

PART ONE

**MINUTES OF THE INTERIM EXECUTIVE BOARD OF GOVERNORS
OF DORMANSLAND PRIMARY SCHOOL
HELD IN SCHOOL
THURSDAY 16 SEPTEMBER 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
Catriona Sanderson (CS)	Clerk

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 d) Noted that Governors and SLT had returned register of business interests form to clerk who would collate, store & update website accordingly. 	CS
2.	<p>JUNIOR LEADERSHIP TEAM</p> <p>JLT met with Governors and FD prior to the meeting. They had taken governors on a tour of the school and presented their aims for the year. Governors were impressed with their enthusiasm and aims but questioned how their achievements might be measured.</p>	
3.	<p>CHAIR'S ACTION: No emergency actions taken since the last meeting.</p>	
4.	<p>CLERK'S UPDATE: PROCEDURES, ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Governors agreed to the continued roles of CW as Chair and LJ & AG as joint Vice-Chairs for the autumn term. b) Governors confirmed their contact details and willingness for details to be circulated within the school & other governance agencies. c) Governors noted that LB and CS would provide Emergency Contact information to SCC. d) Noted that a new training record to be started for the year and governors to inform CS when they had attended training. e) Confirmed that the Governor responsible for liaison with LA in the event of allegation (Child Protection) against Headteacher was Chris Williamson. f) Pay Committee previously agreed as CW and AG g) HT Appraisal Review panel agreed as CW, AG and LJ. h) Appeals Panel to be set as required and noted that CS could approach Strictly Education for an alternative panel if one of the governors was conflicted. i) Child Protection/Safeguarding Governor: CW j) Children Looked After Governor: LJ k) SEND: LJ l) Finance Governor: AG m) Quality of Education: LJ n) Wellbeing: LJ <p>Governors agreed the following procedures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Open or closed meetings: governors agreed to keep the meetings closed but noted that people could be invited to attend part one and would be marked as "in attendance". 	CS/LB

5.	<p>SAFEGUARDING:</p> <p>a) Governors appointed Faye Davies as the Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL) and Mark Cook and Julie Lochhead as Deputy DSLs.</p> <p>b) Safeguarding update: CW noted that although money had been secured for new gates to the carpark nothing had happened. LB said the school was waiting on Surrey to decide which contractor to use. Action: CW to chase up with Surrey. Governors noted that prompt action had been taken on a safeguarding issue during their tour of the school. FD reported that she and Julie Lochhead had signed up to three sessions for Safeguarding Leads on Responding to the Ofsted Sexual Harassment Report. She was also booked onto a 4-hour supervision course on 14 October. A productive inset day had occurred with new staff joining and it had been helpful to hear their views in relation to safeguarding, particularly from the viewpoint of sexual abuse in school. LJ commented on useful document from SAFE concerning sexual harassment and the separate information relating to primary schools</p> <p>c) Noted that governors had received the updated KCSiE 2021 and had completed form to confirm understanding. SS said it was important not to be passive about understanding of KCSiE for staff and governors. Each week at staff meeting a hot topic relating to Safeguarding was discussed to ensure staff were always considering what could be happening at any time in school.</p> <p>d) Update on Training: FD suggested that governors could attend the supervision course on 14 October if they wanted to. AG had attended a course about changes to KCSiE. FD suggested governors sign up to NSPCC updates and Andrew Hall updates.</p> <p>e) Relevance of Ofsted review of sexual abuse: CW commented that children in primary schools could also be subject to sexual abuse even though it was rarer than in secondary schools and that the same sense of "it could happen here" should be adopted. FD reported that her training would look at recommendations within the primary school setting, she also said that it was being made very clear to new members of staff to be aware of this. CW asked if any children had come forward to report anything to SLT. No. Action: FD to bring a short report from her training to the next meeting.</p> <p>f) Child Protection and Safeguarding Policy. CW asked if it was based on the Surrey Model policy. Yes, and cross-referenced with a checklist from Andrew Hall. Governors approved the updated policy. Action: to be put on school website. FD said that she would send governors the updated policies from JLT and behaviour ambassadors to approve.</p>	<p>CW</p> <p>FD</p> <p>LB/FD</p>
6.	<p>HEADTEACHER REPORT</p> <p>Governors thanked SS for her report. Updated data for page one was handed out (attached to minutes). SS did not think the figure of 8% persistent absence was correct and was querying this. Noted that as of 14 September all YR were in school although not all were yet full-time. They were settling in well. Numbers on roll were still lower than the school would have liked. Governors asked how many the school would want. 210 plus a few more in KS2 where they were able to go over 30 in a class. SS explained that the school population was currently quite mobile with a few coming and going and that in Y2 where the school was unable to take more than 30 there were 7 children on waiting list, so it was likely that over time and particularly when this become Y3 there would be more children in school. MC commented that other local schools also had lower numbers and that the village pre-school had closed due to low numbers, which would feed through into continued lower numbers in YR over the next few years. Governors asked what the school did about this. SS explained how much time the school put into working with Surrey</p>	<p>CS to get data</p>

	<p>admissions to try and fill places as quickly and effectively as possible. Surrey continued to predict lower birth rates in coming years. The school was holding two open mornings this year partly due to Covid and partly to encourage as many visitors as possible. SS explained the difficulty of being a boundary school on three counties and how frustrating it was that Surrey would not take this into account within their 10-year plan. LJ asked if the school was likely to be asked to take in refugees. Currently unlikely, with little impact seen in this area but the school did have a handful of traveller children across the years.</p> <p>Pg 2: Actions: CW asked on the progress of two ongoing actions: Noted that a fire drill had taken place the previous day without YR and another drill with YR planned for the following week. As the school year progressed further drills with differing scenarios would be carried out. SS suggested the first lockdown procedure drill be carried out before the next IEB so it could be included in Safeguarding report. Action: SS/FD to arrange.</p> <p>Safeguarding and Child Protection Governors noted that numbers were constantly shifting but no children in YR had started school within any of the listed categories and no LAC children had joined the school. Governors learnt that the cost of Positive Touch Training had gone up considerably and the school was prioritising new staff, SLT and providing refresher updates. The next Safeguarding report would have updated numbers.</p> <p>Attendance CW asked what the school was doing about the two-year groups with over 9% persistent absence which equated to 6 children. SS informed governors how much the school instilled the importance of attendance and that for the children mentioned it was a combination of: A medical need resulting from an accident. Surrey had carried out a risk assessment enabling the child to return to school; parent anxiety post lockdown. MC had worked tirelessly with the family concerned and SS was delighted to report that as a result the child had 100% attendance since the start of term. One case was a child protection issue. SS looked at attendance figures every three weeks tracking closely what was happening. Post-Covid the SLT had retained some procedures which included only having the front gate of school open in the morning. They looked closely to see if children with absence issues had arrived and if not the office were phoning them very quickly. This also enabled SLT to have positive informal contact with parents at the gate. AG asked if the school had a home/school link worker. Yes, Julie Lochhead and she followed up on absence cases, the school gave her specific time for this.</p> <p>Governors noted the SAfE Updates and SS reported that Ciaran Beatty had come to school this week and delivered an extremely inspiring session on the Teaching and Learning Framework.</p> <p>Action: Whole school targets to be circulated to governors with the minutes. SS was waiting on the writing targets from two classes. SS to send to CS.</p> <p>CW asked how the school determined they were setting appropriate targets. SS explained that it was a combination of triangulation visits, the old and new teacher of a year group met at the end of the summer term to look at each child's data, intervention plans and previous targets. Targets then written up to be in place for new term. Pupil progress meetings then triangulated data from the end of term and linked this with the last set of key stage available data. For Yrs 1,2,3 and 4 early years data was also referred to. The school considered the question of where a child would be if Covid had not happened and this was based on previous Key stage data. Pupil progress meetings this year would ensure the targets were robust and evidence could back this</p>	<p>SS/FD</p> <p>SS/CS</p>
--	---	---------------------------

	<p>up. SS said she would not be looking at the final early years data until October. CW asked what the Fisher Family Trust (FFT) were currently using. They were using 2019 data. SS thought that the internal school data was more robust than anything FFT could offer. CW asked if FFT were therefore reducing fees. No. School was also paying for Insight and were pleased with what this offered to them for analysis of data. Noted that current YR would be the first group of children who would not take any SATS until Y6 also noted that the early years outcome data would look different at the end of this academic year, as part of the new framework.</p> <p>CW asked what other local benchmarking the school carried out. SS was currently moderating with two other schools. Teachers met as well as SLT about once a term. Mel Pollard was part of the Surrey Maths Hub Project.</p> <p>Covid Catch-up and Recovery Curriculum Governors noted how little money was being made available and what the school had been able to put in place. MC had carried out work to assess the remote education offering of the school and could confirm that the school was compliant in this area. AG noted that Ofsted expected schools to instantly offer remote learning and asked if the school could do this. Yes, they could on two levels. There was work available via the virtual classroom if a child had to self-isolate or indeed a teacher. In addition, sitting behind the server was a week's worth of remote schooling already prepared if the school was asked to offer this at any time. AG asked where this was referenced. In the Outbreak Management Plan</p> <p>SDP CW confirmed that the priorities were based on the SEF. It was agreed that the IEB would receive the SDP by the end of September. Action: SS</p> <p>Governors noted the Risk Assessment</p> <p>Hostile Incidents: CW asked how the school managed parents in light of harassment incident. Parent Code of Conduct had been sent out. CW said the IEB could support the head if a parent needed to be excluded from the school site. CW asked about a stage one complaint and whether SS thought it would be escalated. She thought it was more likely to be escalated with SEND at Surrey. SS hoped the parent was now happy with the school's response. Governors congratulated the school on a successful summer term and SS said how proud they were that the school had managed to stay open throughout.</p>	SS
7.	<p>POLICIES Governors approved the following policies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whistle Blowing 2. SEND 3. E-Safety (CW asked if this was based on Surrey Model policy – it was). Governors signed section of this policy at the meeting. <p>Governors noted the new admissions arrangements were on school website.</p>	
8.	<p>GOVERNOR MONITORING SCHEDULE Governors allocated themselves against monitoring visits and would liaise with school to arrange visits this term. Noted that a health and safety visit was not required to include governors, but a short report/update from school H&S inspections to come to the next meeting. Action: CS to note.</p>	CS
9.	<p>MINUTES Governors confirmed the minutes of IEB meetings held on 15 July 2021 as an accurate record. Minutes signed by the Chair. Action: Clerk to file. Actions: all completed</p>	CS

10.	<p>DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS</p> <p>Headteacher Performance Review Meeting: Tuesday 9 November 2021: 1-3pm with Alison Day.</p> <p>Pay Committee: 22 November time 3pm: clerk in attendance to take minutes.</p> <p>IEB: Monday 22 November at 4pm</p> <p>IEB: Monday 24 January at 4pm</p>	
11.	<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"> • Set up monitoring visits that would consider the quality of education • Ensured policies in place to protect the children. • Held the school to account concerning attendance and target setting. • Received HT report for previous term • Discussed how to put together a new governing body. 	
	Meeting ended at 5.55pm	

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.....