

PART ONE

**MINUTES OF THE FULL GOVERNING BODY
OF DORMANSLAND PRIMARY SCHOOL
HELD IN SCHOOL on WEDNESDAY 13 SEPTEMBER 2023 AT 4PM**

Present:			
Liz James (LJ) Chair	Parent	Keith Coleman (KC)	Parent
Helen Roe: HR	Co-opted	Hayley Clark: HC	Staff
Alex Sweetlove: AS	Co-opted	Jenny Ashley (JA)	Co-opted
Efio Gigliotti (EG)	Co-opted		
Faye Davies: FD	Co-Headteacher	Mark Cook: MC	Co-Headteacher
In attendance:			
Catriona Sanderson: CS	Clerk	Louisa Blyde:	School Business Mgr

1.	<p>WELCOME & ADMINISTRATION</p> <p>a) Apologies received and accepted from Marie Langer</p> <p>b) No declarations of interest in specific agenda items. Governors returned Register of Interests form to Clerk. Action: Clerk to update on website</p> <p>c) EG asked for clarification on how agenda items were decided for Governor Meetings. CS explained that the clerk drew up draft agendas using the annual schedule of works, previous agendas and actions points. This was then seen by Chair and Heads and either a pre-meeting was held or it was done by phone and email to finalise the agenda. EG suggested that some things might be hidden from other governors, CS reported that nothing was hidden, it was more about appropriate use of different governors' time and the role of Chair was always to set agendas with clerk and Headteacher. Governors discussed whether there should be a section at a meeting where future agenda items could be suggested or that governors could email in advance with suggested agenda items. These would then be discussed by Chair/Head/Clerk. They might already be aligned to the Schedule and SDP, be something that it was felt should be discussed at a meeting or agreed it was not an appropriate item for a Governor Meeting. Action: Clerk/Chair/Head to advise governors on how this could work.</p>	CS
2.	<p>APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR</p> <p>Following discussions at the last meeting LJ and KC had indicated their willingness to re-stand for these positions. LJ also mentioned that she was more than happy if anyone else was interested and CJ suggested the need for succession planning and other governors being able to step up to these roles in the future.</p> <p>Chair of Governors: AS proposed and JA seconded Liz James. LJ left the room. Of those able to vote: 7 voted in favour and 1 against. LJ was therefore duly elected as Chair of governors for the academic year 2023-2024</p> <p>Vice-Chair of Governors: LJ proposed and AS seconded Keith Coleman. KC removed himself from voting area. Of those able to vote 8 voted for KC. KC therefore duly elected as Vice-Chair of Governors for the academic year 2023-2024.</p>	
3.	CHAIR'S ACTION: Approved expenditure for new carpets	
4.	<p>CLERK'S UPDATE: PROCEDURES, ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES</p> <p>a) Code of Conduct: All governors had now signed this. This had also been discussed at the last meeting at which governors had agreed to various protocols on how they worked as a collective body to support the</p>	

	<p>school. They made group decisions or delegated responsibilities to various governors in accordance with their strengths and expertise. Governors were there to act in the best interest of the school, whilst providing the “critical friend” role to the SLT. Governors noted that they had agreed via the Code of Conduct to act with confidentiality and, to focus on strategic matters, to only share what was appropriate in terms of their personal views in relation to school matters and to contact SLT and Chair of Governors before contacting external organisations about school matters.</p> <p>b) Constitution – no vacancies</p> <p>c) New Training record noted. Governors reminded to sign up for training via Strictly Education or NGA and inform the clerk so she could update the record. Expectation that Governors would do at least one training session a term.</p> <p>d) EG asked about the policy schedule, stating he thought that the statutory policies were out of date. It was clarified that he was looking at an out-of-date schedule. LB reassured him that the school had all the statutory policies in place. EG suggested/asked how the school could adopt a new policy that he felt it should have. EG suggested the school should have a Separated Parents Policy. This was not a statutory Policy. Action: Clerk to circulate policy schedule for clarity.</p>	CS
5.	<p>SAFEGUARDING</p> <p>a) Appointment of Designated Safeguarding Leads (DSL). Governors appointed Faye Davies as DSL and Mark Cook, Julie Lochhead and Emma Higginson as Deputy DSLs. <i>LJ asked if they were all up to date with their DSL training. Yes.</i></p> <p>b) Safeguarding Update: FD reported that the new school gates were working well. An old iPad was to be used at the carpark end of school so visitors could sign in at either end of the school. Inset day on 1st September: Majority of staff had attended and the morning had been spent on safeguarding training and updates. <i>JA asked about those who had been unable to attend.</i> A further session was to be run for them. LJ asked if KCSiE updates since 1 September had been communicated to staff. Yes: FD had created a sheet with updates. Main points were about online processes: filtering and tracking what was being viewed. It had been made clear to staff that everything they looked at would be flagged up. <i>HR asked if much was flagged.</i> Mainly pop-ups. <i>KC asked who managed the monitoring.</i> London Grid For Learning: MC was happy with the service being provided and he was able to unlock sites if required.</p> <p>c) Keeping Children Safe in Education (KCSiE). All Governors had been sent a copy of this and were required to read Part One and sign form to confirm they had read and understood their responsibilities for the safeguarding of children in the school. Form was circulated: ML was not at the meeting and therefore had not yet signed form. EG confirmed that he had not yet read the document and could not yet sign the form. Action: CS to follow-up to ensure all governors signed form. EG (and ML) asked to email FD within the next fortnight to confirm they had read and understood KCSiE. FD had a quiz for governors concerning KCSiE that would be circulated.</p> <p>d) To Approve the Child Protection and Safeguarding Policy: ML had reviewed this in advance and recommended that Governors approve the Policy. Governors approved the Policy. ML commented on how diligently ML was carrying out the Safeguarding Governor Role, which she had taken on from scratch with no previous experience in this area. Governors thanked her for her hard work and input. FD reported that staff had six policies relating to Safeguarding that they were expected to read and understand. These were held electronically. <i>LJ asked if the school had up to date records of this if Ofsted wished to see.</i> Yes it was held on the Safeguarding Network. FD reported that the Staff Code</p>	EG, ML FD

	<p>of Conduct had been changed so that included a clause about any change in situation or circumstances which covered any DBS changes. School would still do a DBS dip sample every three years. LB reported that with quite a few new staff having joined the school a number of DBS checks had been carried out. Staff were also now asked to complete an annual register of business interests.</p>	
6.	<p>HEADTEACHER REPORT No questions had been received in advance. CS acknowledged that she had forgotten to remind Governors to do this. Action: CS to ensure this was noted on next agenda.</p> <p>Verbal Update: Eight new members of staff, all settling in well, including TAs, Mid-day supervisors and three teachers: Y6: 2 days a week, Y1: 3 days a week, Y2: fulltime. The school had not had such a large number of new staff starting for a long time. Recruitment crisis in area noted though and advert still out for the 1-1 TA position to work alongside new child starting in YR with severe physical needs. The role was very specific and involved intimate care. HR asked if the child was unable to start until the position had been filled. The school had now found someone who could take on the role 3-4 days a week but was on holiday until late September. However, this suited the school as it gave more time to prepare with medical training, purchasing equipment and modifications to the school. All equipment had been ordered and staff needed to build up their confidence in caring for the child.</p> <p>Adaptations to the school: Land & Property (part of Surrey Buildings) were in touch over the summer and visited the school. They had looked around and come up with a plan which involved knocking out the resources cupboard and reconfiguring the ladies toilets to create a disabled toilet and recreate some storage. LJ asked if Surrey paid for this. Yes, they would be funding the adaptations and the school had fought for this. LJ asked if an EHCP had been confirmed. Yes, but not come through yet. The school had three children who had been granted EHCPs but none of them were on the latest list from Surrey, school was liaising with Surrey about this. FD informed governors that Surrey SEN was currently being Ofsteded. Other children in school were still waiting to be seen and the school was putting in support anyway. Governors heard that parents could become very abusive to school staff about SEN provision. LJ asked if the Parent Code of Conduct was in place. Yes, this had been updated, but changes had been made to EHCPs which involved decreasing the ratio of adults to children in a room and some parents did not like this, even though best practice said it was better and more inclusive for children not to be in a 1-1 situation so much. The school had always shied away from 1-1 provision anyway. EG asked about funding opportunities. Noted that the school could not just apply for things. Priorities of all councils had changed with an initial focus on schools that were not fit for purpose and Surrey's priority was for all schools to be warm and safe. Governors noted that the school had no aerated concrete (mainly schools in Essex) but Surrey would be conducting extra tests in the future.</p> <p>With new staff in school, subject leads had been rearranged and reallocated. Role of a senior teacher had been advertised internally. Jessica Newns had applied and been appointed. JA asked how many applicants there had been. One applicant, but three expressions of interest. JN had been interviewed and MC and FD had been happy with her performance at interview and confident in offering the position.</p> <p>New Playground markings and a new Cherry Logo at Front of school had been paid for by the PTA. Tree works also carried out over the summer and the "aquarium" had been done up to provide spaces for nurture groups. During previous academic year, the school had been optimistic about kitchen redevelopment plans but Surrey had been in touch to say this was now on the</p>	CS

	<p>back burner due to other priorities. Sir Nicholas White: Tandridge District Councillor had been incredibly supportive and vocal for the school and was continuing to fight for the issue. The school was keen to keep Surrey on its side. EG asked if a proposal had been written. Yes, there were plans and a business case. KC explained that money was allocated each year for capital projects . Governors debated whether they could raise money for the project and other ways to continue supporting this. KC agreed to speak to Sir Nicholas at the next Parish Council Meeting.</p> <p>All 199 children on roll had returned to school (two due to move overseas). JA asked what the PAN was. 210. Figures low due to only 22 in Y1.</p> <p>New Website imminent. LB reported a few difficulties with payroll and monthly year end reports due to Surrey’s new systems.</p> <p>Data: Governors agreed to come back to this after working through the rest of the agenda. Please note this section happened after items 7,8,9 LJ asked if the school was happy with the results. Yes, they had been pleasantly surprised. Just two children had narrowly missed out on achieving expectations. The school felt it was better to have results which gave a true reflection of a child’s ability rather than false results following them into secondary school. Governors noted that the school was using Insight as a monitoring tool (currently no national data, but approx. 70,000 schools were using Insight, so it gave good comparisons). LJ noted that writing needed to be worked on. FD agreed and commented that they also needed to target the more able children/ those working at greater depth.</p> <p>SDP included the use of White Rose: maths curriculum and this had ensured the increase in levels of many children. Y6 had been moderated the previous year and Y2 this year which had helped give teachers confidence in setting targets. Governors were pleased to note that 15% of children in KS2 had done better than at KS1, confirming the good education journey they underwent at Dormansland. Early years was doing very well, there were 3 teachers and only 23 children. It was a very needy group with almost a quarter on the SEN register but they were doing well. JA noted the large discrepancy between girls and boys. Some of this related to poor focus and lack of concentration following early years in lockdown. JA commented on phonics and how this would be tricky for the current Y1. Was this in the SDP. Yes. JA asked if the school was confident with the processes in place to teach phonics to this year group. Yes, they were. Governors noted the phonics teaching system (SSP) and Bug Club for reading. KC asked if the school monitored what happened at home. Yes, it did. JA asked if phonics was a daily timetabled activity for Y1. Yes, it was and some had a double-go.</p> <p>LJ noted the huge approach and attention that had been given to maths. Was the school keeping an eye on the targets it had missed. Yes, mainly they were the word problem solving items like maths comprehension. LJ asked if there was a specific focus on what needed to be done. Yes.</p> <p>KC asked if the school tracked progress of PE. Yes it did , but it was not reported to governors. Teachers tracked internally and measured children against a progression of skills from the national curriculum for example throwing/catching a ball/ being able to perform a sequence of movements. It was reported to parents in end of year reports.</p>	KC
7.	<p>GOVERNOR MONITORING</p> <p>Governors had previously agreed that monitoring should continue to be linked to the SDP. The SDP/SEF was now one document and was being circulated to staff for final agreement. FD and MC shared a draft schedule of monitoring</p>	

	with suggested governors assigned to key areas. They confirmed that three priorities from last year were to be kept to "keep the gains". Governors confirmed that they were happy with the proposed allocations. LJ checked to ensure that they would be compliant by covering these areas. KC queried the term "more able learners" was this a Dormansland only term. No, this was a defined term. There was not a % associated with it, but HC explained it was children working above their expected levels and how the school could support them.	
8.	<p>POLICIES</p> <p>ML had reviewed the following policies. She had gone back to FD and MC with some queries and suggestions which they had taken on board, she then recommended for approval. Governors approved the policies.</p> <p>Low level concerns and allegations</p> <p>Whistle Blowing</p> <p>KC had reviewed the Online Safety Policy. He had several queries relating to how the school described the filtering and reporting processes. He wondered if a flow chart should be included. MC explained that CPOMS was used to report any incidents and that he received a weekly report of any concerns flagged up. Governors discussed if something from the Safeguarding Policy should be extracted and added in/or whether the policy should reference other related policies. KC thought parts of the policy could be clearer. He asked how the school would monitor use of mobile phones by children. There was a separate mobile device policy and a change had been made this year that the parent of any child who wanted to bring a phone in, had first to attend a meeting/training session. So far these had gone down well with parents. Governors agreed that KC would liaise separately with MC to finetune the policy and governors were happy for the approval to be done by email.</p> <p>5.20pm EG left the meeting Governors noted that the school had reviewed and updated the following policies: Staff Code of Conduct; Positive Relationships and Behaviour; Online Safety parent Agreement; Parent Code of Conduct</p>	
9.	<p>MINUTES</p> <p>Governors approved the minutes of the meeting held on 6 July 2023 as an accurate record and they were signed by the Chair.</p> <p>Actions: One outstanding: Governors to host an informal lunch to meet staff.</p> <p>Action: FD to suggest a couple of dates to governors.</p>	FD
10.	<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"> • Considered possibilities of joining a Multi-Academy Trust (part Two) • Appointed Safeguarding Team • Appointed Chair and Vice-Chair of Governors • Analysed data and assigned monitoring against SDP. 	
11.	<p>DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monday 20th November 4-6pm (followed by Pay Committee at 6pm) • Monday 22 January 2024 4-6pm • Wednesday 6 March 2024 4-6pm • Thursday 2 May 2024 4-6pm • Wednesday 3 July 2024 4-6pm 	
	Meeting ended at 5.38pm	

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.....