

Moorland Local Advisory Committee (LAC)

Wednesday 8th May 2024 at 5.30pm
Held online via Microsoft 'Teams'

Attended:

Governance Professional- Charlotte Roe (GP)

Chair- Oliver Heathman (OH)

Foundation Governor- Rev Gareth (RG)

Parent Governors- Lynda Cooper (LC), Rosie Stamp (RS), Ewa Ziubryniewicz (EZ), Richard Nutbeam (RN)

LAC Clerk- Nicol Bush (NB)

No	Item	Actions
1.	Welcome and Apologies Apologies were received from AW, JG, RSt.	
2.	Declarations of interest There were none.	
3.	Approval of meeting minutes from March 6th 2024. For approval: The minutes were approved as a true record and would be signed by the Chair and sent to HR for uploading to the website.	Clerk to send minutes to HR.
4.	Matters arising from March 6th 2024 (not on the agenda) There were none.	
5.	Clerk Update- 5.1- Vacancies- The Clerk advised that the LAC was in the process of recruiting for a new Staff Governor. 5.2 Training – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Clerk thanked the LAC Governors for attending recent training with Lizzie Lethbridge (The Trust's Director of Education) that the GP had arranged, which had received very positive feedback from Governors that attended and informed that more training sessions were planned in the coming months with Christina Mabin (Diocese Education Officer on SIAMS/CofE schools) and Andy Keay (The Trust's Director of Standards and Outcomes on data and assessments) (dates TBC) The Clerk also encouraged all Governors to join the regular Governance training sessions that the Clerk circulated in the weekly Governance bulletin. 5.3 General reminders- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Clerk reminded Governors for any outstanding Bio's/photo to be sent to the clerk please. Governors were encouraged to share their completed visit reports with their AH's before the LAC meetings to keep them in the loop (Clerk to share draft minutes with AH's once approved by the Chair) Finally, the Clerk reminded the LAC that volunteers were still needed for the Trust's Exclusion panel. 	Clerk to share draft minutes with AH's following approval from The Chair.

6.	<p>Focus: Provision and impact for SEND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trends over time of prime needs, pupils moving on and off SEND registers, meeting progress targets and EHCP objectives • Pupil and parent voice <p>Wolborough- 21% of children in the school were SEN (above national) and currently had 8 EHCP's. The provision of SEN was a strength at the school-mirrored by the inclusive nature the school emanated. The key focus for the children was quality first teaching- in addition to that, the school used a wealth of devices to meet children's needs: relational practice, visual timetables, stripped back displays, targeted questioning, group work, mixed ability grouping. There was also additional support available for children outside of the classroom: speech link, mental health support team and Arthur the Dog.</p> <p>Children with an EHCP were on individual timetables and were closely supported by 1:1 adults. The children with SEN had made good progress from their starting points, but that had not significantly closed the gap between SEN children and their peers.</p> <p>The barriers that the school had encountered were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EHCP funding often did not match the cost of the support required. • Level of staffing fell short of what had been required. • Attendance of SEN was often lower than their peers. • The amount of space in and out of class was a challenge to ensure SEN children were well accommodated. <p>Parents were consulted throughout the SEN process; they had been informed about the levels of support their children had received.</p> <p>Hennock- Had a high number of pupils on the SEN register (18 of 61) (Governor previously noted Hennock's ethos and size was likely to appeal to parents which could have inflated the data) SEND lead was currently undertaking the SEN qualification and was providing a high level of support for SEN pupils on site.</p> <p>SEN children were supported through individualised, quality first teaching, Provision maps were in place and reviewed throughout the term. Funding was a challenge e.g. pupils who required a 1:1 support in order to remain safely on site- EHCP contribution did not cover so the school had to meet the shortfall. School had a good relationship with parents.</p> <p>Ilington- There had been a slight downturn in SEND numbers- 13 in total on SEND register, 7 on watchlist (2 had left to homeschool, more coming from pre-school) As had been reflected by the Inclusion register, the majority had Autism/ADHD profiles: those were the children with most need and who had funding/funding applications. Children with ASD were provided with practical aids to help them cope in school i.e. calm down baskets, individual workstations, visual timetables and social stories.</p> <p>Progress data across the school was "good" or "better": progress of children with lower levels of need was affected by the amount of resource used to support those with high needs who were unfunded. SEND pupil receiving 1:1 was making good progress with PSED and had a gradual increase in time interacting with peers. EHCP objectives were regularly reviewed and on track.</p> <p>Good relationships had developed with parents of children with SEND and AH had open channels of communication.</p>	
----	---	--

	<p><u>Bearnes-</u></p> <p>There was a higher than national number of SEN children at Bearnes- 46 on SEND register (11 with EHCP) Bearnes had an experienced SENDco and were well supported by the Trust Inclusion team. The biggest barrier was not having enough support staff hours which made it difficult to fully meet needs.</p>	
7.	<p>Focus: Oversight of pupil premium strategies and their impact</p> <p><u>Hennock-</u></p> <p>There were 4 PP pupils in the school, which included 1x Pre-school (1 of these pupils had SEN) PP funding was spent centrally i.e paid to the Trust and used to cover staff costs. Staff reported clear improvements within pupils. (Please refer to the Visit Note for further clarification on Hennock's PP barriers)</p> <p><u>Ilington-</u></p> <p>There were 8 PP pupils at the school; funds were spent on staffing, supporting residential and trips. (Link guidance- PP to cover 50% of trips/Residential) AH tracked data monitoring on progress and attainment and produced a termly report to ensure all were aware of developments and needs of pupils. The school's barriers were, that it was difficult to provide support and intervention to make a difference with the current situation of SEND funding and staff sickness. PP- £145/pupil received as part of the whole school budget and supported extra staffing focused on vulnerable children, the school had to charge approximately £4000 on excess supply costs recently: covered by The Link.</p> <p><u>Wolborough-</u></p> <p>Around 40% of the children were PP (well above the national averages) Funding was mostly spent on staffing to ensure children's needs were met- this included a focus on children's mental health. Funding was also spent on training for staff to help them deliver quality first teaching for PP children- which included the purchase of "Little Wandle" which had a significant impact on children. Impact would be measured through data from PP outcomes and measuring attendance of PP children. Attendance continued to be a barrier to their progress and the school were aware and working on improving it.</p> <p><u>Bearnes-</u></p> <p>There were 49 PP pupils (48%) Half of the funding went towards the Inclusion Hub, £9,500 was spent on an art therapist, who had a huge impact on SEMH in school, but unfortunately due to funding, could not continue to buy into the service.</p>	
8.	<p>School Updates</p> <p>Governors to consider and discuss feedback on any issues/successes from their school visits or visit notes completed by AH.</p> <p><u>Hennock-</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PAN (to include pupils joined/left)- 61 on register. • Pupil workload- Evidence of engagement of learning on the learning walk, pupils enjoyed after school clubs and pupil voice activities (school council, Eco warriors) 	

- **Staff wellbeing and workload-** Particular pressure on staff members undertaking additional training and ratios at ASC provision (being investigated)
- **Attendance-**95.6%
- **Feedback on any parent forum meetings/parents' evenings/PTFA-** PTFA was highly active and had been funding a range of activities this term, AH had worked closely with parents on specific issues e.g attendance (speaking to parents rather than sending out letters) AH had also been visibly present at the beginning and end of the school day.
- **Safeguarding-** Safeguarding checks were up to date, a concern had been raised around the security of site during After School Club, AH confirmed alternative arrangements were being investigated, in the meantime the side gate had been locked with an access code for parents.

Islington-

- **PAN** (to include pupils joined/left)- 73- numbers were strong in lower years, with full 2024 reception intake.
- **Attendance-** 96%
- **Pre-school update-** Major issue with staffing, only 1 member of team remained (pre-school lead) numbers bolstered with agency support.
- **Staff wellbeing and workload-** Team dynamic had been supportive; everyone was leaning in to help and cover where possible. The Link's HR team was brilliant- very measured and supportive approach. Staff wellbeing was hugely affected by staff absences/sickness- The Link Academy was currently funding the majority of TA support from agencies, which had been costly.
- **Feedback on any parent forum meetings/parents' evenings/PTFA-** AH had recently circulated another parent questionnaire and had offered meeting spots for a Headteacher session on parents evening.

Wolborough-

- **PAN-** 191
- **Attendance-** 92.4% (Included date from children with SEND on reduced timetables) attendance was a significant priority for Wolborough.
- **Pre-school update-** Pastoral support worker/Mental Health team working with individuals and groups/Dog mentor/Relational Approach.
- **Pupil workload-** The recent partnership with Bearnese had a significant impact on workload,
- **Staff workload and wellbeing-** Supervision being led by Educational Psychologist for staff working with children with high levels of need, Some Staff were accessing Health Assured, there had also been a Compassionate Training for staff around the subject of death.
- **Feedback on any parent forum meetings/parents' evenings/PTFA-** PTA had held an Easter bonnet parade which was a lovely community event, School had been running a weekly "supportive space" for parents to support each other, facilitated by a staff member. A pop in and play session continued to be run by parents.

Bearnese-

PAN-N	R	1	2	3	4	5	6
11	15	15	12	8	14	13	14

- **Attendance-** 94.2%
- **Feedback on any parent forum meetings/parents' evenings/PTFA-** A drop in was held for parents with the Executive head, the school had introduced a weekly drop-in reading session for EYFS and KS1 which was being well supported by parents.

9.	<p>Current Year's Trust Focus – Relational Approach</p> <p>Illesington- Staff were engaged and supportive, Module One was completed, three more training modules to complete as Twilights- Improving behaviour was evident among children.</p> <p><i>The Governors asked, "Was there a way the Trust was measuring the Impact of the Relational Approach?"</i></p> <p>Bearnes- The Relational Approach was strong, and staff had completed the first stages of Devon Relational training, A recent Learn, Support, Challenge day had highlighted the good behaviour and calm atmosphere in the school.</p>	
10.	<p>Standards and Curriculum Trustees Meeting</p> <p>The Chair fed back points raised at the recent S&C meeting.</p>	
11.	<p>Next S&C Focus:</p> <p>Focus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Overview of curriculum ○ Attendance ○ Behaviour and relational approach 	
12.	<p>Feedback from Ethos Committees and Community Groups</p> <p>SEG Focus: RE</p> <p>The Foundation Governor (FG) shared that he had recently visited Illesington for an ETHOS group meeting, which had been well organised, adding that there had been a learning walk with children, and he felt that the school had a great sense of Christian distinctiveness. The FG really enjoyed observing an assembly, where all children sat in a circle which felt very inclusive and lovely.</p> <p>Wolborough had also been visited- with a walk around with children, looking at a new RE provision in Y5 noting that students were using in depth knowledge and vocabulary surrounding RE.</p> <p>The FG shared that ETHOS minutes had been taken and would be sent to the Clerk who would then circulate with the LAC Governors.</p>	Foundation Governor to share ETHOS minutes with Clerk who will then circulate with LAC.
13.	<p>Evaluation of governance impact</p> <p>There were no comments.</p>	
14.	<p>Summary of questions from Governors to be raised at the S&C meeting:</p> <p>a. Questions relating to the focus.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Was there a way the Trust was measuring the Impact of the Relational Approach, was it having a better impact on other schools?</i> • <i>PP white Paper- Could it be shared with LAC governors.</i> • <i>What Risk assessments were being done around the schools, particularly access into sites pre and post school?</i> • <i>Was there a way of clarifying ratios for After school club (both generally and specifically whether preschoolers count as two pupils)</i> <p>b. Questions relating to anything else.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What would Trustee engagement with the LAC Hub look like?</i> • <i>Could there be better communication around AH appointment interviews, what local stakeholder has been around AH recruitment? What are Trustees expectations of Governors?</i> <p>The meeting ended at 7.15pm</p> <p>The Date of the next LAC meeting- Thursday June 26th 2024 at 5.30pm</p>	