

**PART ONE**

**MINUTES OF THE FULL GOVERNING BODY  
OF DORMANSLAND PRIMARY SCHOOL  
HELD IN SCHOOL on THURSDAY 5 MAY 2022 AT 4PM**

<b>Present:</b>			
Linda Jasper: LJas: Chair	Additionally Appointed	Marie Langer: ML	Co-opted
Alan Gardner: AG: V-Chair	Additionally Appointed	Ef시오 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
<b>In attendance:</b>			
Faye Davies: FD	Assistant Headteacher Items 1-4	Catriona Sanderson (CS)	Clerk

1.	<b>WELCOME &amp; ADMINISTRATION</b> a) No apologies for absence b) No declarations of interest in specific agenda items.	
2.	<b>CHAIR'S ACTION:</b> None	
3.	<b>GOVERNOR TRAINING</b> Governors noted the training record and how positive it was to see so much training being undertaken. AG commented that as governors took on more specific roles, they could tailor their training to specific topics. Skills Matrix needed to be updated with AS's detail. <b>Action: AG, AS</b>	<b>AG, AS</b>
4.	<b>SAFEGUARDING: FD</b> (FD's safeguarding report included in HT report for ease of reference). Surrey had appointed a company to measure for new gates. School still unsure if funding included both gates but if not, money would come out of capital.  A Single Central Record Check (SCR) had been carried out and report issued to LB for records. <b>JA asked who had carried out the check.</b> FD this time and previous time it had been Alison Day. Governors discussed whether a governor should be present when the SCR check was carried out. It could have a GDPR implication as they would be privy to sensitive information. <b>LJam asked how the school had settled on the format of the SCR and if there were any significant gaps.</b> It was agreed that: <b>Action: FD to ask Steve Barker at Strictly whether there was a standard format for SCR approved by Surrey.</b> <b>Action: Agenda item at next meeting to provide headlines of what was included in the SCR.</b> Also noted that it was important for governors to know if all fields were up to date/ any gaps. The agenda item would help support them in this knowledge.  Jessica Newns (JN) PHSE Lead had conducted pupil voice question sessions focusing on RSE Curriculum with positive results picking up on language and consideration of tagging a comment with "it is only a joke".  Emma Higginson, a member of the school's wellbeing support team to complete DSL training in the autumn term. <b>LJas asked how many DSLs the school would then have.</b> Four.  Following decision made at last FGB meeting. Update of DBS checks to begin in July. Staff to have an updated DBS and then be asked to sign up to the annual update system and the annual cost would be reimbursed.  CPOMS (Child Protection Online Management System) training carried out and FD noted that more appropriate categories were being used. <b>AG asked if</b>	<b>FD</b> <b>FD, CS</b>

	<p><b>there was an operational document for what should be entered.</b> Not really, the expectation was that it was used much more widely than to record child protection incidents, the school used it for any information about a child. Some of the local secondary schools used it so records could easily be passed on when children left. <b>Action: FD and Safeguarding Link Governor to consider how anonymised data from CPOMS could be used to inform/train governors.</b></p> <p>Dip sampling of Child Protection files taking place on 16 May. FD reported that the school had developed its approach to support a child identifying as gender fluid. The school had sought legal advice from Surrey and the case had made them consider all it could and would need to do to support the situation. In working out this response, Surrey had asked if it could be used as an anonymised case of good practice at an upcoming Surrey Conference. SS reported that the situation would drive some of the priorities for the SDP in the next year in relation to equality, inclusion and diversity. Future considerations would be toilet facilities and even how data currently recorded as boy/girl split.</p> <p>Staff training carried out on a number of issues including fabricated illness and general site safety routines. FD noted added vulnerabilities as windows and doors open in the summer.</p> <p>Governors had received Safeguarding Training at the end of the spring term run by Strictly Education. <b>KC asked if governors would receive any refresher training.</b> FD reported that staff received refresher training every autumn that governors were welcome to attend and that it could also happen in late spring each year, similar to this year by using the bespoke Strictly Training that the Governor SLA included. Governors were encouraged to email FD if they ever had any safeguarding questions or concerns. ML had met FD to discuss safeguarding and another meeting planned this term with FD, LJas and ML. 4.25pm FD left the meeting.</p>	FD,ML
5.	<p><b>HEADTEACHER REPORT</b></p> <p>LJas noted that currently only 27 YR 1 places had been offered for September and this would have a budget implication.</p> <p><b>Attendance:</b> AG asked for clarification on the figures. SS had not got access to Surrey figures hence the comparisons against national data. School figures for persistent absence were lower than national but higher than they had been pre-Covid. Governors noted that although Covid absences now included within overall figures, SS was continuing to track and record Covid- absence if possible so that the school could look at this data for an entire school year. <b>KC asked whether after extracting Covid absences whether there were still cases of persistent absenteeism that the school needed to consider and work with.</b> Yes, the school was aware and focused on these cases. <b>KC asked how this was done.</b> The school had a system with initial calls made to families if a child not in school and no explanation given. This could be followed up by calls from head teacher, or the inclusion officer. Sometimes if reasons had been given relating to nervousness of attending the schools' family liaison officer could pick up on this. SS reported that a helpful situation in the area was the many school options for families so if a family was really struggling with one school, it was suggested they try another, and this happened between all three local schools in a positive way. The Inclusion Officer came to school once a term. <b>KC asked if they were on the school's payroll.</b> No, this was an external Surrey position and their role was to ensure that SS fulfilled her statutory responsibility of ensuring children were in school by in turn helping parents fulfil their duty of sending children to school. <b>LJam asked if there had been an increase in school refusers since Covid.</b> There had been two cases. MC had worked hard in supporting the families concerned and had helped create ways so the children were happy to come</p>	

back into school. LJam commented, as a parent that there was always an SLT or pastoral team presence at the gate in the morning and how positive this was. SS further reported that since Covid only one gate was open in the morning as they were not able to staff two. However, this had created a positive situation with children being welcomed in at the gate, creating the ability to look out for those feeling nervous or not yet arrived and because teachers were in their class, children arrived gradually allowing them time to chat informally before the start of the day – it made for a much better start to the school day.

Data: **Considering the school profile on page 1 which showed the school to be above national average in its context, AG questioned why the school's data would therefore not also be above national average.**

SS explained why the data was realistic and she was happy that it was holding up to pre-Covid data. SS further explained that because of the relatively low numbers in the school, that one or two underperformances would affect disproportionately the overall score. This year the school was looking at the combined RWM (reading writing maths) data and if a child was dropping in one subject but there was a chance to help them reach the target, the school would work specifically in that area. Also reported that the school was consistent with its borderline children. They would choose not to push a child's final data to say it had been met if they were borderline as they felt this gave a false outcome and was detrimental to the child in the future. Example given of a previous time when children in year two given "grades" that showed they had reached/exceeded targets, but this then did not help in KS2. School was not driven by data, wanted to allow children to make progress without holding them back but similarly not giving false optimistic data.

**LJas asked if governors could see any data for similar one-form entry schools.** Noted that this information was on the website but currently it was pre 2019 data. HC also commented that the data did not take any account that some children (Y2) had not yet done a full school year. Post meeting note: Since the FGB meeting, DfE confirmed that there would be a suite of national data materials available for comparative analysis across schools.

Governors queried subgroups noted in data:

**DP: Disadvantaged pupil.** This was a national term relating to financial situation of a child. A child was in this group if the household income was below a certain threshold noting that financial hardship could have an impact on learning.

**GC: Golden Child.** A Dormansland term used by staff to highlight children going through any specific emotional issue. For example parents going through a divorce, bereavement, illness. They did not necessarily have any financial hardships.

Overall key message from data: Reading and maths progress held steady. Writing and SPAG (Spelling, punctuation and grammar) had dipped. **KC asked when targets were set, who set them and how were they done.** They were set each autumn, taking into account the actual outcomes for each child at the end of the previous academic year. These were in turn informed by termly pupil progress meetings that staff attended with SLT.

AG noted for minutes that targets were down by 1-2 pupils per cohort. SS reported that the amended targets equated to a drop of perhaps one or two children who may not reach expected in all three subject areas, but that this varied across the school with Years 1 and 4 remaining above 70%.

JA asked if governors should create a sub-committee to look at data in more detail each term. **Action: To be considered in the autumn along with other roles and working parties. Clerk to note for agenda**

CS

	<p><b>Action: SS asked if a working group could be set up to look at the carpark and catering.</b></p> <p><b>Staff Absence Figures: LJAM queried the number of days off in the spring term within stress column for teachers, was this for one or more teachers.</b> One teacher.</p>	CS
6.	<p><b>STAFFING</b></p> <p>LJam and JA were thanked for organising Staff/Governor Lunch and delicious food. LJas commented positively on the high level of staff commitment and longevity of staff at the school. EG commented on what a wonderful event it had been providing a good way to get to know staff and governors better. HC reported how much staff had enjoyed getting to know the governors better.</p> <p><b>Approval of Staff Well-being Survey:</b> SS waiting on input from AD and had not yet been able to get it ready. After a brief discussion it was agreed that LJam would send a draft to SS to consider that could then be circulated to governors for approval. <b>Action: LJam.</b> Intention was for survey to be sent out after half term.</p> <p>Governors noted that the headteacher's annual appraisal had taken place on 27.4.22 but the write-up was still outstanding.</p>	LJam
7.	<p><b>FINANCE: AG</b></p> <p>Finance Committee had met to consider the budget. Budget was approved and submitted on time to Surrey.</p> <p>It was <b>agreed</b> (As discussed at previous meeting) that governors should receive the latest copy of the FMR with FGB papers of Resource-focused meetings. Finance Committee governors received FMR every month. <b>Action: Clerk to note on annual schedule and ensure most recent FMR included for next meeting.</b></p> <p>AG reported that the C/f from March was £33,980 and there were no serious issues relating to finances. An FMR tutorial had been held for finance governors and noted that the SFVS had been completed and submitted on time.</p>	CS
8.	<p><b>GOVERNOR ROLES</b></p> <p><b>Appointment of Chair of Governors for Academic year 2022-2023.</b> One nomination had been received from Liz James. Proposer: KC Second: AS. LJam left the room. Governors voted unanimously for her to take up the role.</p> <p><b>Vice-Chair of Governors 2022-2023</b> KC put himself forward for the role. Proposer: ML Second: JA. KC left the room. Governors voted unanimously for him to take up the role.</p> <p>EG asked if it was appropriate to have both roles taken by parents. LJas noted there was nothing in regulations to say this could not happen and that the position was always for one academic year.</p> <p>Safeguarding Governor: ML put herself forward. Proposer: LJam Second: AS. ML duly appointed to the position.</p> <p>LAC and SEND Governor: JA put herself forward and was duly appointed to the position. It was agreed that the role should be expanded to be governor working with all vulnerable groups.</p> <p><b>Action: Clerk to update constitution for the autumn term, informing relevant outside bodies.</b></p>	CS

9.	<p><b>MONITORING</b> Financial monitoring in hand.</p> <p><b>Agreed that in the final months of this academic year the following monitoring to be done.</b> JA: Vulnerable groups ML: Safeguarding visit HC: Website compliance</p> <p>Monitoring Schedule to be planned for following year taking SDP into account which governors were invited to consider with staff on 21 July.</p> <p>SS reported that from the autumn the school would be preparing for a possible Ofsted and the schedule would take this into account along with curriculum intent. She planned that subject leads would create summary reports to give governors regular curriculum updates. This would be worked into the annual schedule of works. <b>Action: Clerk/HT to note</b></p>	<p>JA ML HC</p> <p>CS/SS</p>
10.	<p><b>POLICIES</b> Disciplinary Policy Grievance Policy For both policies, noted that all changes had been highlighted and the policies were based on the Surrey generic model policies. <b>Governors approved both policies.</b> They would be stored on the school server.</p> <p><b>LJam asked if the disciplinary policy worked in practice.</b> Yes, but the school always took advice from Surrey in a particular case. <b>ML asked whether in the case of a suspension the identity of a teacher was protected in case wrongly accused.</b> SS answered that the school would always work to retain confidentiality in such sensitive matters as far as possible.</p>	
11.	<p><b>MINUTES:</b> Governors <b>approved</b> the minutes of the meeting held on 8 March 2022 as an accurate record and signed by the Chair. No outstanding actions.</p>	
12.	<p><b>WHAT HAVE WE DONE AT THIS MEETING TO BENEFIT OR IMPROVE THE EDUCATION OF THE CHILDREN IN OUR SCHOOL?</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Set up new leadership of the Governing Body.</li> <li>2. Ensured that any children persistently absent were being followed up on by the school systems.</li> <li>3. Challenged the data in relation to progress in reading, writing and maths.</li> <li>4. Ensured the data aligned with the school's vision</li> </ol> <p>SS informed governors that at this time of year she started to draft the data analysis and that headlines would be out before the end of the year, but she did not yet know what kind of data she would be working with. <b>KC asked if she used the data to drive decisions.</b> Yes, pupil data was tracked over their seven years at the school and fed into case studies and individual learning stories.</p>	
13.	<p><b>DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tuesday 12 July 4-6pm FGB Meeting</li> <li>• Thursday 21 July: Governors invited to SDP Inset Morning.</li> <li>• <b>Dates for next year to be circulated and added to calendar</b></li> </ul>	CS
	Meeting ended at 5.20pm	

**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.....