

**PART ONE**

**MINUTES OF THE FULL GOVERNING BODY  
OF DORMANSLAND PRIMARY SCHOOL  
HELD IN SCHOOL on MONDAY 21 NOVEMBER 2022 AT 4PM**

<b>Present:</b>			
Liz James: LJ: Chair	Parent	Jenny Ashley: JA	LA
Keith Coleman: KC: V-Chair	Parent	Efisio Gigliotti: EG items 1-5	Co-opted
Alex Sweetlove: AS	Co-opted	Mark Cook: MC	Co-Acting Headteacher
Faye Davies: FD	Co-Acting Headteacher	Hayley Cooke: HC	Staff
<b>In attendance:</b>			
Catriona Sanderson: CS	Clerk	Louisa Blyde: LB items 1-6	School Business Mgr

1.	<b>WELCOME &amp; ADMINISTRATION</b> a) Apologies received and accepted from Marie Langer. b) No declarations of interest in specific agenda items	
2.	<b>CHAIR'S ACTION:</b> No emergency actions taken.	
3.	<b>CLERK'S UPDATE</b> <b>Constitution:</b> Vacancy had been advertised via social media. One response received so far, but on learning more about the role the applicant had decided they did not currently have time to commit. Governors discussed previous applicants for parent roles and a registration of interest from a member of staff at Lingfield College. KC suggested another option would be to seek a governor from a school that had converted to an academy that could provide "cross-over" as the school continued to pursue this. It was agreed that initially previous applicants would be asked if they would like to re-apply. Also noted that although LJ would no longer be a parent after the summer term, a governor was able to stay in the parent role until term of office ended, after which they could step down or convert to a different role. <b>Action: CS to follow-up.</b> <b>Ofsted Questionnaire:</b> Governors were given a hard copy of this in addition to an electronic copy. Each governor was asked to gradually complete the questions as a result of attending meetings, monitoring visits and other general governor work. The idea was for it to provide a checklist for each governor of potential information they may need to know during an Ofsted visit. <b>Action: All governors to complete and bring up in discussions as necessary.</b> <b>Training:</b> Governors were reminded to inform CS when they had done any training so the log could be kept up to date.	<b>CS</b>        <b>All govs</b>
4.	<b>POLICIES:</b> <b>Health Safety and Welfare:</b> EG had reviewed the policy. He noted it was an annual policy and commented that it was a robust and well-written policy and he highly recommended that governors approved it. <b><i>KC asked who the site supervisor was.</i></b> Paulo Ferreira. EG noted that as H&S governor he would continue to liaise with MC via monitoring visits. <b><i>Governors queried who the school's named H&amp;S officer was.</i></b> This was the Head but delegated power to LB, in role of School Business Manager. <b>Relationships and Sex Education:</b> AS had reviewed the policy and sent a couple of comments and queries to MC. These related to letters sent home and adding transphobia bullying into the policy. The school had accepted these and updated policy. AS also recommended the policy for approval. She commented that it was a well-written policy and it's wording truly reflected the school and was relevant to the Dormansland setting.  <b>Governors approved both policies.</b> Governors noted the following policies that had been updated but did not require governor approval:	

	Attendance, First Aid, Mobile Devices, Pupil Premium, Sports Premium.	
5.	<p><b>HEADTEACHER REPORT WITH SAFEGUARDING INCLUDED.</b></p> <p><b>School Context:</b> MC reported that there were currently 202 pupils in the school. Recently held two very successful and positive open day tours of the school. They anticipated a full cohort in September 2023 and noted there would be a high number of sibling applicants. <b>KC asked for clarification of EAL acronym.</b> This was children with English as an additional language. Although many of these children were fluent in English at school, they would be speaking a different language at home which impacted on learning and understanding. <b>JA queried the high persistent absence at 15.3% compared to national average of 8.8%.</b> This figure was due to one family with three children who had taken them out of school for 1.5 months at the start of term for a holiday (unauthorised by school). KC confirmed that this was a snapshot in time feeling that it was a peak that mis-represented the true picture in the school. Although FD agreed, she noted that this would be what Ofsted considered and it was a large amount of time out of school for each child that would not easily be recovered. It had been agreed by the school and its attendance officer (employee of Surrey) that from January parents would be fined if they took children out of school for holidays. She was working with the school to ensure all letters relating to this were compliant. Governors noted that the school did not receive any money from fines, it went to Surrey. Attendance Officer had done a late-gate exercise in the past. <b>JA asked if it had an impact.</b> Yes, some parents had changed things and for a couple of families it had helped the school better understand wellbeing needs that they were coping with. The attendance officer believed that whatever issues any child faced they should be at school on time. New gates now automatically shut at 8.50. FD reported that families continued to request holidays in term time which were all unauthorised. Any pre-arranged holidays that were not taken during Covid were no longer valid.</p> <p><b>Curriculum:</b> Inset day on 31 October had focused on Equality, Diversity and Inclusion. This had gone well and they had been able to consolidate this area which had included a wide-spectrum of statements and initiatives into one statement. Now confident it was an embedded thread throughout the school rather than just a bolt-on. The day also included training for subject leaders and those new to co-ordinating a role to better understand what the expectation was. This linked very much to the new Ofsted Framework with its change in focus towards curriculum. Governors noted the importance of setting up progress in a subject over time and how it connected to the curriculum as a whole. Also noted that AS would be focusing on this during her next monitoring visit.</p> <p><b>Behaviour:</b> Governors noted that there had been no significant behaviour issues this term and behaviour across the school was good. Inset day had included a close look at the school's vision and values and there had been a strong focus on "Inspire, nurture, challenge" forming the focus of assemblies and rewards. This was because it had been noted that not all children seemed to particularly understand or relate to the values. A new design had been produced that better incorporated vision and values and staff agreed that the values needed to link into everything they did. <b>EG concurred stating that it was important for there to be consistency in this area.</b></p> <p><b>Budget:</b> Draft budget for 2023-2024 needed to be submitted by 30 November and all schools had been advised by Surrey that deficit budgets would not be accepted. LJ said she planned to write to Surrey saying this was not acceptable for Dormansland School, following the exceptional circumstances faced during the last academic year. LB reported that it was unlikely the school would go into deficit this year but there would be a significant impact next year with increased salary and energy bills. Governors discussed the general increase in costs that the school would face and the unknown of whether any funding</p>	

would increase. LB commented that the draft budget would be very different to the actual budget that had to be submitted at the end of April. JA commented that it highlighted the need to have a full cohort of pupils. LJ commented that LB had done an amazing job which had enabled the school to balance its budget, that she had saved the school financially, but in effect the school would be penalised for this as its surplus was now decreased with some of the circumstances for this occurrence being of Surrey's own making. LB stated that once the draft budget was submitted the SLT would look at how many hours of work it needed to lose to balance budget and then conversations may need to happen. Governors agreed they would support SLT as they had these discussions and would continue to question and challenge any decisions they felt needed further consideration. SLT stated that they hoped to avoid redundancies and currently staff were flexible and open in their communication so it could be that loss of some hours happened naturally. **JA asked about the school's supply budget.** Very low as mainly able to use internal staff.  
4.50pm EG left the meeting.

**Premises:** New gates had been installed but a few issues as not quite operating correctly. They were set to standard Surrey Guidelines for the length of time they stayed open. FD and MC had an initial meeting with Surrey to re-open discussions about kitchen development. Draft plans were drawn up and it was agreed that the kitchen was too small. Possibility of splitting the kitchen with part of it being relocated into current PE storage cupboards which would increase its size. A meeting had also been held with Olive Dining to discuss their requirements.

**Staffing:** YR teacher leaving at the end of term to move to the private sector. Position had been advertised and one applicant had been interviewed and subsequently offered the job, but on further scrutiny of her current contract, they found they could not be released in time to start the job (January for two terms). **JA queried why the staff member had started in YR and then handed in notice after half a term; were there any underlying morale issues.** No, a personal decision to move to the private sector. FD also confirmed that the teacher had already taught in YR for the previous academic year. SLT currently looking at options for cover and there was a possible long term supply solution. Changes in job-share of Y6 working well.

**Safeguarding:** There had been one referral to social care, in consultation with the family. No online safety incidents and no behaviour incidents. LJ suggested that no behaviour incidents could be used as part of the HT advert. FD reported that she and MC had renewed their designated safeguarding lead training and staff meetings included weekly "hot topics" on safeguarding matters. School subscribed to Safeguarding Network. Governor safeguarding visit took place on 26th October (see item 7) and another visit due following week. Noted that ML continued to visit the school each half term. New team of Digital Leaders established as part of an Online Safety strategy. MC reported that they would be able to help teachers and some pupils with "tech problems" KC suggested the school consider the Barclays, "Digital Eagles" scheme. This could link to a village community event with the digital leaders working alongside "Silver Surfers" – which could help the school's image within local community.

**Action: KC, MC to consider further.**

**School Development Plan:** Full SDP on Governor Zone. This report considered priorities and noted that monitoring visits were now clearly linked to the SDP.

Governors noted that residential visits had been booked. There had been significant cost rises for trips (particularly Y6 residential) and the school was doing all it could to strip out extra costs, for example pupils were being asked to take their own bedding. LJ commented that it was great the school were

**KC, MC**

	<p>now able to offer trips again. PTA was supporting two children to enable them to attend trips and was also doubling the amount of subsidy per child to £20.</p> <p>LJ and JA reported that they had met with the Junior Leaders and Behaviour Leaders respectively. The importance of pupil voice for Ofsted had been considered and a box for suggestions to come via Junior Leaders had been suggested. Governors thought that every monitoring visit should include meeting some children and JA commented that she had done a quick pop-in to all classrooms, a bit like a speeded-up learning walk which had value in relation to learning and pupil-voice.</p>	
6.	<p><b>FINANCE</b></p> <p><b>Draft Budget:</b> See initial notes within HT report section. LB further reported that Surrey was urging schools to keep in a level of contingency but were being very prescriptive in their guidance. Some grants may not continue in 2023/24 so if they were included in the draft budget, the expenditure also needed to be included. Salary implications noted as there would be 5 months of the school year (April to August 2023) with the 5% increase in teachers' salaries that had just been awarded plus 7 months (September 2023 to March 2024) of a further 5% increase. Also, a 5% increase in Support Staff salaries is to be included. Governors asked if the SLT thought any teachers would strike. They thought not but had also tried to communicate that it would be helpful to know in advance. All agreed it seemed almost pointless for LB to have to prepare and submit a draft budget due to the amount of change that would occur by April. It was agreed that LB would prepare the draft budget and send to LJ and KC, she asked if it should go to all governors and LJ thought it should, considering how contentious it might be. <b>LJ asked if LB felt well enough to do this.</b> Yes, she had some time before next treatment and it was agreed that governors needed to come back with questions and approve the draft by email.</p> <p><b>October FMR (to accompany draft budget):</b> LB reported that the school was currently forecasting an approx £30,000 surplus. Although many staff were at the top of their pay scales and therefore receiving higher levels of pay, other savings had helped. School was in a 3-year energy scheme ending in March (energy costs would likely go up after this). <b>KC asked what the biggest saving was to cause the surplus.</b> Due to HT leaving and decrease in salary being paid. Also an offset in other professional services that had been bought. Governors noted that the c/f had decreased. It was only because the previous HT had left that the school had been able to balance the budget and LJ noted that a lot of narrative was needed to explain this to Surrey and how hard LB had worked to ensure this happened. It was noted that budget would need to include HT salary from when they started (more likely to be September than April).</p> <p>FD reported that the school rarely needed to go out to supply companies. <b>LJ wondered that if there was always someone available to cover internally, did this mean the school had too much slack in the system that could be reduced.</b> FD did not think this was possible. They were able to move staff around when needed because staff were so flexible, but it was always different cover required and therefore not straightforward enough to lose a full position. <b>JA asked if support staff were paid when asked to cover classes.</b> Yes, as advanced teacher assistants (ATA). <b>JA asked if the school had preferred supply teachers.</b> Yes they only used two particular companies when necessary and would always ask for teachers by name if they had been good.</p> <p>No further questions for LB. It was agreed that governors to reply all when they commented on draft budget and 3-year plan that they would receive before 30 November. Governors also recorded their sincere thanks to LB for the amount of time, effort and hard work she put into the schools' finances and preparation of the budget. 5.20pm LB left meeting.</p>	

7.	<p><b>GOVERNOR MONITORING</b></p> <p><b>Safeguarding:</b> ML carried out a monitoring visit on 26 September. Report included with papers. Report included update on actions from previous visit as well as other issues listed. ML noted that one member of staff who was awaiting DBS check was escorted by another member of staff when on site. Dip sampling to be undertaken during next visit.</p> <p><b>Leadership &amp; Management: Reengagement with parents and wider community:</b> KC carried out monitoring visit on 11 November. Visit noted the drop off in parental engagement during Covid times and how the school was working to re-engage parents. This was gradually happening. Parents had been in school the previous week for a whole school event and several other ways to come back in had happened. Governors discussed linking the inspire, nurture, challenge vision to parents. KC also thought the school needed to work out how it engaged not just with parents but with the whole village, for example via the Parish Council, Churches Together. He reported that next May there was to be a parish event that the school could look to get involved with.</p> <p><b>Action: FD, MC to consider junior leaders for this.</b> Visit had also touched on communications coming out from school and a questionnaire had been sent out to establish which forms of communication best suited parents: for example, emails, Marvellous Me, Website updates etc. KC stated the importance of considering each bit of comms that went out. What was the message the school wanted to get across and what was the best format to do this with? (it could be all channels, it could be just one). Currently it was too sporadic and the school needed to work on this. FD agreed and said the questionnaire included a free text box and they hoped to use some of the suggestions that came it to be able to report back "you said, we did". Class assemblies, and nativities would also bring parents back in. <b>Action: KC to complete monitoring report and send to CS.</b></p> <p><b>Behaviour and Attitudes:</b> JA carried out monitoring visit on 14 November. Report on Governor Zone. She noted very positive and fantastic behaviour across the school. One action related to staff training of "Positive Touch" approach used in school. FD had reported the prohibitive cost of "buy back" training from Surrey in current financial climate. JA wished this to be noted as the school needed to consider what training was statutory and what was only desirable. She commented that once in a Trust or more linked with hubs of schools there could be opportunities to collaborate more in relation to training. She warned against lack of positive touch training in case of a major safe-guarding incident. FD acknowledged this and assured governors that staff had received training, this had purely been to update staff.</p> <p>Governors were thanked for their visits. CS to ensure all reports on Governor Zone. AS visiting the following week to look at Quality of Education and EYFS along with data headlines.</p>	FD, MC  KC
8.	<p><b>MINUTES:</b> Governors <b>approved</b> the minutes of the meeting held on 20/09/22 as an accurate record and they were signed by the Chair. Action List updated. All done or in hand. Noted that when Surrey Facilities team next visited the school, they would be asked to install a further fire alarm. ML had been signed up to the Safeguarding Network in her role as Safeguarding Governor.</p>	
9.	<p><b>WHAT HAVE WE DONE AT THIS MEETING TO BENEFIT OR IMPROVE THE EDUCATION OF THE CHILDREN IN OUR SCHOOL?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrated the importance of balancing the budget whilst ensuring no impact on the education of the children.</li> <li>• Range of monitoring visits had ensured that governors could demonstrate the children were safe, well-looked after and engaged in their learning.</li> </ul>	

10.	<b>DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monday 23 January 2023, Wednesday 8 March 2023</li> <li>• Thursday 4 May 2023, Wednesday 12 July 2023.</li> </ul>	
	Meeting ended at 5.45pm	

**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.....