

PART ONE

**MINUTES OF THE FULL GOVERNING BODY
OF DORMANSLAND PRIMARY SCHOOL
HELD IN SCHOOL on TUESDAY 8 MARCH 2022 AT 4PM**

Present:			
Linda Jasper: LJas: Chair	Additionally Appointed	Marie Langer: ML	Co-opted
Alan Gardner: AG: V-Chair	Additionally Appointed	Efisio Gigliotti: EG	Co-opted
Keith Coleman: KC	Parent	Sarah Stokes: SS	Headteacher
Liz James: LJam	Parent	Hayley Cooke: HC	Staff
Jenny Ashley: JA	LA	Alex Sweetlove (AS)	Co-opted
In attendance:			
Faye Davies: FD	Assistant Headteacher Items 1-3	Louisa Blyde: LB	School Business Manager Items 1-6
Catriona Sanderson: CS	Clerk		

1.	<p>WELCOME & ADMINISTRATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) No apologies for absence b) LJas welcomed AS to the meeting and brief introductions were made. c) Governors had voted unanimously to approve AS's appointment as a co-opted governor. d) No declarations of interest in specific agenda items. HC declared an interest in the Part 2 agenda round staff wellbeing. 	
2.	CHAIR'S ACTION: None taken.	
3.	<p>SAFEGUARDING: FD</p> <p>FD reported that she had attended training on graded care profiles, an assessment tool designed to help social workers identify when a child was at risk of neglect. She had undertaken further training on recording concerns and peer audits. Noted that the school used CPOMS, an electronic register to record safeguarding matters as well as other details.</p> <p>SS and FD attended DfE webinar on domestic abuse, information to be fed into staff safeguarding training.</p> <p>FD had attended 6 school group meetings, reviewing child protection and had needed to contact West Sussex for advice on one case. Governors noted that the school sat on the borders of three counties who all worked very differently, which was a further challenge for the school.</p> <p>Attendance was currently 93.9% noted that this was in line with similar schools. Before Covid attendance would have been closer to 97% and again noted that other schools reporting similarly.</p> <p>A "late-gate" to be held by the inclusion Officer in the coming weeks who would be on the gate to track late arrivals with the aim to improve punctuality. A lockdown drill had taken place on 07/03/22 taking 2 mins and 40 seconds. FD commented that the time could be improved as children were being "too polite" and staff had explained that in this kind of situation more than one class could walk down a corridor at once.</p> <p>Fire Drill on 23/02/22 taking 3 minutes and 5 seconds: slightly longer than the previous one which was due to a staff member struggling to open a padlock and Y3 in the hall doing PE without shoes on.</p> <p>No bullying, racist or harassment incidents recorded so far this term.</p>	

	<p>FD reported that recently the press had reported on two Surrey schools being graded inadequate by Ofsted (one of which had previously been outstanding). In both cases it was the safeguarding judgment that had caused the inadequate grading. FD, along with other safeguarding leads across Surrey had looked at the websites, read the Ofsted report and questioned the grading, particularly as one of the schools had a Surrey Safeguarding Audit conducted by Surrey 5 days after Ofsted in which it had been graded good.</p> <p>Ann Panton, SE Area Support Officer for Surrey reported that the Ofsted statements had been fairly bland but related to DBS checks on staff and convictions of wider family members.</p> <p>This prompted discussions about DBS checks. Noted that there was no statutory requirement to renew DBS checks. If DBS checks were renewed every 3 years, there would be a significant financial implication for the school. FD proposed one of two options to governors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Renew staff DBS checks every three years (cost £1800 each third year) 2. Renew all DBS checks once and then reimburse staff to buy the annual update service which would cost £13 a year per staff member. This would incur the initial outlay of £1800 but would then be the cheaper option over the following years. LJas commented that the school must be fully compliant in this area. Noted that the school was compliant, this was only a recommendation. Governors discussed the options and noted that LB would do a mid-year check on all staff in February (they would be asked to sign to say that nothing had changed). Governors were asked which option the school should go for. Governors voted unanimously for Option 2. <p>Governors discussed the term Safeguarding Culture which Surrey used, and that Ofsted would ask governors how they had contributed to safeguarding within the school. SS reported that the School improvement advisor had found good evidence that there was a good safeguarding culture in the school. Action: SS to put Safeguarding Culture documents on Governor Zone.</p> <p>All governors had now signed to say they had read and understood KCSiE. Document to be filed in school.</p> <p><i>EG asked what documentation the school had to show risk assessments and preventative actions relating to safeguarding.</i> SS suggested governors read the reports from the SIA which should explain the safeguarding culture in more detail and that it pervaded everything the school did.</p> <p>Noted the bespoke Governor training on Safeguarding on 30th March run by Steve Barker which would provide further guidance and evidence for governors. FD was thanked for her report and left the meeting.</p>	SS
4.	<p>FINANCIAL UPDATE: LB</p> <p>LB reported that the January Financial Monitoring Report (FMR) was in line with projections as it got closer to the year end. She and AG had a meeting planned to go through it in more detail. Nothing major to report, but she was able to talk to AG if anything came up. Noted that the school was currently looking at a surplus of about £34,000. <i>LJam asked if this was an in-year or accumulative surplus.</i> It was accumulative.</p> <p>Amigo Funds (After-school club) were breaking even, and it looked like there would be a surplus of approx. £3000 at the end of the year. Parents who had dropped sessions during Covid were gradually booking more sessions.</p>	

	<p>It was agreed that at future Resource-focused FGB meetings the FMR would be circulated with the papers. Noted that finance governors to meet before year-end (30 March).</p> <p>SFVS Update: AG had received the draft version the previous day. It would be submitted to county by 18 March.</p> <p>At this point in meeting governors considered policies that LB may need to answer questions on.</p> <p>Finance Policy: <i>LJam questioned the expenditure and virement levels.</i> Agreed that the policy should be amended to clarify the distinction between virement levels. Action: LB to make changes. LJam checked that the policy covered the interim governance arrangements – agreed that it did.</p> <p>Financial Procedures in School: Governors noted that this was mainly an operational document. AG stated that the process for how the Credit card was used needed to be included in the procedures as well as process for petty cash. Action: LB to add these in. EG commented that no reference made to pupils and their social value. LB explained that this was included in the budget. Also noted that the school had to account for any grants and monies given. It was a statutory requirement to show how money spent from the Pupil and Sports Premium grants and this was on the school website. Governors received this information in the autumn term. It was agreed that the information about Pupil Premium on the website should be moved to a more accessible place. Action: LB to move it to the “About Us” section.</p> <p>Charging and Remissions Policy: Action: to be stated that this is based on Surrey Model Policy.</p> <p>Best Value Statement</p> <p>Governors approved the policies and procedures subject to the changes noted above.</p>	<p>LB</p> <p>LB</p> <p>LB</p> <p>LB</p>
5.	<p>PREMISES OVERVIEW & HEALTH AND SAFETY</p> <p>LB reported that the school had an ongoing maintenance programme that was constantly kept under review. A health and safety walk carried out once every half term and a more detailed one with the premises manager every term. JA asked if a governor could attend. Agreed that once a H&S governor appointed in the autumn they could join once a year. The school completed Surrey H&S audits which were moving from an annual procedure to more continual updates. The school bought into Surrey contracts. LJAm asked if the school had someone at Surrey they could contact if they needed help. Yes they did. AG asked how safe the school was for children since a fence had come down in the storms. A risk assessment had been carried out, the school was safe and a barrier had gone up in the meantime.</p> <p>Tender invitations were going out imminently for the replacement of the school gates and the tender process was likely to take about three weeks.</p>	
6.	<p>RISK ASSESSMENTS/RISK REGISTER</p> <p>Risk assessments were carried out and logged across several school documents, but mainly within the Emergency Plan. Separate risk assessments kept for all premises related matters. There was also a separate Covid risk assessment and for events happening off-site all the risk assessments were stored within the Surrey Evolve system. The school was considering one risk register but did not want to duplicate the recording of information unnecessarily.</p> <p>LB left the meeting at 5pm</p>	

7.	<p>GOVERNOR ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES</p> <p>Governors were thanked for taking part in 1-1 calls with LJas. This had fed into a Teams meeting attended by SS, LJas, AG and CS and the table of roles and responsibilities had been created. The idea was to give further clarity about when roles needed to be appointed.</p> <p>LJas had learnt from her calls that governors were still getting to know each other and needed a little longer to consider roles, as well as learn about who might be the best person for the roles of Chair and Vice-Chair. Events coming up in March would afford further opportunities for governors to get to know each other. LJas asked governors for ideas on how they would like to run nominations/elections for these key roles. KC suggested that anyone interested in the roles should come forward and that there needed to be an openness for governors to chat together about the roles. Governors then received the "Surgery Schedule" from SS. The school was offering opportunities for governors to meet different members of the SLT to discuss various governor link roles. "Try before you buy" approach". Schedule circulated and governors filled in what they wished to attend. JA asked if there would be a place for elections for any of the roles. SS proposed that in some cases roles could be shared and previously, the school had actively encouraged paired-monitoring visits.</p> <p>Staff Wellbeing Governor: AS and JA volunteered to share this role. Impact on Mental Health (Carnegie Award) LJam volunteered to support the school with this role. Website Governor: HC</p> <p>Other roles to be agreed after the surgeries had taken place. Action: CS to update governor list.</p> <p>Chair and Vice Chair: Action: CS to send out timeline for nominations in advance of the next meeting and governors agreed that if they were interested, they should discuss with each other and email CS, LJas and all governors.</p> <p>Governor Vacancy Update: LJas had received one application from Inspiring Governance. She suggested that governors other than her and AG made the next appointment and questioned whether a further governor was needed yet and that a delay of a few months could give governors more time to decide what type of person and skills they needed. Governors also noted the importance of diversity on the governing body. Agreed that vacancy would be considered again next term. Action: All governors to consider</p> <p>Action: LJas to inform applicant that the vacancy was not going to be filled yet, but that she would hold on to the application.</p>	<p>CS</p> <p>CS</p> <p>All gobs</p>
8.	<p>GOVERNOR TRAINING</p> <p>AG thanked governors for the training they were doing and reminded them to let CS know so she could update the records. Action: AG to add AS to the skills audit.</p>	AG
9.	<p>HEADTEACHER REPORT: Verbal Update</p> <p>Ukraine: A range of resources compiled for staff to use when supporting children and responding to questions raised regarding the current international situation. SS had also sent support resources for parents to use in last week's newsletter. SS had spoken about the situation in assembly with the focus on being fortunate to be in a safe place and how they could help other children in the world where this was not currently true. Children wanted to fundraise, and SS planned to link this to Red Nose Day, as Comic Relief would be sending funds to Ukraine. Noted that the school had families that were directly affected by both sides of the conflict and was doing all it could to provide emotional support during this challenging and uncertain time. AG asked how many</p>	

	<p>Eastern European children were in the school. Eleven families, mainly Polish, 1 Russian and 1 Ukrainian. SS was aiming to change the narrative about the situation and the school would be looking at famous refugees in the UK who had been able to make a positive new start.</p> <p>World Book Day and the BBC: The school had been on TV the previous Thursday, at the last minute, live on SE Lunchtime and later in the evening news. SS had received many comments of support from parents and the wider village community. BBC's own safeguarding procedures had been very impressive. SS noted that three parents had been unhappy that their children were kept out of the actual filming part, due to their responses on permission slips that were currently held on file for every child. SS had responded to them all, explaining lack of notice and the fact that she could not contact parents individually due to time constraints and the number of children this involved. In future, permission slips would be requested annually.</p> <p>Carnegie Mental Health Award: This was a National accreditation for schools, in recognition of the work achieved to promote positive mental health for all stakeholders. A diagnostic self-assessment tool was submitted in the Autumn term and following this the school had been told it was on track to attain the Gold Award by December 2022. To do this the school needed to provide a range of outreach opportunities, through published articles and HT speaking at national conferences. One article about running an effective parent forum had been accepted by a national publication this week.</p> <p>Governance of staff mental health was one of the eight core aspects of the award and SS thanked LJam, AS and JA for support they had offered for this.</p> <p>Staff development: NPQs: Three members of staff taken up offer of Government funded courses. They would be supported with appropriate release time throughout the next 18 months, to complete their coursework and attend conferences and seminars. Expectation that most of the self-study materials completed in staff's own time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jessica Newns: NPQTL (Middle Leadership) • Mark Cook: NPQH (Headship) • Sarah Stokes: NPQEL (Executive Leadership) <p>Academisation: Acknowledged that this aspect of the school's future needed to be reconsidered by the new governing body. SS and AG prepared a briefing document and an opportunity for Governors to understand the school's journey to date along the academy route, as well as the thinking behind possible decision proposed. Suggested that a Teams meeting could be held after the Budget Approval Meeting on 26th April for Governors to attend. Action: CS to check timings and set up meeting.</p> <p>Teaching, Learning and Assessment Framework: This continued to be developed with staff and the draft document was being applied in subject leadership work, when monitoring the quality of provision across the curriculum. Final draft to Governors for approval in July, and would replace current curriculum, teaching & learning and assessment policy documents from September 2022. Action: CS to note for agenda</p> <p>Living with COVID-19: Latest RA document on Governor Zone. At the moment, parents and staff continued to let school know when they had a positive case at home and advised to stay at home until negative test on two consecutive days with a 24-hour gap in between. From April this would no longer happen or be required.</p> <p>SCITT (School Centred Initial Teacher Training): A TA had been successful in her application to train as a teacher through the South Farnham SCITT. She</p>	<p>CS</p> <p>CS</p>
--	--	---------------------

	<p>was keen to remain at Dormansland, and the school was accepted by the SCITT team to provide her placement from September. Very positive step for the school, not only to retain an excellent member of staff, but to become part of the SCITT scheme (Noted that Lingfield and Felbridge schools already part of the scheme).</p> <p>Staff preferences for next year: All staff completed their annual preference form for where they would like to be based next academic year. In addition, LB and FD had spoken to each member of staff individually, as some staff preferred to discuss options verbally with SLT. SLT would now begin the task of placing staff across the school. Governors asked if the school had a long term/succession plan. Yes it did have a plan as part of its strategy but it could not be done in relation to individual staff. If/when a member of staff left the strategy was always consulted and changes made where appropriate.</p> <p>Kitchen and catering: A continuing ongoing concern, with the current situation being unsustainable. Parents had set up a petition to lobby the LA regarding current status quo. School had approached other local catering companies to see if they could get a better contract going forward. JA asked how long the current contract was. One year. Noted that KC had offered to look at the contract to consider what could be done.</p>	
10.	<p>POLICIES</p> <p>Flexible working requests: JA asked if it was based on a Surrey Policy. School had taken elements from Surrey’s procedural documents. JA thought it was very generous and asked whether it provided sufficient support for the HT to organise staffing for the benefit of the children as well as the staff. JA questioned whether flexible working arrangements benefitted children. Yes they did, without happy staff the school would not function. SS stated that what was best for the children always drove the staffing arrangements, but where she could help to grant requests, she would do. Governors noted that the policy was a management document that the school could refer staff to if it had to make a difficult decision about a request. Governors checked the policy to ensure it did not leave the school open to appeals. Noted that it was very clear that staffing was reviewed annually and there were no assumptions or expectations that requests could be met. Governors noted the difficult balance of ensuring both the wellbeing of children and the staff. Governors discussed whether the policy should include anything about requests coming before governors. KC suggested and governors agreed that rather than all requests coming to governors which was very much an operational issue, SS should report on retention rates of staff within HT reports. Action: SS to note for future reports. On page 4, AG suggested a bullet point be added to assess impact on pupils. Action: SS to do this.</p> <p>Supporting children with health needs who can’t attend school</p> <p>Governors approved both policies subject to action noted above. Governors noted that the following statutory policies had been updated this half term & where they were located:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equality – annual – website • Drugs & medicines – annual – website • Exclusions, Fair Access & managed move protocol – annual – Held on staff server. • Non-collection – 3 years – website • Parent code of conduct – latest version (Sept 21) on website • Behaviour, Safety& Welfare Policy being updated • School Food Plan no longer required • Young Carers Policy being updated <p>Action: SS to ensure that policies are updated and relocated (as relevant) Governors noted that the High Achievers Policy which was non-statutory had</p>	<p>SS SS</p> <p>SS</p>

	been reviewed and would no longer be a separate policy. Rather, a relevant statement would be included in the Subject Lead Report for each curriculum subject.	
11.	MINUTES: Governors approved the minutes of the meeting held on 24/01/22 as an accurate record and signed by the Chair. No outstanding actions.	
12.	PAY COMMITTEE: Governors noted that this had taken place on 22/02/2022.	
13.	WHAT HAVE WE DONE AT THIS MEETING TO BENEFIT OR IMPROVE THE EDUCATION OF THE CHILDREN IN OUR SCHOOL? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Considered how policies supported the children: in particular, an amendment to the flexible working requests policy. 2. Reassured by Safeguarding report that children were safe in school. 3. Checked that good health and safety measure in place 4. Discussed plans for monitoring areas of the school development plan. 	
14.	DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wednesday 16 March 8.30-9.30am Monitoring Training • Wednesday 30 March 4-6pm Safeguarding Training • Tuesday 26 April: Budget Approval, followed by Academy Update 4-5.30pm on Teams • Thursday 5 May 4-6pm FGB Meeting • Tuesday 12 July 4-6pm FGB Meeting 	
	Meeting ended at 6.15pm	

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.....