be for each child



	<p>this year?</p> <p>A) This is calculated in a slightly different way every year based on the progress of pupils nationally but we can make projections based on previous years' formulae. The school is using these to target intervention for pupils in this year's Y6 but the figures are not secure enough to use to set official KPIs.</p> <p>Q) Do you have any concerns looking at these tables?</p> <p>A) We are in a much better position than we were last year, but there is still work to be done.</p> <p>Q) Looking at this data, is writing the main concern for KS2?</p> <p>A) No, progress in writing is showing as 0.0, which is expected. Based on progress measures, it is Maths that is showing to be more of a priority. Current projections show 14% of children who attained a Level 3 at KS1 to be on target to achieve the Expected Standard. However to secure a positive progress score they will need to achieve the High Standard.</p> <p>Governors realised that the exceptionally high outcomes at Key Stage 1 were in turn producing progress issues at the end of Key Stage 2. Last years Year 6 had an average starting point of 17.7 APS and this years Year 6 have an average starting point of 18.2 APS which again presented challenges in terms of progress. It was also noted that other aspects of a pupil's education were being sacrificed to gain these levels of progress and governors should monitor this. For example, peripatetic music lessons.</p> <p>Q) Would it be possible to put the KPIs on the 'snapshot' data charts, just so they can be easily cross-referenced?</p> <p>A) Yes. JM to add KPIs to future charts.</p> <p>Governors were appreciative of the SLT's robust approach to reporting on performance and had found the projections data very useful. The same approach would be taken in the spring meeting.</p>	<p>JM – add KPIs to charts</p>
4	CHALLENGE	
4.1	<p>ACTIONS FROM CORE LINK GOVERNOR REPORTS</p> <p>A copy of the latest English ROV and Maths ROV had been provided prior to the meeting.</p> <p>TM suggested that as Maths was a key focus for the school, governors should consider that a ROV be carried out twice a year rather than just once. EG and LW to review and update the ROV schedule for approval at the next meeting.</p> <p>EG had carried out an English ROV and RT had updated the actions.</p>	<p>EG/LW – review ROV Schedule & contact any gov's re reports</p>



	These would be added to the back of the ROV and the updated document would be uploaded to TTG. EG recommended that any governor carrying out a ROV should always go back to the actions from their last visit before doing their next report.	
4.2	ACTIONS FROM POLICY REVIEWS No actions from policy reviews were required this term. LW and EG to meet to sync Link Governor reporting with the policy review schedule	LW/EG – arrange to meet
4.3	AUTUMN LINK GOVERNOR REPORTS EG or LW plan to meet and go through the policy review schedule asap. Therefore it was agreed that either EG or LW would contact any governors accordingly to advise them if they needed to do a report.	EG/LW – revise schedule & advise govs
4.4	POLICY REVIEWS As noted in item 4.3, the GB Policy Review Schedule was to be revised and brought before the LGB for review at the next meeting.	Clerk – Agenda item
5	FINANCE	
	<p>MJ handed out copies of the Laurus Trust CFO Report and noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2017/18 Budget is showing a deficit, however this would be offset by the surplus carried forward from the 2016/17 year. • Governors had previously requested to see detailed breakdowns of various figures from the budget summary (see Autumn 1 minutes) and they were provided in the handouts. • The 3-year forecast generated by the financial software shows the school to be in a deficit position over the next few years and this will need addressing. • The 3-year forecast was not looked at in any great detail when preparing the 2017/18 budget but the school will need to do this in the next couple of months. <p>LM advised governors that GB was not unique in its current financial position. All schools were currently facing difficult cost-cutting decisions due to increased staff and supply costs with no extra funding. We still don't know what the new Fairer Funding Formula will mean.</p> <p>GOF informed governors that the figures on the 3-year forecast had not been worked on yet. The finance software simply takes the figures from this year and makes a prediction for future years. The school is looking at ways to make savings. Also, in January the funding situation will be clearer.</p> <p>Q) Is it possible to have a phased budget? A) It could be done. MJ would look into providing one for the next meeting.</p>	MJ – provide phased budget?



	<p>Q) Have you had much interest from businesses in regards to taking part in the Aspirations Week?</p> <p>A) Yes, we still have some chasing up to do, but we will have enough organisations to run the event. We have a local animal sanctuary coming in and we are also working with Wilmslow Youth. There will be an emphasis on community services throughout the week. We would welcome any governors who could put on or help to run a session, even come in and talk about the role they do as a governor.</p> <p>Governors discussed the possibility of getting larger, local business (Royal London, Barclays or Aston Martin) to sponsor such events, as they would have more money.</p> <p>Q) Can we get a plan of how the school are tackling the budget issues?</p> <p>A) We aim to have something in place by January 2018 and governors will be informed at the Spring meeting. .</p> <p>Governors agreed that the Finance section should be brought forward on future agendas to enable MJ to leave earlier.</p>	Clerk – Agenda item
6	SAFEGUARDING	
6.1	<p>PUPIL NUMBERS AND ATTENDANCE</p> <p>A document entitled ‘School Characteristics November 2017’ was issued prior to the meeting. No significant changes were noted.</p>	
6.2	<p>SAFEGUARDING/BEHAVIOUR</p> <p>A Behaviour and Safety update document was issued prior to the meeting. No Safeguarding/Behaviour issues were noted during the meeting.</p> <p>RT advised governors that in anticipation of an Ofsted inspection all safeguarding policies and procedures were being rigorously checked and all actions were being followed up.</p> <p>Cheshire East have recently launched a new document called ‘Signs of Safety’ which covered how teachers and schools can ensure pupil voices are heard and how best to work with families. The next step for the school was to incorporate any new advice from the document in to its policies.</p>	
6.2	<p>EXCLUSIONS</p> <p>None this term.</p>	
6.3	<p>HEALTH & SAFETY</p> <p>In addition to the Health & Safety Update provided prior to the meeting, GOF provided a brief summary:</p>	



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff at GB had been closely working with Rob Hardman of CHHS to ensure H&S recordkeeping was the same across the Trust. • Zygy Turek, our Health & Safety Consultant will be conducting his annual H&S audit in January 2018. • Roof works are now complete and the Fire inspection concluded that they were satisfied with the way we had worked with contractors. • Tony Vearnals our Fire Safety Advisor carried out a fire safety audit in October and the findings from this will form part of GB's new fire risk assessment. • Going forward we will be looking at how we can save money. For example we will seek three quotes for any future works/contracts. 	
6.5	EDUCATIONAL VISITS None this term.	
6.6	GORSEY BANK RISK REGISTER This item would be carried forward to the next meeting.	Clerk – Agenda item
7	DEVELOPMENT GOVERNOR REPORT	
7.1	<p>TRAINING UPDATE The Training Update document had been issued prior to the meeting.</p> <p>CBB informed governors that she had conducted the governor induction with AM. AM would look at booking on to the three-module Governor Training once the new Spring programme had been released. EG had also sent AM a number of useful documents to read. CS to follow up/meet with AM once he is able to.</p> <p>CBB asked governors to check and record any actions against the Governor's Action list on the TTG website.</p>	<p>CS meet with AM</p> <p>All Govs – record actions/training on TTG</p>
7.2	<p>FOCUS FOR JOINT STAFF/GOVERNOR TRAINING Ideas for the focus of the next staff/governor training session on 10th January 2018 were welcomed.</p> <p>LW/JM suggested the topic of Staff Well-being because it is a topic of significant importance and relevance. There had recently been a national consultation on the subject and SLT are required to address any issues raised. Key areas that had come out of the consultation were marking, feedback, data and planning.</p> <p>LM informed governors that they had reduced the number of pupil reports teachers were required to produce throughout the year and instead introduced an additional parent's evening. This had helped to relieve time pressures and was actually more effective to both the teachers and the parents.</p>	



	Governors agreed that this would be a genuinely good topic to bring staff and governors together on. SM agreed to help plan the session.	SM – help plan joint training
8	AOB	
	<p>a. <u>Communications Plan</u> A copy of the draft Communications Plan had been issued to governors prior to the meeting. SM summarised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan was a simple ABCDE of Communications which initially looked at two key areas – parents and the community. • As Governors we sometimes get asked what we do and one of the starting points we could look at to help inform parents and the community would be to produce a quarterly update on the website. This could then be flagged up in the newsletter and on Twitter #gorseygovernors • Governors could also provide a summary of each LGB meeting. <p>b. <u>Website Audit</u> CW to share his audit findings with LW and JM and consider incorporating the above ideas in to the governor section of the website.</p> <p>c. <u>Trust Away Day</u> LM informed governors that the Trust was looking to organise an away-day and governors would be duly invited. Date and venue to be arranged.</p>	CW – liaise with LW/JM re website
9	NEXT MEETINGS	
	<p>The date of the next LGB was confirmed as Tuesday 13th March 2018.</p> <p>The dates for the remainder of the academic year are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 22 May 2018 • 10 July 2018 	
10	IMPACT OF THIS MEETING	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governors developed a better understanding of how PHSE is implemented across the school/curriculum. • Governors had reviewed the GED and been informed of the schools focus and actions to improve pupil outcomes. • Governors had considered Pupil Progress ‘snapshot’ data for KS1 and KS2, identified the main area to focus on (Maths) and requested comparison projection updates at the Spring LGB meeting. • Governors had received the Laurus Trust CFO Report and had been made aware of the school’s financial situation over the 	



**GORSEY
BANK**

PRIMARY SCHOOL

	<p>coming years and requested to see the plan to address any deficit.</p> <p>Q) Would governors receive a copy of the Laurus Trust accounts? Only governors would like to monitor the Trust's financial situation as any issues would impact on the LGB.</p> <p>A) The Laurus Trust Financial Statements were openly published and the public could access that information. A copy could be provided to the LGB if deemed necessary.</p>	
--	--	--

The meeting moved to Part 2.

..... Chair

..... Dated