



**Meeting of the Full Governing Body
Tuesday 5 October 2016
17.45 – 19.45**

MINUTES

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Governors: | Mary Burr (Chair of Governors), Jo O'Donoghue, Liz Kaye, Rev Jeremy Bamber, Sarah Brydon, Daniel Horan, Ian Rothery, John Stockdale, Annie Schulte, Sue Warren, Mandi Ramshaw, Mary Burr |
| In attendance | Viv Davies (clerk), Kevin Bull |

| | Agenda Item | Action |
|----|---|---------------|
| 1. | <p>Welcome MB opened the meeting.</p> <p>Governors agreed that the chair had been elected at the July Meeting.</p> | |
| 2. | <p>Apologies for Absence</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Scott O'Brien. Governors noted that Francis King was interested in being a Safeguarding Governor and would be interviewed by MB and IR with a view to co-option onto the Governing Body.</p> <p>JB proposed, MB seconded that Kevin Ball (currently an Associate Member) be co-opted on the Governing Body. This was unanimously agreed by Governors.</p> | |
| 2. | <p>Declarations of Interests & Confidentiality Reminder.</p> <p>Governors completed the declarations of interest forms. Governors were reminded about confidentiality.</p> | |
| 3. | <p>Minutes of the last meeting & follow up of actions.</p> <p>A slight amendment was made to the minutes. Two year 1 pupils will retake the Phonics Test. JS proposed, LK seconded approval of the minutes. The minutes were signed by MB.</p> <p><u>Actions.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Premises Inspection Governor Visit report was outstanding. | |

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Parent Survey had been completed. • The Parent Questionnaire would be conducted in Term 2 • The Staff Questionnaire would be conducted in Term 4. • The Inclusion Report would be reported at this meeting. • Governor visits would be discussed under item 6. • School expansion would be discussed under Headteacher report. | |
| 4. | <p>Governance</p> <p><u>Terms of Reference</u> <u>Standing orders.</u> MB proposed that the Standing Orders and Terms of Reference be adopted. These were based on the NGA terms of Reference. Further discussion would take place during the meeting regarding the working of the Governing Body and the various working groups.</p> <p>Action: LK to check on the date of reconstitution. JS had not received a copy of the Governors handbook. Action: LK to ensure it was available on the learning platform.</p> <p><u>Instrument of Government.</u> To be uploaded onto the learning platform. Action: LK</p> <p><u>Governor Code of Conduct approve/sign.</u> Governors agreed to follow the NGA Code of Conduct.</p> <p><u>Declarations of Interests update/sign.</u> Governors completed their annual Declarations of Interests.</p> <p>LK would Check governor details are up to date. Action: LK LK would review/update website profiles. Action. LK. Governor representation (newsletters and INSET days 15/16).</p> | <p>LK</p> <p>LK</p> <p>LK</p> <p>LK</p> |
| 5. | <p>Head teacher’s report. See copy in Minute book.</p> <p>The Headteacher’s report had been distributed prior to the meeting. Governors raised the following questions. Governors challenged why the school had not met the target for attendance. The Headteacher reported that this was due to a small number of children with specific issues. The school had to be aspirational when setting targets. Measures were in place to improve attendance.</p> <p>Governors challenged what the school was doing to address bullying incidents. The Headteacher advised that the school had a behaviour log and a bullying log. Governors noted the number of incidents had decreased. This was due to work carried out with Thrive and the provision of a Learning Mentor and Counsellor.</p> <p><u>School Development Plan</u></p> | |

| | | |
|-----------|--|--|
| | <p>Governors requested information regarding the Quality of Teaching. Currently 33% of teaching was “Outstanding”, 93% was “Good.” Questions were raised regarding the targets set for English and Maths. The Headteacher reported that targets set were aspirational targets based on the national expectation.</p> | |
| <p>6.</p> | <p>Developing a new way of working for governors</p> <p>MB advised that the school had received a very successful Ofsted judgment in the Summer and now wanted to move from “good” to “outstanding”. It was proposed that the Governing Body work as an integral part of the school. MB proposed a different way of working to reframe the working groups to link to the School Development Plan.</p> <p>Governors were assigned responsibilities and assigned to working groups detailed below:-</p> <p>Safeguarding/Attendance – FR no change. Leader. IR. Governors noted that attendance was key issue in the School Development Plan.</p> <p>Health and Safety – Scope remains the same. Scott O Brien. Leaders IR</p> <p>FWG – No changes were proposed to the scope of the group – JB, SOB, KB. Leader JB.</p> <p>PPG Inclusion - AS, TOD, SW, JB, DH, LK. Leader LK</p> <p>Teaching (Homework) – AS, MB, MR. Leader MB</p> <p>Leadership -Teaching – IR,MB, JS. Leader Learning.</p> <p>EYFS- KB, SB, JOD, SW. Leader Learning. This working group would focus on the Nursery and Reception Development Plan</p> <p>Learning Links Assessment System – LK , AS, JS, Leader Learning.</p> <p>The following working Groups would remain unchanged: -</p> <p>Pay and Performance – JB (Chair) scope unchanged</p> <p>Headteacher Performance Management – scope unchanged. MB and LK</p> <p>Governors noted that there would be less involvement from the Behaviour Link Governor. One Governor visit to monitor behaviour was proposed in this academic year.</p> <p>In order to raise the profile of the Governing Body it was proposed that Governors would come into school during the day and trial changing the times of 3 of the Full Governing Body meetings. It was proposed that there be 3 evening meetings (5.45 pm -7.45 pm), and 3 breakfast meetings (8.00 am to 10.00 am).</p> <p>The Governing Body approved the new working groups and the</p> | |

| | | |
|----|--|--------|
| | <p>change to the times of Governing Body Meetings.</p> <p><u>School Development Plan</u></p> <p>Governors challenged why English and Maths were the main focus in the School Development Plan. The Headteacher explained that Priority 1 – Middle Level Leaders was based around the range of subjects. In Priority 2, Governors noted that the South Malling Essentials are relevant for every lesson.</p> <p>Action: JO to make it more explicit in the School Development Plan that the school is addressing the whole curriculum.</p> | JO |
| 7. | <p>Safeguarding</p> <p>The Headteacher reported that Safeguarding training had taken place. The Keeping Safe in Education Policy had been amended. The school was awaiting a new Safeguarding/Child Protection policy from ESCC.</p> <p>The Code of Conduct for Employees had been adopted by staff.</p> <p>Action: JO to upload documents to the learning platform.</p> | JO |
| 8. | <p>Finance</p> <p><u>Finance Working Group report.</u></p> <p>Governors noted the following: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget monitoring had taken place. • Additional PPG Funding had been received. • Healthy Schools Grant. The school now had to develop an Action Plan for the funding which was heavily ring-fenced. This action would fall under the remit of the PPG working group. <p>The working group had assessed the financial systems to be sound. JS and KB would conduct a mock audit.</p> <p><u>Finance Approvals</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Authority Financial Regulations • Local Financial Procedures • Scheme of Delegation. This was last year's Scheme of Delegation and subject to review by ESCC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Code of Conduct and Conflict of Interest • Anti –Fraud and Corruption Strategy • Confidential Reporting Whistleblowing (non-safeguarding) <p>JB proposed MB seconded approval of the above Policies.</p> <p>Governors challenged when benchmarking would take place.</p> | JS, KB |

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| | <p>This would be presented to FGB 3.</p> <p><u>Risk Management</u> KB had reviewed the risk register. Governors noted that the risks were similar to those posed last year. However, the Risk Assessment related to the 2015-16 School Development Plan. Action: KB to conduct a Risk Assessment related to the SDP 2016-17.</p> | KB |
| 9. | <p>Pay and Performance</p> <p>The Lead for Finance advised that the Performance working group had met twice (July and September). The working group remit was to monitor the performance management system to ensure the process was robust. Governors noted that the school was getting closer to the point where rewarding good teachers would affect the future budget. JO would meet with the teachers to set targets for next year.</p> <p>Governors challenged if performance management for the TA's was performance related. This was not currently the case. Staff are challenged to develop the areas to develop their professional development.</p> | |
| 10. | <p>Learning</p> <p><u>Data – headlines</u></p> <p>AS reported the following: -</p> <p>The system of learning links was closely aligned to the results for Year 2 and Year 6.</p> <p>Governors noted that KS2 performed well in terms of National and East Sussex. There were issues with the results for writing. Governors noted that last year there had been a new assessment system for SATs. The new framework and writing in particular was an issue nationally. Governors challenged what interventions were in place for writing. Interventions were in place.</p> <p><u>KS1</u></p> <p>The Headteacher advised that there were a high level of special needs children in the year group and the data was below National and East Sussex. Governors noted that the year group (current Year 3) are slowing making progress.</p> <p><u>Year 1 phonics</u></p> <p>93% of Y1 children had passed the Phonics Test. This was above national and above East Sussex data. Governors noted that 2 children were required to retake the Phonics Test in Year 2.</p> | |

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| | <p>Validated Raise on line data would be available in the near future.</p> <p><u>Pupil Premium/Inclusion Report</u></p> <p>AS reported the following: -</p> <p>There was a SENCO, Learning Mentor to support emotional and social health.</p> <p>AS reported that disadvantaged children at KS1 had performed well. At KS2. Disadvantaged children had performed well at reading, Maths, SPAG.</p> <p>Governors challenged if Educational Health plans were in place. This was the case.</p> <p>Governors noted that it had been highlighted that there may be an issue with disadvantaged children in Maths and the Year 3 cohort (37% Special needs). This issue would be monitored by the learning links working group. Attainment and progress would be closely monitored. Governors challenged why the information did not include Star learning. This would be addressed.</p> | AS |
| 11. | <p>Wellbeing</p> <p><u>Premises report.</u></p> <p>There was no report. Governors noted that a walk around had taken place. No major issues were raised. A premises development plan had been established.</p> <p>Governors challenged the projected expenditure. The Business Manager advised that a £7.5k grant had been received. In addition, £2.5k had been received from the “Friends”</p> <p><u>Offsite visit approvals.</u></p> <p>Two Year 5 classes were going on 2 separate residential trips. Governors challenged if this affected the risk assessments. This was not the case. The Year 6 would go on a Bowles trip.</p> <p>The FGB approved the proposed off-site visits.</p> <p><u>Christian Distinctiveness.</u></p> <p>IR advised that there is a possibility of a SIAMS inspection this year. Five years ago the school managed “satisfactory” in the judgement. A SIAMS toolkit had been developed and an inspector had visited to conduct a “Health Check”,</p> | |

| | | |
|-----|--|-----------|
| | <p>Governors noted that RE is identified as a strength. The school had moved a long way since the last SIAMS inspection. One area of the inspection is to address how Governors are involved in Christian Distinctiveness.</p> <p>Action: IR to work with JO to ensure a “Good” judgement for Christian Distinctiveness.</p> <p><u>Lewes Learning Partnership.</u></p> <p>The Lewes Learning Partnership Trust had looked at the strengths and weaknesses and had conducted a SWAT analysis. It was important that Governors added their responses and emailed JO with any additions Governors wished to be added on behalf of South Malling. Action: Governors.</p> | Governors |
| 12. | Approvals and Policies - None | |
| 13. | <p><u>AOB</u></p> <p>Year 6 Transition. Governors noted that success of the Year 6 celebration.</p> <p>In addition, the welcome card from the Governors to the new staff had been very positive.</p> | |

Signed as a true representation of the meeting:.....
, Chair of Governors