

PART ONE

**MINUTES OF THE FULL GOVERNING BODY
OF DORMANSLAND PRIMARY SCHOOL
HELD IN SCHOOL on MONDAY 22 January 2024 AT 4PM**

Present:			
Keith Coleman (KC) Chair	Parent		
Helen Roe: HR arrived at 5pm	Co-opted	Hayley Clark: HC	Staff
Marie Langer (ML)	Co-opted	Jenny Ashley (JA)	LA
Faye Davies: FD	Co-Headteacher	Mark Cook: MC	Co-Headteacher
In attendance:			
Catriona Sanderson: (CS)	Clerk	Louisa Blyde (LB)	School Business Mgr
Jess Newns: (JN)	Senior Teacher		

1.	<p>WELCOME & ADMINISTRATION</p> <p>a) Apologies received and accepted from Alex Sweetlove, Efisio Gigliotti and Liz James. Clerk confirmed that the meeting was quorate</p> <p>b) No declarations of interest in specific agenda items.</p>	
2.	<p>CLERK'S UPDATE:</p> <p>Currently no vacancies.</p> <p>Governors discussed what training they might have from Strictly Education as part of the SLA package. KC suggested Curriculum. After a discussion on this it was agreed that this was better delivered by school leaders to explain how Dormansland interpreted the national curriculum. Action: next meeting. CS to note for agenda.</p> <p>Understanding School Finance was suggested. It was agreed that CS to ask Strictly Education what the "top five" requested courses were and governors would then decide what would help most. Action: CS to contact Strictly.</p>	CS CS
3.	<p>CHAIR'S ACTION</p> <p>KC noted that this was his first meeting since taking up the role. No emergency actions taken since last meeting and no general updates. KC had checked Governor Training records. There were quite a few blank slots and he asked governors to take the time to attend training over the year ahead. Action: All Govs.</p>	All govs
4.	<p>SAFEGUARDING</p> <p>FD reported she had done a 'review' of CPOMS records from an Ofsted slant. Good examples of CPOMS records had been printed that could be given in evidence if asked. She informed governors that since 2022 there had been a significant improvement in the school's CPOMS records: less storytelling and more facts and actions, which is what Ofsted would look at. When an action was followed up the outcomes were also entered. Governors learnt that all staff were able to input into CPOMS but only the DSL could get into all records and could also add notes or requests for staff in relation to what they had recorded. CPOMS generated a report each week for the DSL and could provide reports on specific children if required. FD commented that in a school as small as Dormansland this was not so important as children were well known to staff, but in a bigger school this would be very helpful. JA asked if the school would receive a notification from the police if an incident occurred at home. This was meant to happen but didn't always – for example if it was across the county boundary or during the holidays. The system to enable this to happen was called 'Operation Encompass'. The police should say if an incident occurred at home and the child was there. KC and JA asked what the school did with this information. There was very little they could do unless the child revealed anything.</p> <p>FD reported that after April the school was moving away from using SIMS (its current management information system) to Arbor. This would be slightly</p>	

	<p>cheaper in the long-run, behaviour could be recorded separately to safeguarding concerns, and it had many more reporting options that the school could benefit from. Confirmed that the school had carried out best value and got the required number of quotes for moving to the new system.</p> <p>Governors commented that the Ofsted Safeguarding Training had been very helpful.</p> <p>ML, safeguarding governor, reported that she had checked the Single Central Record (SCR) on 1 December, report included with papers. Dip sampling of new and existing staff had been carried out. She confirmed it was accurate, up to date and no problems. This went above and beyond DBS checks and was clearly defined within KCSiE. KC asked how checks were carried out on agency staff. The agency emails through DBS details and these were recorded and confirmed by LB.</p> <p>FD reported that a new lanyard system was now in place: Green: DBS checked Red: DBS in progress, or no DBS (for example a one-off visitor) and person needed to be accompanied. This had been explained in a careful way to children, not to cause fear but rather that those with a red lanyard needed to be accompanied round school as they might not know their way around.</p> <p>Lockdown Drill had taken place earlier in the day: 2 minutes and 48 seconds. FD and MC were pleased with the time and commented on how quickly the youngest children did this. Governors confirmed that children went to either the hall or the library, a handbell was rung, windows and doors had to be locked and blinds put down. Governors asked some questions about how best to make it work, whether other alarms could be used. The school could not use the fire alarm system. Governors were reassured that the school had a good system in place.</p>	
5.	<p>HEADTEACHER REPORT</p> <p>English Update from Subject Co-ordinators: HC and JN</p> <p>SAfE had visited the previous week to look at English provision and carried out an audit on early reading, observed phonics classes, Bug Club provision and looked at data. A 'note of visit' had been provided with two minor next steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitor TAs when doing catchup reading interventions to better aid assessments. 2. Link up with another school who were just starting their Bug Club Journey. This was mainly so Dormansland could provide the other school with support. <p>Visit had noted the formation of letters in handwriting from YR upwards noting how the provision and progress was gradually spreading up the school. Noted that the English focus was likely to be a 3-4 year journey for the school. Reading and Handwriting first then to be followed by writing.</p> <p>JN and HC were considering different writing schemes that could be used. They had not yet found one that covered exactly what they wanted it to and were considering a slight pick and mix approach or designing their own. They reported that writing wasn't bad in the school, but it was a challenge to get children working at greater depth. There was a need to ensure that progression was monitored and recorded so Ofsted could see evidence. The visit had given good tips on how to do this. JN and HC had a clear vision of what they wanted to do. They reported the move to whole class reading. Research had been done, trialled in their own classes first, asked others to trial and give feedback, and were now implementing this approach.</p> <p>JA asked how this visit linked back to a previous visit from Roxanne Gumb at SAfE. This had been a follow-on visit. FD further explained that SAfE were contracted by Surrey and carried out yearly Key Skills Needs Analysis visits (KSNA). For the next visit another person was coming: Maggie Mackie. JA</p>	

asked if it was helpful to have different people visiting. Yes, the school was happy with this as each one had different expertise. **JA queried AS's November monitoring report, because she thought it was quite negative.** School had thought opposite and that it had been a positive report and day for them. They confirmed that many of the next steps and points included were items they had discussed with SAfE and agreed to being in the report as areas they were already working on. School was happy to have external visits to keep up to date but commented they often had to explain things again to a new person.

KC commented on the variance of in-class achievements: +2.3in KS1 down to -2.6 in KS2. **Was this a concern for the school. How did the school encourage and further progress those doing well alongside picking on up those who struggled to meet expectations.**

FD explained that within a class there could be some children working 3-4 years below their age expectations and some 2-3 years above, which was a big challenge for the teacher to keep all engaged. Teacher was required to work with the same curriculum for all and find ways for those at the higher end to go into greater depth. Catch-up required for those at the other end. HC said that children would be identified who needed 1-1 daily catch-up and support, small group daily catch-ups and small group once a week catch-ups. Teachers identified the bottom 20% of class (minus SEN children). This was reviewed termly and daily reading was also a focus for these children. The school was seeing some narrowing of the gap, particularly with the use of pre-teaching which it was keen for TAs to continue doing. They would pre-teach identified children which could involve things like within science giving help with language or methods that would be used, which then gave them the boost they needed once back in class.

KC asked how whole class reading worked. HC confirmed it was not the whole class reading aloud at the same time or being asked to read in a carousel it was that teachers taught the whole class reading at the same time. Within a class it could be that there was an 11-year-old with a reading age of 7, but comprehension for their age. The whole class teaching allowed them to be exposed to the expected skills. It also worked the other way round where a child was a good reader but had little comprehension. **KC asked if teachers chose the books read in class.** Far more work done now to help children understand the texts, language, punctuation, plot. Parent workshops had been run to guide parents so they understood the need to go into the text more than just racing through books. **JA asked how the school nurtured a love of reading and if children were asked if they had enjoyed a book.** Yes, JN had carried out pupil voice taking two children from each class, and asking questions about reading apart from one they had all spoken positively about the books and when she had queried the one who said they were not enjoying reading it was about the style of book. A conversation followed about not having to finish a reading book if you didn't like it – as long as they were able to articulate why, which further showed evidence of comprehension.

Headteacher verbal update

School had spent time digging beneath the aims of Inspire, Nurture and Challenge to consider the values that sat underneath them. Four values had been agreed: Curiosity, Respect, Responsibility and Resilience. Governors received a handout to explain this which linked to how these manifested in the curriculum offer. Teachers needed to consider how they delivered the curriculum in relation to the values. Curriculum groupings had been set up so subject leaders no longer worked in isolation creating more collaborative work opportunities.

	<p>KC was concerned that as a parent it did not make sense if you wanted to understand the curriculum, he thought it needed more narrative. FD explained that governors were not looking at the Curriculum but how the school “drives” its curriculum. It wasn’t a document for parents and it did not need to go onto the website, it was a staff oversight document.</p> <p>KC thought there should be something more parent friendly available. Action: FD and MC to review curriculum area on website.</p> <p><i>JA asked if inspire/nurture/challenge was on walls in classrooms.</i> Currently not in classes as default, partly due to it potentially being lost within other display items. It was in the hall and on pillars. FD confirmed that if children were asked, they could name the words and had understanding of what they meant. It appeared on smart screens in classes. JA suggested it would be helpful to be on walls as a notice, but it was understood that budgetary constraints were a factor.</p> <p>Autumn Term Data Report <i>JA asked if the number of children equivalent to percentage could be included in future reports. Action: FD/MC to note.</i></p> <p>Noted that current Y6 had no Y2 data and going forward that would be the case. Currently the school was having to measure progress from EYFS up to Y6 which was a very large gap.</p> <p><i>JA asked if staff had targets.</i> Yes, the data predictions were their targets. Governors and staff discussed the need for honest data and how they worked against targets that could make staff ‘round up’ just to reach a target. Governors learnt that the pupil progress meetings were the key place at which a pupil’s progress was discussed with questions being asked about how the teacher planned to move them on/ why a child wasn’t meeting targets. <i>JA asked if the school thought it would meet the targets.</i> Some targets already met, for others hard to know.</p> <p><i>KC asked if different targets were used for SEN children.</i> No, they were measured against the same national targets, so would often never meet expected but the school also set them its own internal targets.</p> <p><i>JA commented that considering the school was rated below other Surrey schools for reaching greater depth, did FD and MC think other schools had a different approach they could learn from .</i> FD commented that when a school improvement partner had looked at maths she said that many children were working at greater depth, but the school did not have the evidence to show this, as a result evidence trails were a priority.</p> <p><i>JA asked what the three key messages the data was telling the school were:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Greater depth 2. Progress of SEND children (they were making progress but it wouldn’t show in the data. 3. Deprived pupils <p><i>KC asked how the large number of new staff members were being integrated into school.</i> This was going well, but because historically the school had low turnover, it was a big change this term and it was parents who were finding it the most difficult to get used to. SLT were working to help staff settle in and get used to the school’s systems. They were also using other staff members to ask how things were going so it did not all come from SLT.</p>	<p>FD, MC</p> <p>FD/MC</p>
--	--	--

	<p>New teachers brought their own style and children were learning there was "life outside Dormansland". They felt it was very much a fresh, positive approach. KC concurred and commented that his children had articulated slight unhappiness about changes, and he had commented that this was a good transition, things would be even more different at secondary school and it was good to get used to change. HC had a lot of new staff in the early years team and reported that they were growing into a strong confident team.</p> <p>JA asked if the school was doing all it needed to with regard to gender questioning. The school had completed a questionnaire from the Government in connection with this and continued to read about the subject. Currently there were no children within this category in school. A few years ago, there had been and advice had been taken from Surrey, in particular relating to residential trips. FD was confident the school was doing what it needed to at this time.</p>	
6.	<p>FINANCE</p> <p>FMR: Nothing had really changed since the last one. LB reported it was still hard to predict salaries due to problems with the new payroll system. It didn't generate the correct reports – some were actuals, some were budgets. However, she was confident with her reports. She had allowed overtime due to increased staff cover required and was projecting just under £27,000 surplus. More capital had been used but they would still end with a surplus. Several SLAs were coming to an end and school was starting the process of transferring records to Arbor (mentioned above) which would make systems more manageable. A little extra would be needed in 24/25 budget but not too different. KC commented that it didn't look like much had been spent on training. LB explained that much had been put into different cost centres. Learning Resources: Educational Psychologist training sat along with play therapist. The school had taken the decision to get this type of training. However, staff were attending training courses and the school was managing to access quite a few free courses. LB kept a record of all staff training. FD wished to minute the many weeks and hours that LB has spent on payroll, above and beyond her normal hours and thanked her for this. LB commented that she had received an email asking what help she might need for the system. She had completed it but reply had come back and said they couldn't yet schedule in a time to help her. She said how frustrating it was for staff and very difficult to track under or over payments. HR asked when it was likely to be fixed. Unsure, it had been going on since September.</p> <p>SFVS: Deadline 15th March: KC agreed to work on this with Louise and it would be formally approved by FGB. Action: LB and KC to work on this.</p> <p>Governors noted that the school was approaching the PTA for more and more support.</p> <p>Kitchen: Still ongoing Disabled toilet: no confirmation yet of how this would be installed. Next meeting on 21 February to discuss.</p>	LB, KC
7.	<p>HEALTH AND SAFETY</p> <p>School had received an email about asbestos training. This did not apply to the school. No RAAC in school Site Conditional Survey Visit on March 18th. Some breakages on trim trail had been reported which Surrey would fix.</p>	

8.	<p>POLICIES:</p> <p>Governors noted that the school had reviewed and updated the following polices: Drugs and Medicine Exclusions Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (specific duties and objectives)</p> <p>Update on RSE: a further conversation to cover this would happen at HR's next monitoring visit.</p>	
10.	<p>MONITORING</p> <p>Governors noted monitoring visits carried out and that JA's action to include a paragraph in newsletter about the purpose of her visit had also been done. Behaviour and Attitudes – Engagement of Learners: JA Quality of Education: AS</p>	
11.	<p>MINUTES</p> <p>Governors approved the minutes of the meeting held on 20 November 2023 as an accurate record and they were signed by the Chair.</p> <p>Outstanding Actions: Governors and staff discussed a possible date for a lunch. Two possible dates:</p> <p>Wednesday 28th February: 12-1.30pm Wednesday 6 March: 12-1.30pm followed by some visits to classrooms and earlier FGB at 2.30-4.30pm</p> <p>JA kindly offered to prepare the lunch. Action: CS to send email asking governors for which suited them best and majority date to be agreed.</p>	CS
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"> • Considered safeguarding of the children • Robust discussion on how English taught in school to support all levels of need. • Consideration of data • Looked at new curriculum offer 	
13.	<p>DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wednesday 6 March 2024 4-6pm TBC once training date set • Thursday 2 May 2024 4-6pm • Wednesday 3 July 2024 4-6pm 	
	Meeting ended at 6.10pm	

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.....