

PART ONE

**MINUTES OF THE INTERIM EXECUTIVE BOARD OF GOVERNORS
OF DORMANSLAND PRIMARY SCHOOL
HELD VIA TEAMS
MONDAY 22 NOVEMBER 2021 AT 4PM**

PRESENT:

Chris Williamson (CW)	Chair
Alan Gardner (AG)	Co-Vice Chair
Linda Jasper (LJ)	Co-Vice Chair

IN ATTENDANCE:

Sarah Stokes (SS)	Headteacher
Faye Davies (FD)	Assistant Headteacher
Mark Cook (MC)	Assistant Headteacher
Louisa Blyde (LB)	School Business Manager (items 1-5)
Catriona Sanderson (CS)	Clerk

The meeting followed an earlier online engagement with the school's Behaviour Ambassadors, in which the eight Y6 students introduced themselves and spoke in some detail about their role. They answered questions from the IEB.

1.	<p>WELCOME</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) No apologies for absence b) CW welcomed everyone to the meeting. c) No declarations of interest in specific agenda items. 	
2.	<p>CHAIR'S ACTION: No emergency actions taken since the last meeting.</p>	
3.	<p>CLERK'S UPDATE: PROCEDURES, ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) New Instrument of Government ready to take effect from 1 January 2022 with nine governor positions. b) Governor Recruitment Update: Parent elections in process. Five nominations for two positions. Elections being held electronically for the first time via google forms with the option for parents to use a paper ballot. Election to close at mid-day on 26 November and clerk would report the results after they had been counted and verified. Hayley Cook nominated and duly appointed as the new staff governor. c) Jennifer Ashley had applied to become the LA governor, she had completed an application and been interviewed via Teams. Governors considered her appointment. CW proposed and AG seconded that they wished to put her forward to the SCC governor nomination panel for consideration in anticipation of being approved and appointed as the new LA governor from January 2022. d) This left four co-opted positions still to be filled. CW meeting another candidate and had asked Inspiring Governance to chase other candidates and had also signed up with Governors for Schools as well as a route through Surrey County Council. SLT commented that in the past local secondary schools had been approached and had yielded good success with some teachers taking up the role. Action: SLT to approach the school's feeder secondary schools. e) Induction: plans in hand for this to happen in January alongside support from SAFE. 	SLT
4.	<p>SAFEGUARDING:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Governors received FD's safeguarding report. Noted that LB and CW still chasing Surrey regarding financing of new school gates. CW reported that Surrey had reflected on their decision and he was continuing to chase. Likely because it was costing more than Surrey had anticipated. The school had a chronology of supporting evidence 	

	<p>and staff were very concerned that no one had been to meet them to understand the issue. It was still hoped that the work could be done over the Christmas holidays. Action: CW to supply evidence to SCC</p> <p>b) Fire and Lockdown Drill Reports: Governors asked if there was a target time for these and whether they fell into line with good practice targets elsewhere. FD reported that this was why a second one had taken place, which did fall into line with the school's planned time. Noted that drills got quicker through the year. The lockdown drill had taken longer. Junior had done very well but there was an issue with the bell not being heard in the lower playground. A louder bell to be purchased and it would be done again with actions to be reported within next Safeguarding report.</p> <p>c) Check on Single Central Record: Governors noted the report and that it was checked on 19/10/21. All records which were mandatory were in place. A further date set for 06/12/21.</p> <p>d) FD reported on the Supervision Training she had attended. Noted that she had asked for further advice on coaching. FD also reported on sexual harassment sessions with key points shared with staff: two good sessions had been held using the "in our school" line and looking at children's responses, especially looking at KS2 processes as the children were a bit old for some of the techniques that were started in Reception.</p> <p>e) Noted that Professional Curiosity Course had been helpful and that the Surrey Audit of Safeguarding Plan 2012-2020 was all completed apart from GDPR refresher training which would be done by end of term.</p> <p>School's residential to take place in March was at a PGL centre called Windmill Hill which had been in the news due to Ofsted. Noted that the site was still open, and the particular aspect related to under-8's being unsupervised. It did not affect school trips. SS had also given some words to the Y6 parent rep to ensure that they felt comfortable about the venue in relation to safeguarding. <i>CW asked if school had done a risk assessment.</i> Yes, MC did this and it was checked by Surrey if it was for a residential. MC responsible and trained for all risk assessments appropriately.</p> <p>AG sought clarity about the 2019-2020 Surrey Audit of Safeguarding: SS explained that it was a Surrey document, and the school took from the audit what was relevant to them and added this to their own action plan. Action: Report back in January about harmful sexual behaviours. Action: Clerk to note for January FGB Agenda</p> <p>CW concluded the Safeguarding section by stating he was assured that Safeguarding was effective in the school and other members of IEB agreed.</p>	<p>CW</p> <p>SS CS</p>
5.	<p>FINANCIAL MATTERS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AG had reviewed the October FMR with LB Noted that the draft budget for next year had a £5,353 in year deficit, this in itself was not a concern, but AG was concerned that there was an in-year deficit each year and that the projected reserves of £39,753 at the end of 2021-22 would diminish to £14,556 at the end of 2022-23 and he thought costs needed to reduce in the coming years to maintain a healthy c/f. Noted that LB did a very good job with the budget and it was a very conservative 3-year budget. It did not include an increase in pupil funds and had worked on worse-case scenario based on the Special Needs Block transfer being confirmed by Surrey Cabinet. LB was confident figures would improve. <i>LJ asked if the school would be receiving any contributions for teacher pensions.</i> There was no further information about teacher pensions and also no news about the drive to make teacher salaries start at £30,000 and whether schools would 	

	<p>have to cover this. <i>AG asked if it would affect Dormansland, not really because nearly all teachers were at the top of their pay scales.</i></p> <p>Governors noted that the Bourne Education Trust had done a financial review of the school in September and there had been some recommendations relating to sustainability and the three-year budget. They wondered if the actions should be considered again and whether it was urgent. Currently not because of the way staff costs were skewed. LB commented that the carry forward would probably change as more savings made over the next couple of months. <i>LJ asked about Amigos budget.</i> The budget had remedied this year and the projection was a small surplus. Amigos was full and making around £4,000 pa.</p> <p>LB thanked for her work on the budget and left the meeting at 16.37pm.</p>	
6.	<p>STAFFING UPDATE Governors noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HT appraisal took place on 9 November 2021. CW apologised to LJ that she had not been included. • Pay Committee Meeting held immediately prior to this meeting • Staff Appraisal Objectives: The Head's objectives and cascade objectives were noted and SS thanked for updating the staff cascade objectives. The increase from 70 to 72% was seen as a very aspirational and highly ambitious target. SS reported that the appraisal cycle had been finished for the autumn term. 	
7.	<p>HEADTEACHER REPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verbal Update: Attendance noted as pretty much in line with national figures. School: 93.18% National: 93.8% <i>AG asked if any parents were reluctant to send their children to school.</i> Yes. School reaching out in sensitive ways to individual families but noted that if they did not come in for 10 days the Educational Welfare Officer would contact them. SS reported that taking care over Covid Communications to the parent community was taking up much of her time. Responses had ranged from abuse at the school gate to others being very supportive and understanding. Noted that the LA definition "school outbreak" was not helpful. Vacant places in school were being rapidly filled and there had been a very positive response to the school at recent open mornings and they were hopeful of a full YR uptake in September 2022. <i>AG queried the budget that stated three more pupils would join in Y3 taking class number to 33.</i> SS explained that they were all siblings of children in the school, currently on the waiting list. <i>AG asked if SS was confident the school could cope with 33 in a class.</i> Yes, SS explained that once in KS2 a class could take more than 30 children and indeed Surrey could force the school to take up to 34 in a class – this was not a new situation for the school and several KS2 classes had more than 30 in recent years. It helped the budget and the reputation of the school if it could take in some of the extra children. • SS reported that the school was looking out for a new catering service from April 2022 as they were not happy with current provision. <i>AG asked what break clause there was.</i> Annual contract running to end of March 2022 <i>he also asked if LB thought she could get a new service for the same amount of money.</i> Yes this was hoped for or less and the school was looking for more local companies to avoid the transportation issues currently happening with food coming from Caterham. FD thought it would not be long before parents started to complain about the quality of the food. Local MP lobbying on behalf of the school to Surrey for a full kitchen. • SDP/SEF. <i>CW asked if SS could confirm endorsement of the SEF from the school improvement partner.</i> Yes SIA had embraced the SEF. <i>LJ asked how the school arrived at the objective grades in terms of ticks and headings in the report on page 19.</i> SS explained that this was normally done at an Inset in July with staff and governors but for Covid 	

	<p>reasons had not happened in the usual way for the last two years. The SLT and teachers had done it and had looked at triangulation of evidence so that they could be confident that although a subjective judgment it did reflect all stakeholders. Noted that Ofsted statements were used because Ofsted would very likely look at the school SEF when they came. <i>AG asked how far from outstanding was the quality of education.</i> SS explained that quality of teaching was no longer a judgement. She felt confident that pupils performed consistently well. The school could look at quality of learning and provision through use of learning walks, pupil voice, pupil progress meetings and book scrutiny which suggested very strong practices with only one teacher noted as not consistently good yet. Alison Day had validated the evidence the school was using and noted that the school would be very clear in how it dealt with any capability issues. CW suggested the fourth column in SEF to be Embedded rather than embedding. Action: SS to change. CW also suggested the new FGB should be taken through the SDP as part of their induction. Noted and to be included in induction: Action: CS</p> <p>Governors approved the SDP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Targets: A robust discussion concerning these had taken place at the HT appraisal and they were now set, SS confirmed that a robust process had taken place to set then and that they were realistic and achievable. 	<p>SS</p> <p>CS</p>
8.	<p>POLICIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupil Premium Strategy 2021-22: Governors asked if this followed the Surrey template and had been customised to Dormansland. It was a new DfE template that all schools were now required to use and was not customised apart from that the school had chosen to show more details than the DfE asked for in the final review section. <i>LJ noted that the majority of funding had previously been used to fund TAs and noted that this year it was being used for the ELSA post – was this a new or extended post.</i> This had been part-funded in this way for many years due to the extensive work the ELSA carried out and each year it was extended. This year it was being developed for nurture sessions. LJ asked who was in the team. Julie Lochhead and two other part time members who added in other interventions though the week. They were all TAs. <i>LJ confirmed they had ELSA accreditations – yes.</i> Noted they may work out of class, within a class or in the Y4 nurture group which was a separate group being trialled. Each year the children getting the interventions were reviewed to decide what they would benefit most from and currently learning resilience and integration back into school were most important. Governors approved the statement and noted it would be going on the website. • Sports Premium Strategy 2021-2022: Noted that this was also a DfE template. LJ was interested to understand how much went into the after-school club offerings. <i>She asked how the school ensured the broadest group of children could benefit.</i> MC explained that it linked back to pupil premium and that discounts often offered to PP children especially for breakfast club as this was a way of ensuring they got to school. SLT noted difficulties that could occur with SEN children who might want to attend the clubs but would warrant 1-1 support. <i>Governors asked if PP children had to pay for clubs.</i> It depended on several factors and noted that since Covid a larger group of families were struggling financially but not necessarily eligible for PP – the school was aware of this and did their best to provide access. Noted that it would go on the website and be monitored. Governors approved the statement. Noted that at next meeting there would be an impact column. CS for agenda. 	<p>CS</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data Protection: AG asked who the school's DPO was. A contact from Judicium. The school bought into their service, and it worked well. Governors noted that it was a Surrey Model Policy. • Freedom of Information: Surrey Model Policy. Footer to be removed. Action: SS • Health, Safety and Welfare • Relationships & Sex Education: Based on Surrey Model Policy <p>Governors approved all the policies. CW asked that on the front page of each policy it should say if statutory or non-statutory.</p>	SS
9.	<p>GOVERNOR MONITORING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupil Premium Strategy: LJ had been part of a meeting with Alison Day which was auditing pupil provision. An internal PowerPoint document had been requested by the SIA. LJ asked how the school would evaluate the broad approaches against the actual targets. FD, LB and SS had created a spreadsheet to breakdown costings and impact. SS commented that the school should be able to be fully accountable if a parent asked how PP money was specifically being spent on their child and the school system was working on being able to do this. Noted that LJ needed to close next steps on monitoring report. LJ • RSE Curriculum: Next steps noted as more parental involvement, lesson observations to gauge teacher confidence in delivery and seeking more appropriate resources. LJ suggested follow up in summer term. 	LJ
10.	<p>MINUTES</p> <p>Governors confirmed the minutes of IEB meetings held on 16 September 2021 as an accurate record. Minutes to be signed by the Chair. Action: Clerk to file.</p> <p>Actions: All completed</p>	CS
11.	<p>DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS</p> <p>IEB: Monday 13 December at 4pm 2021 FGB: Monday 24 January at 4pm FGB: Tuesday 8 March 2022 at 4pm.</p>	
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"> • Discussed allocation of funds to ensure being well spent. • Approved statutory documents • Approved an ambitious SDP that would benefit all pupils. • Considered school targets and cascade objectives that were very aspirational and should improve the quality of education for all. • Discussed and made plans for new governance arrangements 	
	Meeting ended at 17.45pm	

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...13/12/21