

PART ONE

**MINUTES OF THE FULL GOVERNING BODY
OF DORMANSLAND PRIMARY SCHOOL
HELD IN SCHOOL on MONDAY 20 NOVEMBER 2023 AT 4PM**

Present:			
Liz James (LJ) Chair	Parent	Keith Coleman (KC)	Parent
Helen Roe: HR arrived at 5pm	Co-opted	Hayley Clark: HC	Staff
Alex Sweetlove: AS	Co-opted	Jenny Ashley (JA)	LA
Ef시오 Gigliotti (EG) left at 5.30pm	Co-opted	Marie Langer (ML)	Co-opted
Faye Davies: FD	Co-Headteacher	Mark Cook: MC	Co-Headteacher
In attendance:			
Catriona Sanderson: CS	Clerk	Louisa Blyde:	School Business Mgr
Jess Newns: JN	Senior Teacher		
Junior Leadership Team: Items 1-3 BK, SC, BM, FM, AT, BY			

1.	<p>WELCOME & ADMINISTRATION</p> <p>a) No Apologies for absence b) Jess Newns welcomed to the meeting as a new member of the SLT. c) No declarations of interest in specific agenda items.</p>	
2.	<p>CLERK'S UPDATE:</p> <p>Governors reminded to inform clerk when they had been on training courses. New Website up and running. CS checked that governors could access the Governor Zone. Some items still needed to be uploaded. Action: CS to check and update, including Governor List.</p> <p>Currently no vacancies but a possible candidate was interested, via a contact from AS. If suitable they could be appointed as an associate allowing them to "train up" in the role and then take up a full position when a vacancy occurred.</p>	CS
3.	<p>JUNIOR LEADERSHIP TEAM (JLT)</p> <p>The JLT was welcomed to the meeting and introduced themselves. They were all in Y6 and Mrs Seltzer oversaw their roles. They had agreed their foci for the year and had three main projects they were working on. They informed governors what these were. Governors asked questions to clarify and gain further information.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A Bring and Buy Toy Sale. Each child in school could bring 1 or 2 toys in and £1. JLT would display toys on sale and children would come to the sale in house groups to purchase something. Proceeds would go to Cancer Research and any left-over toys to be sold at Christmas Fayre or donated to charity shops. Posters around the school to promote the event as well as all families receiving an email. At the meeting it was agreed that the Houses should be drawn out of a hat to see which one came to the sale first. 2. Deciding which Charity to Support: Three had been short-listed: RSPCA, Great Ormond Street Hospital and Cancer Research. Cancer Research received the most votes and was therefore chosen. 3. Tackling a Problem: JLT were aware that children often walked up the grass banks and this was a problem. They planned to build a low-level fence as a deterrent, but it would be made with wooden cups with the names of pupils when they left, that they would buy – raising money for charity. It would be a visual reminder not to walk on the bank as well as a memory wall. It combined giving away to charity with something to help and support the school. <p>JLT had the opportunity to ask questions:</p>	

	<p>What is your favourite part of the job? Seeing pupils in their classes, being able to see what the headteachers told them in practice in class.</p> <p>What are you plotting? LJ explained what was on the current agenda: Safeguarding always on there as it was important for governors to ensure the children were safe. JLT confirmed that they knew about this and had designed a poster/letter to ensure they all knew who to talk to if they had a concern.</p> <p>Governors thanked JLT for attending and asked if they would come back to a meeting in the summer term to report on their progress over the year. Action: CS to note for agenda. 4.20pm JLT left meeting.</p>	CS
4.	<p>CHAIR'S ACTION No emergency actions taken since the last meeting. Governors noted that the HT appraisal had taken place at the end of September, carried out by Alison Day from Leo Trust.</p>	
5.	<p>SAFEGUARDING FD reported that the electronic gates were working and the electronic sign-in system was also up and running. Visitor lanyards had been replenished to ensure that adult visitors were easily identified. FD had attended refresher safeguarding training the previous week and whilst talking with others had come across the idea of different colour lanyards that differentiated between adults with DBS check or without who could or could not be alone in the school. She liked the idea that the children could easily identify visitors and it might help staff more easily distinguish who needed to be escorted and who didn't.</p> <p>ML reported back from her Safeguarding Visit on 8 November. Governors had received her report with meeting papers. ML highlighted a few points from her report. Online safety processes as required by KCSiE 2023 were in place and compliant. New school website up and running. Policies published and up to date. Staff handbook updated. Report noted that all but one governor had confirmed to say they had read and understood KCSiE. EG was asked and said that he had now read and understood this document. He also noted that he had taken the quiz.</p> <p>ML informed governors that she had attended two Ofsted Webinars that were available on YouTube. She strongly encouraged other governors to look at what Ofsted was offering in this way. She had attended: How Ofsted inspects safeguarding in schools and Effective culture of safeguarding in schools. Both had been very informative and really got across the essential role that governors had in developing safeguarding culture within school. Action: Agreed that all governors should watch at least one of these webinars and inform CS when they had done so.</p> <p>FD agreed to alert governors to other relevant Ofsted webinars as they came up. Action: FD.</p> <p>LJ asked if there were any particular implications from KCSiE that the school needed to consider. Main area to do with monitoring and filtering online. MC confirmed that the school had checks in place and ran this through London Grid for Learning (LGFL) which provided reports. They also had support via Classmaster who looked after the school's IT.</p> <p>KC asked how the school managed visits for prospective parents from a safeguarding point of view. In the past there had been a big one-off open day with many people on school site which had been hard to manage. This year nine tours had been run with groups of six which the school had been much more able to manage with FD or MC showing the groups around.</p>	All FD

6.	<p>HEADTEACHER REPORT</p> <p>No questions had been submitted in advance. Governors were reminded to note the deadline on agendas for asking questions in advance as this helped SLT prepare.</p> <p>Y5 teacher leaving at Christmas. This had happened at relatively short notice. First round of advertising had not been successful but then an ECT (early careers teacher) had applied and been appointed to start after Easter. This left one term to fill, and school was hopeful it had someone for this too. JA queried the effect it would have on the year group to have three teachers over the year. FD agreed it was important to ensure they were looked after and they had considered supply teachers but felt this could be even more disruptive. LJ asked how they could ensure stability for them in Y6. One possibility being considered was to send the TA up with them in Y6. This had worked well in the past, but at this stage could not be guaranteed. FD was confident that they had a good plan in place and that the teacher starting was a good fit. It was a permanent appointment and the teacher would be well settled into school by next September. JA asked if the school had to provide support for an ECT. Yes, JN was trained to provide this over two years.</p> <p>KC asked what would happen to the music co-ordinator role that the Y5 teacher had also carried out. FD confirmed that the new teacher was not musical, but they had some options: A parent may be coming into help and Lingfield College had offered to support a school choir. She also stressed that many other teachers were involved in putting on musical events and good handover plans were in place including a resource called "Sing-Up".</p> <p>MC reported that the new website was up and running. It had been quite a difficult process to transfer data over. Positive feedback received from parents, especially as it was now much easier to access on phones or tablets. It was also easier to maintain. Governors congratulated the school on getting this done.</p> <p>KC asked for clarification on the role of an Educational Psychologist (EP). In the past Surry had an Educational Psychology Team who would visit the school to support particular children they were concerned about. Now they only covered statutory area for EHCPs (Educational Health Care plans). An EP the school used to work with had set up their own business employing several EPs and the school was now buying into this service. Noted as a crucial need to unpick and deal with some of the issues the children were facing. TA training was being provided on Precision Training, an intervention method. EG asked if they came from the LA. No – HC confirmed there was some involvement from the LA in other areas but not educational psychologists. Governors asked what needs the children had who saw an EP. It was connected to learning and behaviour issues and could link to undiagnosed health problems as well. As a result, they may then need a health referral.</p> <p>KC commented that not everyone had understood the link between the odd sock day and bullying. This led to a discussion on national programmes and which ones the school chose. LJ suggested the school could ask the JLT to comment on which ones they thought would be good.</p> <p>New Payroll System: Surrey had brought in a new system called Unit 4. LB had done an inordinate amount of work on this and there had been many problems including some new employees not being paid in September, October and November. Governors asked if Surrey charged for this service. Yes. LB had sent in a formal complaint. It was responded to, but no notification had been received when actions had been</p>	
----	---	--

	<p>taken. An official letter had been received at the end of September for school business managers to forward to employees affected by the non-payment of salaries but, although emails had been sent to business managers, nothing further had been issued to forward to all staff. LB was concerned for staff who received benefits because if salary pay was not correct this affected benefits. The school was not alone in the problems that had occurred, it was a Surrey-wide issue.</p> <p>Governors noted that the teacher pay award would not go through until December. There was a Surrey pay award in April for all support staff but this had not been actioned until August. Back pay had been split across August and September. All of these issues made it difficult to set a draft budget.</p> <p>JA queried some figures in the report: Pupil numbers in school context and % of children GLD: Action: MC to reprint School Context section and send to governors. To check % of GLD and report back.</p> <p>School Development Plan The format had been changed and it was now merged with the SEF (Self-Evaluation Form) to make it a more useful working document. MC and FD had worked with School Improvement Partner Roxanne Gumbs to come up with the priority areas. Within Leadership and Management, the vision and values section was being considered. The core values of "Inspire, Nurture, Challenge" were still appropriate but sitting under these were six further values, for example: happy, secure, inclusive. FD commented that they were unsure what these actually meant for pupils in school, and they were hidden from parents. Were they even relevant? Survey to be sent to parents and staff in the new year to address this. They needed to be based on the school's culture.</p> <p>Governors noted emphasis on strengthening greater depth in maths and writing. Resources in place but staff needed to be reminded of this. Mel Pollard continued with the Maths Hub and looked at ways to sustain and improve this work, however on visiting other schools she concurred that the school was doing well in this area. 5pm HR arrived.</p> <p>New Behaviour Initiative: Children were now much more aware of the different stages and understood the level of behaviour that would cause class teacher to contact their parents or one of the headteachers. Teachers were now asked to record behaviour issues throughout the week and JN analysing results to see if there were any trends.</p> <p>Other foci within SDP: Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS). HC had worked hard and FD said the YR class was a delight to visit. Since half term she noted that the children were really settling and starting to understand the routines and rules expected of them.</p> <p>Attendance: Several children still affected by Covid-legacy and had home attachment issues. Inclusion Manager was supporting these families.</p> <p>Throughout the SDP, governors noted "maintain the gain" this was to ensure that good results and priorities from the previous year were not forgotten.</p> <p>In KS1 a big variance in those working at greater depth in maths was noticed. HC said that part of this was due to lack of evidence that was now being worked on.</p>	MC
7.	<p>FINANCE FMR: Due to IT issues and power cuts the previous week this had not been distributed. LB reported that in future the FMR would be sent monthly to KC to</p>	

	<p>check and the most recent one would come to governor meetings. Main areas to note: An increase in salary costs due to employment of more staff for the children with SEN needs. The school had to employ the staff before it got funding. KC asked if money would be backdated when it came. Yes. HR asked if the funding would cover all the costs. Likely that it would not and the school would have to absorb extra costs of salaries incurred to support the children.</p> <p>Surplus had reduced, but good news from Amigos. Places had been increased on some days to accommodate new parents in school which was generating significant extra funds. LB forecast an extra £7000. They would need to apply to transfer the funds to the main budget but unlikely that this would be rejected as it could be shown that this would benefit all children in school.</p> <p>Draft Budget: Due to IT issues and problems with new payroll system, Surrey had extended the deadline to 11 December. LB asked if governors could receive this by email (this had happened in the past).</p> <p>Governors agreed the following: LB to send draft budget by email to all governors with a deadline for replies. Any questions governors had must be cc'd to all and subsequent approval of draft budget.</p> <p>The most difficult part of draft budget was predicting staff salaries. LB was unsure what was happening with the increased employer contributions for teacher pensions. (12%). It was thought the government would fund it for the first year. EG asked if the school offered salary-sacrifice schemes. (an agreement to reduce an employee's entitlement to cash pay, usually in return for a non-cash benefit). Surrey did offer this kind of scheme, for example, bike to work but a member of staff would need to apply to Surrey and currently no-one had applied.</p> <p>KC asked if the school had received funding for adaptation of disabled toilet. Not yet, it was still being worked on. EG asked if the school had CAD diagrams for this. No, it was not something the school dealt with directly, it went through Surrey. (at this point, governors considered complaints policy after which EG left meeting – see item 8 below).</p> <p>JA asked what percentage of the budget was spent on salaries and what the school would consider its ceiling for this. Currently 84%. LB said they would not want to go above this but the school did have a high proportion of staff on upper pay scales and at the top of main scale. JA suggested this was a consideration for future investment and asked if the school ever encouraged staff to move on to grow careers elsewhere. FD noted this and commented on the difficult balance of having experienced staff versus budget versus recruitment. JA asked how the school encouraged training up from within. A TA who had worked in the school last year had an overseas teaching qualification and had approached the school about doing an apprenticeship through the school. LB was looking into options for the apprentice levy and they were also registered with Christchurch University Canterbury for taking student teachers.</p> <p>JA asked about admin staff and noted that the school had cut back to three admin staff. Governors also discussed support staff. LB always considered this but it would be a complete policy change if the school decided to reduce the number of TAs and consultation would be required before removing roles.</p> <p>Governors thanked LB for all her hard work on keeping the school finances under control and producing reports for them.</p>	
8.	POLICIES: Nominated governors had been assigned documents and policies to review in advance and recommend approval.	

	<p>(EG asked for complaints policy to be covered as he needed to leave the meeting by 5.30pm)</p> <p>Complaints: EG had reviewed this in advance and thought it was too procedural. He noted that the first page had a typing error the word Staff included. Action: FD to remove this. EG said he did not agree with everything in the policy and had suggested a new introduction that he had written. FD, MC and LJ explained that this was a Surrey Model Policy and that they would not wish to deviate from it in case this affected the support they received from Surrey if there was a complaint. Governors discussed whether the policy needed to go to all governors to consider the concerns EG had. However, a majority of other governors had read the policy and were happy to approve it. Governors approved the policy. EG did not approve the policy and wished to contact Surrey about his concerns. Action: FD to find out if there was anyone at Surrey that he could contact. EG was reminded that it was not the role of governors to rewrite school policies. 5.30pm EG left the meeting and governors moved back to finance section.</p> <p>Health, Safety and Welfare: see below</p> <p>SEND: JA had reviewed the policy and recommended approval. Governors approved the policy.</p> <p>Relationships and Sex Education: HR had reviewed the policy and had a number of queries. It was felt this did not affect the policy and HR recommended approval. It was agreed that JN would answer HR's queries and these would be reported back at the next meeting. Action: Clerk to note for agenda. Governors approved the policy.</p> <p>Pupil Premium Statement: JA Sports Premium Statement: AS</p> <p>Noted that these were not policies that needed to be approved. They were statutory documents that the school must display on its website. AS had asked if the school had the funds within its budget to carry out all that was noted in the sports premium statement. Yes it did. JA had some queries and suggestions about the Pupil Premium Statement. It was agreed that she would discuss these during her next visit to school and report back to governors. Action: CS to note for report/agenda</p> <p>Governors noted that the school had reviewed and updated the following policies: Admissions Arrangements, Adult helpers and visitors' policy, EYFS Policy, Home Learning Policy Home School Agreement</p> <p>CS suggested a change in the way policies were reviewed. It was agreed that policies requiring review should be sent to designated governors earlier than one week before a meeting to allow for comments and queries to be dealt with outside the meeting. Action: CS to work out deadlines for this with FD and MC.</p>	<p>FD</p> <p>FD</p> <p>JN, HR CS</p> <p>JA, CS</p> <p>CS</p>
9.	<p>HEALTH AND SAFETY</p> <p>Health, Safety and Welfare Policy: KC had reviewed the policy and made a few comments prior to the meeting to MC. MC had made the changes. KC had queried the reference to lockdown and fire drills. MC confirmed that a fire rill happened termly and also a lockdown drill with the aim being to get children to designated safe place as quickly as possible. Designated areas were the hall and library. Member of SLT took the grab bag. KC asked what was in this. It included a list of all pupils, contact numbers, a torch , contact details of area support officer and a copy of the emergency plan, keys to the church which was the contingency safe area.</p>	

	<p>KC recommended approval. Governors approved the policy.</p> <p>Health and Safety Executive to carry out random school inspections and in preparation for this, the school had completed a conditions survey.</p>	
10.	<p>MONITORING</p> <p>This was well underway for the term with dates set for most visits.</p> <p>Action: KC to set date for monitoring of SLT and middle leaders.</p> <p>CS to upload reports to Governor Zone when done.</p>	KC
11.	<p>MINUTES</p> <p>Governors approved the minutes of the meeting held on 13 September 2023 as an accurate record and they were signed by the Chair.</p> <p>Outstanding Actions: Staff/Governor Lunch: to be on agenda at next meeting. CS to note.</p> <p>Query raised at previous meeting about how to include extra agenda items requested by Governors: Clerk had sent governors details of annual planner which gave overview of what needed to be covered at each meeting. It was agreed that if a governor wished an agenda item to be considered, they must email Clerk, Heads, Chair and Vice-Chair no later than three weeks before a meeting with suggested item (but no guarantee it would be included). For the next meeting it must be received by 3 January. Governors agreed that any requests must be relevant and appropriate to the role of governance in schools.</p>	CS
12.	<p>WHAT HAVE WE DONE AT THIS MEETING TO BENEFIT OR IMPROVE THE EDUCATION OF THE CHILDREN IN OUR SCHOOL?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listened to plans of the JLT and encouraged them in their role. • Considered needs of Y5 following changes to teaching staff. • Approved Health and Safety Policy • Considered Budget. 	
13.	<p>DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monday 22 January 2024 4-6pm • Wednesday 6 March 2024 4-6pm • Thursday 2 May 2024 4-6pm • Wednesday 3 July 2024 4-6pm 	
	Meeting ended at 6pm	

Advice given by Governors at this school is incidental to their professional expertise and is not being given in their professional capacity. Governors must respect the confidence of those items of business which a governing body decides and not disclose what individual governors have said or how they have voted within a meeting.

Signed..... Date.....