

PART ONE

MINUTES OF THE FULL GOVERNING BODY OF DORMANSLAND PRIMARY SCHOOL HELD IN SCHOOL on MONDAY 24 JANUARY 2022 AT 4PM

Present:			
Linda Jasper: LJas Chair	Additionally Appointed	Marie Langer: ML	Co-opted
Alan Gardner: AG Vice-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		
In attendance:			
Catriona Sanderson: CS	Clerk	Louisa Blyde: LB	School Business Manager
Faye Davies: FD	Assistant Headteacher	Mark Cook: MC	Assistant Headteacher

1.	<p>WELCOME & ADMINISTRATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) No apologies for absence b) LJas welcomed everyone to the meeting and brief introductions made. c) No declarations of interest in specific agenda items d) Noted that Governors had returned register of business interests forms and website up to date. e) Governors agreed to and noted that their contact information circulated to SAfE, S4S, SCC, National Governors' Database annually. f) Governors noted and signed the Code of Conduct g) Action: SS to write short piece in next parent newsletter introducing new governors with a link to bio section on website. 	SS
2.	CHAIR'S ACTION: None taken.	
3.	<p>GOVERNOR ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) LJas explained that to ensure continuity from the IEB to new FGB, it was proposed that she and AG continued in the roles of Chair and Vice-Chair. Governors agreed to the continued roles of Linda Jasper as Chair and Alan Gardner as Vice-Chair until end of the academic year. <p>LJam commented that the new governors had little sense of what the IEB had done, or how successful they had been. <i>She asked if any summary report of their work would be available to aid new governors in the transition period.</i> LJas confirmed that as new governors took on specific roles and responsibilities it would become clearer as handover sessions took place. Also noted that the IEB had been brought in by SCC for a specific purpose which had now been fully concluded satisfactorily. They had also been the FGB with all the usual responsibilities for the last year, as well as deep dives into safeguarding and finance. Minutes of the IEB were on the school website. <i>KC asked if there had been a concluding report of the IEB.</i> AG responded: <i>Yes, this was with SCC, but it was not thought it would be available to new governors.</i> Agreed that it was a clean slate for the new governing body to move forward and support the school from now on.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) Process for appointment of future Chair and Vice-Chair. AG stated the intention would be for future Chair and Vice-Chair to be nominated with time to shadow LJas and AG. Governors discussed what process would be used to appoint these positions. Governors were asked to consider if they were interested and could talk to LJas and AG about the role. It was also noted that whoever became the 	

4.	<p>GOVERNOR TRAINING</p> <p>LJas went through list of suggested training for governors and encouraged everyone to get up to speed as quickly as possible. Many of the options were via webinars meaning governors could fit them in around their other work and responsibilities. Particular dates to note:</p> <p>26 January: Safeguarding Webinar by SAfE: All governors booked to attend or listen to recording.</p> <p>12 March: Introduction to New Governance: Webinar by Strictly Education</p> <p>16 March: Visit in school by Alison Day the school's improvement advisor. AD has key role in monitoring and advising the school and had suggested that during her next visit she could do a short session for governors on how to be effective in monitoring at a strategic level. Agreed that early in the day would be best and provisionally 8.30am timeslot agreed. FD could also set up an option for governors to join remotely. Action: Governors to inform CS if they could attend in person or virtually.</p> <p>Bespoke Governor Training on Safeguarding by Strictly Education to be arranged. Action: CS to set up doodle to find suitable date.</p> <p>21 July 9-12: Governors invited to join this part of a school inset day to consider the SDP and SEF. Further details to follow nearer the time.</p> <p>Skills Audit: AG reported that there were no major areas of weakness and that already there were strong skills within the team. AG to update this and CS to put on Governor Zone.</p>	<p>All gobs</p> <p>CS</p> <p>AG, CS</p>
5.	<p>SAFEGUARDING</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Safeguarding issues in school: A report from FD included within the headteacher's report. Governors noted and approved FD as Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL). 2. KCSiE: All governors had read and signed to confirm understanding. Action: FD to send round a "quiz" she got staff to do after reading the document. <i>AG queried when the draft new KCSiE document for September 2022 would come out and whether governors should send back comments on this.</i> FD to check on this. 3. Governor Safeguarding Training & Prevent Training: <i>LJam asked if training from other settings would suffice.</i> No, although it could be noted, the training needed to be done specifically relating to the role of governor at Dormansland School. FD to send a link to governors for Prevent Training but noted that Safeguarding training was the priority for governors. 	<p>FD</p> <p>FD</p>
6.	<p>HEADTEACHER REPORT</p> <p>Several questions raised around acronyms and terms which SS explained. These included an explanation of the term "Ever 6" linking to the streaming fund received in schools for pupil premium children. SS explained that once a child received pupil premium, this then lasted for 6 years independent of change of circumstances. This linked to why it was such an important area for governors to monitor and question the impact of all pupil premium funding within a school.</p> <p><i>KC questioned the persistent absence figures, that were almost double the national average.</i> Action: SS to question the data from Insight, it seemed that the Covid code was included for the school but not for national figures.</p> <p>Safeguarding and Child Protection: AG was delighted to hear that Surrey had now agreed to fund the electronic gates for the carpark and it was thought this would also include funding for the pedestrian gate. LJas thanked SLT for including the update from the DfE and noted that SCC was keen that governors understood the process Ofsted used for inspection relating to safeguarding.</p>	<p>SS</p>

Also noted that schools could request a deferral of one week if they received the call from Ofsted and were working under exceptional circumstances, for example a much-reduced staffing contingent due to Covid.

Attendance: Governors noted that this was lower due to the impact of Covid. National Figures was currently 88% and although Dormansland's was higher than this at 94% this was still much below what it had been in the past – around 97%. However, noted that the LA had no concerns about attendance and the school had strong procedures in place for checking up on individual children's attendance.

Governors noted that Y4 % affected by Covid had increased to 53%. LJAm noted the outbreak management plan and how families were obviously taking it seriously and keeping children off school in Covid-related circumstances. SS reported that since September nine members of staff had time off related to Covid and pressure was building due to staff absence. Noted that SCC would only close schools if staff numbers were too low to run the school safely. (not if too many children were off).

Quality of Education: *LJas asked what impact receiving the Carnegie Mental Health Award would have on the school.* SS said that it would be a major boost to the school and wished to talk to governors in more detail about this at the next meeting. **Action: CS to note for agenda.**

School Targets: KC queried the 2020 predicted data. SS explained that this was when the school was shut and there was therefore no data, so they had been predictions. The 2021 Outcomes were internal data as again there had not been national tests (SATS). Normally these results would be in the public domain.

KC asked what were the areas for concern. Children's emotional resilience in learning, post-lockdown is the key area where most support is currently needed.

LJAm noted that early years and KS1 were struggling to make their targets. A discussion followed and governors noted that older children were doing better in relation to school targets but needed support to re-build their emotional resilience since Covid. For the younger children some had completely missed out on preschool/nursery stage and were therefore struggling. Governors asked why national targets had not therefore been adjusted to take account of this. SS explained that there were several reasons. These included the need for "business as usual" alongside reality of where children were. It was important to continue to have high expectations as well as stressing the importance of what being in school gave to a child.

KC asked if a parent would know their child was classified as a "Golden Child". No, they would not know that specific term but would likely understand that the school was keeping a special eye on their child due to the specific circumstances they found themselves in.

Risk Assessment Update: Noted that the school updated this regularly. AG questioned whether all governors should receive updated versions. It was agreed that updated versions would be put on the Governor Zone. Also noted that this was an operational document. Governors needed to ensure there was a risk assessment and that SLT had taken account of guidance in compiling it, but they did not need to analyse it in depth.

Staffing: LJAm commented that there was much focus on helping children catch up due to the impact of Covid but wondered how staff were doing and if there was anything specific that governors could do to support them. Were there specific processes in place for supporting their wellbeing.

CS

	<p>SS replied that things were in place and this linked to the Carnegie Medal. It was agreed that this would be discussed in more depth at the next meeting with further input from governors. Action: CS agenda.</p> <p><i>KC asked if the school bought into Surrey OH and EAP programmes – Yes</i></p> <p><i>JA thanked SS for the report as well as SEF and SDP received previously. She noted that the school was aiming to become outstanding but questioned where there was collaboration with other schools (since Achievement for All had gone into liquidation) where did the school collaborate and was there any thought to join a Multi-Academy Trust.</i></p> <p>SS replied that the school had been considering academisation over the last 7 years and as the new FGB settled into its role this would need to come back on its agenda. The previous year she and AG had documented the school's journey so far and this would be made available to new governors.</p> <p>Noted that there was collaboration involved with the Carnegie Award and some work with Lingfield College.</p> <p>JA commented that the overview of data in the report did not include anything on ethnic minorities. <i>She asked what diversity there was in the school.</i> Noted that there was very little (SS would ensure the data included this next time). JA suggested this was another reason to pursue collaboration.</p> <p>LJAs thanked SS for her comprehensive report and congratulated the SLT and staff on their hard work within the school.</p>	CS
7.	<p>GOVERNOR MONITORING SCHEDULE Governors noted the monitoring schedule. CS to update and agreed that other allocation of monitoring would be held off until March Meeting and training by Alison Day. This would still leave time for a visit before easter relating to early reading development. Action: CS update schedule Action: SS to put Alison Day's previous reports on Governor Zone</p>	CS SS
8.	<p>POLICIES Special Leave Policy: <i>LJam queried a discrepancy around the number of days a staff member could have off if their partner was ill compared to if they died.</i> Governors noted and agreed that all time given was at the discretion of the headteacher and were therefore happy with the policy as written. Governors approved the policy. School Dog Policy: Governors approved policy Governors noted the Policy Review Process. This was used to inform agenda setting and review of policies throughout year. Action: LB to update with the FGB meeting date a policy was approved at. A discussion followed about governor access to policies. A large number were on school website. It was agreed that if they were not on website, they would be uploaded to governor zone, this would be an ongoing process. Action: LB, CS.</p>	LB LB, CS
9.	<p>EMERGENCY PLAN: Governors noted that this had been updated with the name of Chair and emergency contact details.</p>	
10.	<p>WHAT HAVE WE DONE AT THIS MEETING TO BENEFIT OR IMPROVE THE EDUCATION OF THE CHILDREN IN OUR SCHOOL?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensured a new strong governing body in place to support SLT. 2. Identified skills and commitment of the new FGB. 3. Looked at school data, challenged headteacher regarding information and were satisfied with answers given. 	
11.	<p>DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS Tuesday 8 March at 4pm: FGB Tuesday 26 April: Budget Approval Meeting: time and attendees tbc. Thursday 5 May at 4pm: FGB</p>	

	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.....