

**PART ONE**

**MINUTES OF THE FULL GOVERNING BODY  
OF DORMANSLAND PRIMARY SCHOOL  
HELD IN SCHOOL on THURSDAY 6 JULY 2023 AT 4PM**

<b>Present:</b>			
Liz James (LJ) Chair	Parent	Marie Langer (ML)	Co-opted
Helen Roe: HR	Co-opted	Hayley Clark: HC	Staff
Alex Sweetlove: AS	Co-opted	Jenny Ashley (JA)	Co-opted
Faye Davies: FD	Co-Headteacher	Mark Cook: MC	Co-Headteacher
<b>In attendance:</b>			
Catriona Sanderson: CS	Clerk	Louisa Blyde:	School Business Mgr

1.	<p><b>WELCOME &amp; ADMINISTRATION</b></p> <p>a) Apologies received and accepted from Keith Coleman, Alex Sweetlove (reasons given) Apologies received and accepted from Efiso Gigliotti (no reason given).</p> <p>b) Clerk confirmed that the meeting was quorate.</p> <p>c) No declarations of interest in specific agenda items.</p>	
2.	<p><b>CHAIR'S ACTION:</b> No emergency actions taken.</p>	
3.	<p><b>CLERK'S UPDATE: PROCEDURES, ROLES &amp; RESPONSIBILITIES</b></p> <p>a. Contact Details: Governors confirmed their willingness for details to be circulated within school &amp; other governance agencies.</p> <p><b>Roles confirmed and updated as follows:</b></p> <p>b. Governor responsible for liaison with LA in the event of allegation (Child Protection) against Headteacher: Liz</p> <p>c. Pay Committee: Jenny, Liz, Alex</p> <p>d. HT Appraisal Review: Liz &amp; external advisor. <b>Date to be agreed</b></p> <p>e. Child Protection/Safeguarding Governor: Marie</p> <p>f. Children Looked After: Jenny</p> <p>g. SEND: Jenny</p> <p>h. Finance Governor: Keith</p> <p>i. Health &amp; Safety: Efiso</p> <p>j. Quality of Education: Alex and Helen</p> <p>k. Website: Hayley</p> <p>l. Governors discussed and noted that the roles of Chair and Vice-Chair would be appointed at the next meeting. LJ confirmed that she was happy to continue in the role, but also welcomed others if they wished to nominate themselves. A discussion followed about the importance of succession planning and sharing duties to ensure individual governors were not overloaded. CS shared a model from one of her other schools. Co-Chairs split the role but did not do other monitoring to ease the burden and make the role of Chair less of a step up for other governors.</p> <p>m. SDP would be ready in September and governor monitoring roles would then be assigned.</p> <p><b>Procedures as outlined on sheet agreed</b></p> <p>n. Governors <b>agreed</b> to continue holding closed meetings</p> <p>o. Governors <b>agreed to</b> these protocols and statements: Alternative Participation Protocol, Professional Negligence &amp; Confidentiality Statement</p> <p>p. <b>Code of Conduct: All governors signed a copy.</b></p> <p>Governors <b>approved</b> the Terms of Reference</p>	
4.	<p><b>SAFEGUARDING</b></p> <p>ML carried out a safeguarding visit on 20 June and notes from meeting on Governor Zone. ML observed how families arrived at school and accompanied Julie Lochhead at the gate. She commented on how well the school was able to</p>	

	<p>identify any children arriving with anxiety issues and they were immediately cared for. Safeguarding culture in school was now well established. Training up to date. Governors confirmed that new starters in September would undertake the necessary training and DBS checks to be carried out. LB confirmed this.</p> <p>No safeguarding issues. There was an accessibility issue for new child due to start in September with severe disabilities (Noted in HT report). FD reported that school had emailed the Special needs case worker who had gone back to Surrey. The number of hours to be allocated to the child was still not confirmed and this made it very difficult for Dormansland to prepare, advertise and recruit. <b>HR asked if there could be a delayed start.</b> Yes, legally she did not need to be in school until the term when she turned 5, which was Spring term. <b>Governors queried why the allocation of an EHCP had not given the hours.</b> EHCP process changing and now involved two meetings. One to allocate the plan and a further meeting to agree funding. Governors noted the uncertainty was hard for the family. HC said they had concerns for her medical needs and how the school could best support her.</p> <p>CPOMS: Some staff had received further training which was cascaded down to all staff. FD and MC had noted an increase in the quantity and quality of reports being entered which they were pleased about.</p> <p>Policy updates: Changes to KCSiE would come through in September. FD reported that the Government would not finalise changes until 6 September which was very unhelpful for schools who used insets at the start of September to cover updates. Surrey had asked all schools to respond to a survey they were producing which they would use to go back to express dissatisfaction to central Government.</p> <p>ML had discussed Ofsted during her visit and noted that following situation with teacher who took her own life following an Ofsted report, they planned to be a lot more collaborative with schools in the future.</p> <p><b>Action: CS to share notes of Ofsted questions from another Trust with governors.</b></p> <p>Next term Safeguarding to focus on online safety. KCSiE to have an emphasis on this. <b>LJ asked if the Chrome Books used in school had the necessary filters on them.</b> Yes, school used London Grid for Learning (LGFL) which ensured correct filters on all devices. Security being further tightened over the summer. Noted that LGFL could easily enable the school to block or unblock websites. <b>LJ asked if it provided reports on what staff or children might search on.</b> Yes, it did this.</p> <p>During ML's visit a change to procedures and policies for children who wished to bring a mobile phone to school. From September if a child (or their parent) wished them to bring a phone to school, the parent would first have had to attend a workshop in school regarding online safety. School planned to hold them at different times during the school day.</p> <p>ML said, that one year on she now felt a lot more confident in her role as Safeguarding Governor. Visit from Roxanne Gumbs ( see HT report) had concurred with the high quality of work that ML did and that going forward only one safeguarding visit a term was necessary. ML thanked for all she did and time she gave to the role of Safeguarding Governor.</p>	CS
5.	<p><b>HEADTEACHER REPORT</b></p> <p>FD and MC reported that Roxanne Gumbs, School Improvement Advisor from Schools Alliance for Excellence (SAfE) had visited school that morning to carry out a quality assurance visit. She had come in an advisory capacity met SLT,</p>	

teachers and Chair of governors and they reported that it had been a very positive visit. She was impressed with the school, alongside giving some advice on ways they could continue to improve. She looked at data, including attendance and found all to be very robust. A report would be sent to the school. **JA asked if this was similar to what a School Improvement Advisor would do and did the school have to pay.** It was part of Surrey's responsibility to maintained schools. Although school did not pay for it directly, they did pay for services from SAfE, so it was included in that. SAfE used to pick a selection of schools at random to visit but they were now visiting all schools. JA concurred that it was good to have external validation. FD and MC felt very positive about the visit and wanted to share, improve and collaborate.

RG had picked up on the fact that governors talked to both staff and pupils when they visited the school. She also said that for governors, when in front of Ofsted it was acceptable to say "I don't know" but I know where to go to get that question answered.

Questions raised in advance:

School Absence: **EG asked if there was a possibility that by focusing on high attendance targets alongside not authorising time off for holidays, could the school inadvertently be seen as less attractive to those settling in the area from overseas or with different cultures and religions which might wish for time off at different times to normal school holidays.** He wondered if this might cause less families to choose the school. FD and MC explained that they were bound to following Surrey Guidance on attendance. This did allow for time off in exceptional circumstances, for example EID and for children from Gypsy/Romany families, if they travelled, the school had a special code they could use. Governors were confident that the SLT followed the prescribed law with regards to attendance and absence and that they continued to uphold their responsibilities in relation to EDI.

Governors discussed the problem of unauthorised absences and how much of this could be attributed to affluent families going on holidays who were happy to pay fines. For something like a wedding or funeral the school would authorise the actual day and one travelling day if required, but no more. **JA asked why Y6 had higher absence rates.** Now that SATS were over some families did not see the same need to keep them in school and there was a large group within the year that holidayed and took days out together. The school always phoned and queried reasons for absence given. School would be issuing fines from September (Governors noted that it was Surrey who made any decisions on whether a family was fined. The school had template letters that would be used). **HR asked how the school re-enforced the importance of attendance.** It was emphasised at the new parent open evening, reiterated at parent coffee mornings and in newsletters.

**EG asked if there were any opportunities to apply for grants from Surrey for specialised vehicles for children with disabilities.** Noted that this would come from a personal budget. If school was going on a trip and needed a special vehicle for a child with a disability, they would be able to hire an appropriate vehicle.

**Finance Audit:** LB reported that this was still ongoing with a few more items that she needed to provide to auditors. Formal report to follow but three findings noted. 1. Something the auditor had missed and the school actually did. 2. Recommended that the school should have written contracts/agreements with other schools that gave them services free of charge. For example, Lingfield College allowed the school to use its minibuses. The auditor suggested this should be more formalised. Governors discussed

	<p>whether this might actually hinder positive informal relationships that had been built up over time. <b>Governors agreed and authorised</b> the SLT to consider the recommendation and make a decision. Noted that it was only a suggestion from auditor, the school did not have to follow it. 3. Recommended that school should hold a list of register of interests for all members of staff. LB said this was captured on application forms and currently there were none. School planned to add this to forms that staff were asked to complete each year with update of their personal details. Internal audit had been a long process. Governors congratulated LB on the process and the very minor recommendations.</p> <p><b>Data:</b> KS2 data due out on 11<sup>th</sup> July. Governors would see data within HT report in September.</p> <p><b>SDP/SEF:</b> RG discussed this with FD and MC suggesting it should be more streamlined and combined into one document. <b><i>LJ queried whether the SEF was not a valuable stand-alone document for internal audit that then linked to the SDP and asked what the benefit of combining them was.</i></b> They would be shown separately within the combined document and there would be a full and abridged version.</p> <p><b><i>JA asked if targets should be measurable and smart.</i></b> A discussion followed noting differing advice around targets and that SMART targets were no longer always recommended. FD explained that all teachers had targets, but they were moving away from SMART targets to create smaller targets within the headline ones. ML suggested it was important not to focus on the measurement of a target but the overall way in which it could be achieved. Governors to see the SDP next term.</p> <p><b>Finance:</b> LB reported that the May FMR didn't show much yet, after only two months everything was still on track and governors noted some skewing of figures where SLAs paid upfront. The June FMR would give a better picture of how the school was doing. LB reported on a new payroll system being set up via Surrey. Several initial problems with staff not being able to see pay and transactions needing to be authorised. LB was hopeful that the new system would be working properly by the end of July.</p>	
6.	<p><b>POLICIES</b></p> <p><b>Emergency Plan:</b> KC had reviewed this in advance and suggested some minor points to LB which had been noted. <b>Governors approved the policy.</b> FD explained that the policy included information of what to do in an emergency and where the school would need to congregate off site if necessary. It was reviewed annually.</p> <p><b>Staff Pay and Appraisal:</b> JA had reviewed in advance and said it was fit for purpose, being mainly based on Surrey template. It included current figures, but LB would update in November/December when new terms and conditions for teachers agreed. <b>Governors approved the policy.</b></p> <p>Governors <b>agreed</b> that the next meeting of pay committee would follow FGB on Monday 20<sup>th</sup> November at 6pm: <b>Jenny, Liz, Alex to note.</b></p> <p><b><i>JA asked when appraisals had to be completed.</i></b> FD and MC confirmed that they would all be done before half term. <b><i>JA asked who the external advisor for HT appraisal would be.</i></b> Still being agreed. Previously it had been Alison Day but the school could buy the service in from Strictly Education or SAfE and was considering both options. Governors confirmed that the co-heads had been set targets in September when they had initially agreed to take on the role at very short notice for a temporary period. Targets had continued once in substantive role.</p>	JA, LJ, AS

<p>7.</p>	<p><b>GOVERNOR MONITORING</b>  Governors noted Health and Safety Report from EG.  JA had recently carried out Behaviour and Attitudes monitoring (report to follow).  AS had come into school and given Y6 a “Y7” English lesson and observations from this would form her final monitoring on quality of education for the year.</p> <p><b>Governors discussed and agreed to the continued use of the template for monitoring.</b> All governors to use the report after a visit which ensured consistency. It was also noted and emphasised that monitoring reports and other documentation created by governors was for internal circulation only. If a governor wanted to check or discuss something externally, they must first check with SLT and Chair as this could be a data or GDPR breach. <b>Governors agreed.</b></p> <p><b>Review of Monitoring:</b> Two questions to consider: Is it giving governors confidence in holding SLT to account and is it supportive to SLT.  ML concurred that it was the triangulation of checking that what SLT told governors in a meeting was happening and they could check this by talking to staff and pupils to ensure there was consistency. It was also valuable evidence for Ofsted.</p> <p>Governors noted and <b>agreed</b> that next year’s monitoring objectives and responsibilities may change once the SDP was finalised.</p> <p>SLT said it was good to talk to governors during visits. JA said she had met both the SLT and Julie Lochhead during recent monitoring and reported it to be a very open conversation. She praised FD and MC for how they facilitated such open dialogues with their staff. Confirmed that JA and ML had spoken to children on previous visits.</p> <p>Governors discussed and noted that EDI, SEND and Safeguarding came into everything they and the school did. It was <b>agreed</b> that monitoring forms would be slightly tweaked to remind governors to consider these areas whilst on monitoring visits. <b>Action: Clerk to update form.</b></p>	<p><b>CS</b></p>
<p>8.</p>	<p><b>GOVERNOR EFFECTIVENESS</b>  <b>Training:</b> Governors discussed the need to stay up to date with training and ideally complete one training session per term. It was noted that it could sometimes be confusing to log in/access training. Governors had access to the NGA (National Governors Association) and Strictly Education which had an additional section called Better Governor. <b>Action: Clerk to provide clear instructions for governors on how to access training.</b></p> <p>Governors also discussed the need for a clear induction which would point them to a set of required initial training (to include Safeguarding and Introduction to School Governance) NGA Learning Link gave guidance for this and previous information provided by IEB. <b>Action: Clerk to update and provide clear induction information. Agreed</b> that when a new governor joined, they would be invited to school one hour before their first FGB for induction and welcome to the school. <b>Action: CS, LJ, FD, MC</b></p> <p><b>How has the year gone? (One year on from becoming a new FGB).</b>  ML said things felt a lot calmer and governors now knew where they were heading. JA said the FGB felt a lot more purposeful, it was functioning well and she hoped they could continue to progress and become even more effective.</p> <p>FD and MC commented on how effective the monitoring throughout the year had been and HC said it now felt that the governors were part of the same school community. LB concurred that things felt a lot more unified. Children were much more used to seeing governors around the school. There had been a lot for the governors to take on at the start, but they had come together well</p>	<p><b>CS</b></p> <p><b>CS</b></p> <p><b>CS, LJ, FD, MC</b></p>

	<p>as a group. JA expressed a desire to visit the school informally. All governors received the newsletters and FD extended an open invitation to governors to attend assemblies or any other events such as fetes, sports day etc – governors were always welcome. As a courtesy, governors were asked to inform the school in advance if they planned to attend any events.</p> <p>Governors discussed and noted that they had</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positively managed a very complex issue with discretion whilst offering stability to the school community and ensuring children were well-supported to carry on with education as normal.</li> <li>• Successfully transitioned from the Interim Executive Board (IEB)</li> <li>• Appointed co-heads using a fair and robust recruitment process</li> <li>• Recruited further governors</li> <li>• Undertaken strong monitoring throughout the year</li> <li>• Continued to keep academisation on the agenda throughout the year</li> </ul> <p>Governors also congratulated the heads on the successful SAFE quality assurance visit. All concurred that there was now a much more open collaborative approach to governance within the school. FD and MC had the support they needed from the Chair and Vice-Chair. JA commented that none of this could have been possible without the Co-heads agreeing to step up and manage the school in September.</p> <p><b><i>ML suggested the SLT should also say how they felt about the FGB and JA asked if staff felt the governors were accessible enough.</i></b></p> <p>LJ reported that a couple of staff members had contacted her directly. HC said that when governors came to school, staff were happy to talk to them. LB suggested that small things were good and it was noted that informal visits were helpful. Governors agreed to put on another staff lunch sometime in the next academic year. <b>Action: All govs.</b></p> <p>Governors discussed the Code of Conduct and noted how important it was to be familiar with what it said and adhere to the principles set out. During the year there had been some blurring of what was strategic and what was operational. Governors needed to ensure they were strategic and left operational matters to the SLT. Governors were also reminded to act professionally and ensure they only shared what was appropriate in terms of their personal views in relation to school matters. <b>Governors agreed.</b></p> <p><b>Governors agreed</b> that the Chair of Governors should delegate more and take on less monitoring to ensure that the role was easier for others to step into/ease succession planning.</p> <p>It was <b>agreed</b> that there would be short paragraph from the governors in the final newsletter of term. <b>Action: LJ</b></p> <p>CS informed governors that Rebecca Plaskitt, CEO of Tandridge Learning Trust had confirmed she would be attending part of the first meeting in September. <b><i>JA asked if any other Trusts were being considered.</i></b> Yes, this was just the first. SLT recently made aware of another possibility based in W Sussex. FD and MC also forming links with the Horley Learning Partnership (HLP) not a MAT, but it provided positive collaboration between schools.</p>	<p><b>All govs</b></p> <p><b>LJ</b></p>
9.	<p><b>MINUTES:</b> Governors <b>approved</b> the minutes of the meeting held on 4 May 2023 as an accurate record and they were signed by the Chair. Actions: None outstanding.</p>	
10.	<p><b>WHAT HAVE WE DONE AT THIS MEETING TO BENEFIT OR IMPROVE THE EDUCATION OF THE CHILDREN IN OUR SCHOOL?</b></p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This had been covered in the review of governor effectiveness and governors could see a clear connection that what they did was there to improve the outcomes for the children in school. Governors thanked staff, SLT and the clerk for all they had done over the year.</li> <li>It was noted that governors had discussed and agreed to several items in relation to effectiveness and conduct. <b>Action: Clerk to ensure that governors not present at meeting were made aware of what they also needed to agree to.</b></li> </ul>	CS
11.	<b>DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> September:</b> 4-5.30pm FGB 5.45-6.60pm Tandridge Learning Trust presentation.</li> <li><b>Monday 20<sup>th</sup> November</b> 4-6pm ( followed by Pay Committee at 6pm)</li> <li><b>Monday 22 January 2024</b> 4-6pm</li> <li><b>Wednesday 6 March 2024</b> 4-6pm</li> <li><b>Thursday 2 May 2024</b> 4-6pm</li> <li><b>Wednesday 3 July 2024</b> 4-6pm</li> </ul>	
	Meeting ended at 5.50pm	

**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.....