

PART ONE

**MINUTES OF THE FULL GOVERNING BODY
OF DORMANSLAND PRIMARY SCHOOL
HELD IN SCHOOL on WEDNESDAY 8 MARCH 2023 AT 4PM**

Present:			
Marie Langer: ML	Co-opted	Jenny Ashley: JA	LA
Liz James: LJ Chair	Parent	Hayley Clark: HC	Staff
Keith Coleman: KC V-Chair	Parent	Efisio Gigliotti	Co-opted
Alex Sweetlove: AS	Co-opted	Mark Cook: MC	Co-Headteacher
Faye Davies: FD	Co-Headteacher		
In attendance:			
Catriona Sanderson: CS	Clerk	Helen Roe: HR	Governor elect
Mel Pollard: MP item 1-2	Y6 Teacher & Writing Lead		

1.	<p>WELCOME & ADMINISTRATION</p> <p>a) No apologies</p> <p>b) No declarations of interest in specific agenda items. Clerk reminded governors to inform her of any changes throughout the year relating to annual register of interests.</p>	
2.	<p>CURRICULUM UPDATE: MATHS FOCUS</p> <p>Mel Pollard: Maths Lead</p> <p>MP explained that the school had been using a “Maths Mastery” approach for a number of years and the current Y5 had learnt using this method since they joined the school. Approach looked at the class as a whole with everyone able to achieve. Although there was always variation within a class, all would be working towards achieving the objectives in their own way. At the start of the approach MP and MC had been part of a maths Hub and visited other schools in Surrey. The school used resources from White Rose, an educational planning and resourcing package that had grown in use during lockdown. It provided a clear consistent approach and was currently the main source for the school’s maths resources. MP confirmed that maths results had been good for the last two years. Children were growing in their confidence and mindsets had changed, with them learning from mistakes and embracing new ways of learning. MP was confident that results were improving. FD acknowledged that results could be very specific to a particular cohort. MC commented that one of the challenges with maths mastery was getting parents to understand the change in approach. MP explained there was still the need to provide top-end challenge for those to deepen their knowledge of a topic, rather than just move onto something new. <i>LJ asked what happened if a child did not grasp an objective.</i> There could be a quick intervention at that point in the class, or at the end of the lesson or picked up quickly the following day. Live marking was also used. <i>EG asked if the whole class would be working on the same topic.</i> Yes they would be but some might only get through the first few questions and others would go further. There were no sub-groups. <i>EG asked how a teacher would enable a class to work towards different objectives.</i> A number of different approaches used, including different resources and equipment. There might be a progression for different children from equipment to pictures to numbers. (Visual markers). Two parent workshops had recently been held and teachers had explained that even though a child might come into school being able to count to 100, what did that mean? Currently YR were only now up to number 10, because they needed to learn beyond counting: did they know what 10 “looks like”, could they pick out ten items, or add two groups of items to reach ten? – All part of the mastery approach. <i>KC asked how the mastery approach aligned with academic attainment.</i> MP explained that Mastery was just the name, it</p>	

	<p>meant mastering different maths objectives. The objectives for the mastery programme were taken from each year groups' objectives and expected levels of attainment. A whole class objective would be for every child to at least reach the expected level of development. LJ asked what assessments were being used. NFER (National Foundation for Educational Research) Assessment. This was a formal test once a term and was a consistent way to gain data that aligned with SATS tests. It also helped children prepare for SATS as they were more used to taking tests and not so scared. KC asked how the TT Rock Stars linked to the mastery. It didn't link, it was another challenge children could take part in. EG asked what the approach for learning timetables was. A mixture of learning by heart as well as teaching understanding of what lay behind the sums and multiplications. JA asked if there was a cost implication with White Rose. Yes, the school paid for online access to PowerPoints, lesson plans and worksheets for every child. It was a minimal cost of £90 a year, but much photocopying was needed. MP said they were considering whether there might be cost savings by purchasing some of the workbooks for specific topics. Also noted that it did not cover early years and a separate resource used for this age group.</p> <p>JA asked if children ever worked on computers for maths lessons. Not really, however NFER had recently trialled some online tests that a number of children had taken part in. MP thought this would be the future. JA asked MP whether as maths coordinator she felt confident that her colleagues were teaching the approach as required. Yes. MP explained that she had time allocated to visit her colleagues in their classes to observe teaching and lessons as well as taking time to chat to children. She was confident the approach was working.</p> <p>MP was thanked for her time and left the meeting.</p>	
3.	<p>FINANCE UPDATE: LB unable to attend the meeting due to bad weather and had offered to answer any questions over the phone if required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SFVS (Schools Financial Value Standard & Assessment Statement). KC was agreed as the governor with delegated responsibility to complete this. LB to send him a draft to review. It was agreed that LB would now circulate the SFVS to finance governors who would review it and recommend for approval to FGB. This would happen by email. Governors agreed with this approach. • Finance: KC had also checked that the School Fund was audited separately by a local accountant and would then come to governors to note. Governors understood this was a holding account for fees to be paid in and out of. It had also been used to purchase Coronation memorial pin badges and bookmarks for all pupils. PTA held another separate account for their funds and would then be asked or offer to support projects in the school. <p>Policies: KC had reviewed the following policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finance Policy: A few comments relating to consistency in terminology, take out some repetition. KC had questioned some of the internal controls including use of school credit card. • Financial Procedures in Schools: Some suggestions made to tidy up and sound more positive. KC noted that it allowed a co-head to spend unbudgeted funds. He asked if they did this. FD confirmed they never spent anything without first discussing with LB. • Best Value Statement: KC had gone back with a few queries noting that the funding of school trips relied on parents. • Charging and Remissions <p>Once changes had been made KC recommended all the policies for approval. Governors approved the policies subject to the changes suggested.</p>	
4.	<p>CHAIR'S UPDATE</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor Recruitment: LJ welcomed HR to the meeting. Explained that she had applied to be a co-opted governor, had met with FD and MC for an informal interview, visited the school and been in email contact with LJ. All governors introduced themselves. Governors approved HR to become a co-opted governor subject to DBS checks and completing the required forms. Action: CS to process the application and contact HR with relevant forms and information. • No emergency actions taken since last meeting. • Report back from HT recruitment panel: Three candidates (including FD and MC) had been shortlisted and interviewed on 21 February 2023. Panel had consisted of AS, ML and LJ supported by JA who had observed a session and given feedback to the panel during the day. Roxanne Gumbs, School Improvement Advisor from Surrey had been kept informed throughout the process and had approved the shortlisting and appointment of the successful candidates. Candidates had been required to carry out an in-tray exercise, Ofsted exercise, teach a lesson, interact with children and be interviewed. All had been scored. LJ reported that the other candidate had been a strong contender, but FD and MC had been the stronger candidates on the day. Panel had asked teachers and pupils for their opinions on all candidates and there was overwhelming support for the successful candidates. Noted that the pupils liked all three candidates equally. The positions became effective immediately and LJ was therefore delighted to welcome FD and MC as substantive Co-headteachers of the school. She also noted and thanked them for the considerable amount of time that they had held the roles and supported the school in an acting capacity particularly through Covid. Parents, staff and pupils had all been duly informed. FD and MC reported that they had held a session with staff asking them all if they could change one thing and/or bring in one new thing what would it be. The only overwhelming change suggested was to improve the physical environment of the school. Also looking to bring in joint planning time for co-leads of subjects whilst noting that other wellbeing needs like PPA time and free tea and coffee already provided. A message had also been sent to parents asking for their feedback including an open text box for comment. <i>EG asked if there was anything that could be learnt from the other candidate.</i> One suggestion given was an Ofsted fact sheet. • Ofsted: Governors noted that Ofsted was in the area. Governors aware that they were still a very new governing body with only just over a year in position, but needed to be prepared and ready for Ofsted. Governors considered the Inspection Crib sheet they had been given to complete and noted that this was a very broad document. Agreed that unlikely one governor would need to know all this information. It was agreed that governors needed to devote some more time to preparation for Ofsted. Noted that minutes of meetings, monitoring reports and training records would be taken into account. Action: Clerk to check Governor Zone up to date. Governors to consider how best to prepare. Action: LJ to plan next steps. 	<p style="text-align: center;">CS</p> <p style="text-align: center;">CS LJ</p>
--	--	--

5.	<p>HEADTEACHER REPORT</p> <p>School Context: Noted that two children had left this term. Currently 199 on roll. Reasons for leaving related to families moving out of area. Governors asked what effect this would have on the budget. None this academic year, and it was hoped it would not affect next year as likely to be a full YR (currently 82 applications, but school did not know how many were first choice applications).</p> <p>KC asked if the school was concerned about the persistent absence of 19.4% No, FD explained that the school had been badly hit by an outbreak of chicken pox in one year, a sickness bug in another and ongoing holiday requests. However, because it was only half way through the year, the figures would even out by the end of the academic year. Katherine Giles, working with Co-heads looking at the school's absence policies to ensure they were compliant and giving appropriate notice that the school would start to fine parents for unauthorised absences for holidays. Once checks made, fines could be made from September. Attendance slightly down from the previous year. This mirrored what was happening across schools nationally.</p> <p>Curriculum:</p> <p>Data: Pupil progress meetings had taken place in January. During these teachers had been asked if children were on track to make the expected levels of development by the summer. It was not always easy at that stage to tell, but conversations with staff enabled support or challenge to be put in place.</p> <p>HR asked if it was normal to see only 38% in early years on track to make a good level of development (autumn term figure). No this was very low. FD and MC reported that the current YR class contained many children with high levels of need, almost 25% looked like they had special needs and may need to be referred. It was a cohort that would need a lot of support. However this term some significant progress had been made with reading. KC asked if some of the needs related to impact from Covid. Yes, these children had missed out on time mixing with others between the ages of 18 months to 1.5 years at toddler groups etc and had not developed so many of the social skills that would normally happen in these settings. Language had also not developed so well. KC asked if the school received additional support if a child was categorised with SEND. If a child was identified and given an ECHP (Education Health Care Plan) there might be a nominal amount attached to this, but it could just be that a plan was given without funding. Currently if an application was made by a parent rather than the school it was more likely to go through. FD was therefore working with some parents to support their applications. Governors noted that in the past applications from the school were more likely to be accepted. LJ asked if AS looked at data during her monitoring and might identify children with additional needs. Yes, AS asked questions to monitor the pupil progress meetings. JA queried the GD (greater depth) targets asking why they seemed so low. HC and FD explained that these showed the % of pupils who had reached this by the end of the autumn term (having only been taught 1/3rd of the curriculum by that stage). HC said they were realistic targets and showed the minimum level of expectation. JA asked if data had been moderated. Yes it had. Although Ofsted was no longer so focused on data they would expect the school to understand its own data. Historically the school had been caught out by having inflated Y2 data and children had not progressed to expected levels in Y6, the school therefore erred on the side of caution. JA asked how the school could be sure that the low expected targets were not just down to poor teaching. HC explained that the school could confidently show curriculum maps, book scrutinies and lesson plans to show that teaching was providing what the pupils needed. School could also track data back to when a child joined a school to show what progress and attainment had been made. Governors noted that Ofsted would be more likely to ask about pupils not meeting age related expectations.</p>	
----	--	--

	<p>Inset: Review of learning principles undertaken and following discussions with School Improvement advisor it was agreed this was too many and had been condensed to 6 key principles. To be applied in subject leadership work when monitoring the quality of provision across the curriculum. Governors also noted that the school website was being overhauled to make it more user and mobile friendly.</p> <p>Behaviour: remained good, although some recent low levels incidents had occurred. AS had attended school the previous day for a monitoring visit and noted good behaviour throughout her time in school.</p> <p>Staffing: Staff had received a preference form for the following academic year and it helped the heads plan ahead. Noted that this helped LB with finances. KC queried what the preference forms asked. Staff could say if they would prefer to be placed in early years, KS1 or KS2. No guarantees they would get what they asked for. TAs were also asked if they wanted to increase or decrease hours. This question had enabled the school to find out about a TA retiring at end of year which helped ease financial burden by reallocating hours to other staff from September.</p> <p>Governors congratulated Jessica Newns on completing the NPQ MLD.</p>	
6.	<p>SAFEGUARDING</p> <p>Safeguarding governor ML had visited the school on 30 January meeting with MC and LB. Report noted. Dip sampling of the SCR had been carried out. At her previous visit ML had talked to children about safeguarding. This time she talked to teachers to find out directly what they thought about the school's safeguarding culture. For example, did they understand their responsibilities. She was confident with their answers. They received a training update on safeguarding at each staff meeting, and had good access to CPOMS. She had also observed pupil pick-ups in the afternoon looking out for possible safeguarding issues. She was satisfied with procedures for identifying correct adults to take children home. ML satisfied that the school had a good safeguarding culture all staff were "talking the same language" and no incidents to report.</p> <p>FD reported that she and MC had attended CPOMs training and learnt how to make use of regular reporting. This was cascaded down to staff.</p>	
7.	<p>POLICIES:</p> <p>Complaints: Reviewed by EG. Governors noted this was a Surrey Model Policy. EG stressed the importance of following processes within the policy carefully and a desire to catch complaints before they became formalised where possible. He recommended the policy for approval. Governors approved the policy.</p> <p>Governors noted the following polices that had been updated by the school but did not require governor approval:</p> <p>Collective Worship Restrictive Physical Intervention</p>	
8.	<p>GOVERNOR MONITORING</p> <p>Governor monitoring up to date for the term. A good number of monitoring visits had taken place.</p> <p>Action: Clerk to update schedule and check all monitoring visits on Governor Zone.</p>	CS
9.	<p>MINUTES:</p> <p>Governors approved the part one and part two minutes of the meeting held on 23 January as an accurate record and they were signed by the Chair. Action List updated. All done or in hand</p>	
10.	<p>STRATEGY DISCUSSION</p> <p>LJ led this item stating that with a relatively new governing body and newly appointed co-heads was this an appropriate time for the governors to ask how</p>	

	<p>they and the new heads might keep an eye on the longer term future beyond the SDP and if there was anything in particular the heads would like support for.</p> <p>Joining a Multi-Academy Trust came up as a major strategy decision for both school leaders and governors. Governors discussed: the importance of staff being comfortable with the “feel” of a Trust – which could involve them visiting schools within trusts. EG commented on the three key words used by Dormansland: Inspire, Nurture, Challenge, this was a straightforward way to consider if a Trust had the same ethos as the school.</p> <p>JA asked if the SEF could be used as a driver for future long-term strategies. KC asserted that Academisation should be seen as a way to achieve some of the longer-term strategies the school might have rather than a strategy in itself. For example, governors may say... “we want to achieve such and such...” Does joining this MAT help us work toward this or not? Governors agreed they needed to consider what a MAT could offer the school.</p> <p>Action: FD and MC to continue the process of talking to MATS and look to invite a Trust to speak to governors in May.</p> <p>Governors also considered the desire for an improved physical environment in school turning it around to ask how an improved physical environment could help the school achieve better learning outcomes.</p> <p>KC commented that it could be helpful to invite other governors to meetings or attend other FGBs so that governors could benchmark themselves and their effectiveness.</p>	FD, MC
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"> • Noted the appointment of new substantive Co-heads, providing stability within the school. • Gained better understanding of the teaching of maths within the school • Noted the appointment of a new governor and a full complement of governors to support the school. 	
12.	<p>DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tuesday 25 April 4.45pm: Budget Approval 5-7pm: Strictly Education Training Session with Steve Barker: Data interpretation linked to Ofsted Framework. • Thursday 4 May 2023 FGB 4-6pm • Wednesday 12 July 2023 FGB 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.....