



**Meeting of the Full Governing Body  
Tuesday 30 November 2016  
08.00 – 10.00**

**MINUTES**

<b>Governors:</b>	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, Kevin Bull, Francis King
<b>In attendance</b>	Viv Davies (clerk)

	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
1.	<p><b>Welcome</b> MB opened the meeting.</p> <p>Governors confirmed that Francis King had been co-opted onto the Governing body with effect from 30.11.16</p>	
2.	<p><b>Apologies for Absence</b></p> <p>Apologies had been received from Kevin Bull and Scott O'Brien.</p>	
3.	<p><b>Declarations of Interests &amp; Confidentiality Reminder.</b></p> <p>Governors completed the declarations of interest forms. Governors were reminded about confidentiality. MR declared an interest as Chair of the Parents Fundraising Group.</p>	
4.	<p><b>Minutes of the last meeting &amp; follow up of actions.</b></p> <p><u>Actions.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Premises Inspection Governor Visit report had been completed.</li> <li>• The Parent Questionnaire would now be conducted in Term 5.</li> <li>• The Staff Questionnaire would be conducted in Term 4.</li> <li>• The Date of re-constitution of the Governing Body was 11.2.15.</li> <li>• The Governors handbook for 2015 is on the learning</li> </ul>	

Signed as a true representation of the meeting:.....

, Chair of Governors

	<p>platform.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Instrument of Government is on the Learning Platform.</li> <li>• Governor details are up to date.</li> <li>• Governor representations inset days. JO would work with LK.</li> <li>• MB would write a welcome card to new staff.</li> </ul> <p><u>Matters arising</u></p> <p>Governors questioned how governors would be involved in Christian Distinctiveness. JO advised that Ian Rothery, Sarah Brydon and Jeremy Bamber are the Governing Body representatives.</p>	<p>JO/LK</p> <p>MB</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p><b>Governance</b></p> <p><u>Governor Visit – Lesson Study</u></p> <p>MB and MR had visited the school and met the teachers and observed “lesson study”. MB and MR would conduct a further visit to observe teachers planning the lesson study lesson. JO had completed teacher observations for the current term and had observed an upward movement in the quality of teaching. Teaching Observations were now securely “Good”. All Children were engaged in their learning.</p> <p><u>New Governor Planner</u></p> <p>MB emphasised that it is important that all Governors were aware of the Working Group and individual activity planner. The meetings would have to be diarised in advance to ensure the working groups could report to the appropriate FGB. The Clerk would liaise with the Group leads to chase up reports.</p> <p>Governors challenged whether the school should aim to be outstanding. Governors wanted the best for the children in the school. The school was striving for excellence for their children.</p> <p>Governors challenged whether the school should be obliged to share the success that the school was having in the lesson study approach. Governors noted that school to school support was the way for the future.</p>	

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

6.	<p><b>SDP review: working party reports</b></p> <p><u>Teaching and Learning</u></p> <p>MB and MB had visited to look at Lesson Study. Governors noted that there may be a requirement for additional funding to release staff from the classroom. Governors would monitor the financial implication. Governors challenged what proportion of the budget was currently used for cover. Wherever possible TAs were used for cover. There was an impact on the additional duties which teachers needed to carry out. JO/SW would analyse the financial sustainability of the venture.</p> <p><u>Pupil Premium Group Report</u></p> <p>The group had met and would include inclusion. Governors were alerted to the fact that the PPG working group would monitor the SEN budget and ensure that the expenditure was making an impact.</p> <p>Governors challenged what strategies were in place to improve achievement. The school was looking at various interventions. The disadvantaged children were not achieving in Maths. There was a focus on the language used in Maths.</p> <p><u>Targets for county for year 2 and year 6.</u></p> <p>AS reported that the following targets had been sent to ESCC: -</p> <p>KS1 – Targets were 20% higher than last year. KS2 - Targets were set in line with last year.</p> <p>Greater Depth. KS1-Targets were 10% higher than last year. KS2- Targets set were similar to last year.</p> <p>Governors noted that there were issues with Year 5 writing. AS had conducted individual needs meetings with teachers. Governors noted that interventions were in place for vulnerable children.</p>	JO/SW
7.	<p><b>Safeguarding</b></p> <p>FK had met with JO and had submitted a report. The safeguarding audit had been completed and would be sent to the local authority. The clerk would ensure the audit was loaded onto the learning platform. <b>Action: Clerk</b></p>	Clerk

Signed as a true representation of the meeting:.....

, Chair of Governors

	<p>Governors challenged if there were any significant actions highlighted in the audit. FK reported that some actions were listed in the report. There were no significant causes for concern</p> <p>The ESCC Safeguarding Policy had been adopted and was approved by Governors. Governors also approved the Intimate Care and Toileting Policy.</p> <p>FK had viewed the Single Central Record. There were no issues raised.</p> <p>Governors noted the time commitment on JO in carrying out the Safeguarding lead. This was affecting the capacity of the school. Governors noted that best practice was that other members of staff were Safeguarding lead. JO would look at reviewing staffing structure for 207/18. In addition, administrative support could alleviate the time commitment. It was proposed that JO maintained responsibility for Safeguarding and for AS to be responsible for Behaviour/Inclusion.</p> <p>Governors noted that Governors had a statutory responsibility for Safeguarding.</p> <p>Discussion took place regarding the requirement for all Governors to undertake safeguarding training. It was proposed that Governors complete the on-line GEL Safeguarding training in the ICT suite prior to the next FGB meeting. Action: LK/AS to prepare the IT suite at 3.30 pm. On 1<sup>st</sup> February.</p>	LK/AS
8.	<p><b>Finance</b></p> <p>Governors noted the Finance Monitoring Report. The FWG group were happy with the budget. SW advised that the school budget is working well. The school is working on the Healthy Schools Grant. A lot of finance monitoring was taking place in Nursery due to issues with Staff absence and low pupil numbers.</p>	
9.	<p><b>Pay and Performance</b></p> <p>Governors noted that the Pay and Performance group had met for the final time in the 15-16 cycle and had reviewed anonymised objectives for the current year. Governors were confident that the process was robust including the link between the SDP and the performance objectives.</p>	

Signed as a true representation of the meeting:.....

, Chair of Governors

	<p>Governors were aware that pay progressions would influence the budget.</p> <p>Governors approved the following ESCC model policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pay Policy. This was based on the ESCC model. Governors approved the policy.</li> <li>• Capability and Appraisal Policy. These were the same as last year. Governors approved the policy.</li> </ul>	
10.	<p><b>Wellbeing</b> <u>Premises Report</u></p> <p>The Premises report had been distributed to Governors and uploaded onto the learning platform. Governors noted that there were no significant issues raised in the report. Governors noted that the old train on the playground needed to be removed. Action: SW</p> <p><b>Behaviour and Anti-bullying policy</b></p> <p>SB had met with JO and reviewed the anti-bullying policy. Next year the school would consult all stakeholders in the Behaviour and Anti-Bullying policy. The FGB approved the policy.</p>	SW
11.	<p><b>MAT and LCLP Update</b></p> <p>Governors noted that at some time in the future the school would have to change the way in which it worked. The Lewes Partnership and Multi Academy Trust options would need to be considered by Governors.</p> <p>JO had approached Lesley Gannon the CEO of the Diocese Academy Trust. The foundation status of the school would need to be maintained. The diocese were open to community schools joining a MAT if it is led by a Church School. Governors noted that the diocese had raised concern regarding the school joining the Lewes partnership with other schools which were not foundation schools.</p> <p>JO and IR were attending a meeting at the Lewes partnership and would report back to Governors.</p> <p>A further FGB was proposed (12<sup>th</sup> January at 8.00 am) to discuss the options. LK would upload information regarding the MAT and</p>	LK

Signed as a true representation of the meeting:.....

, Chair of Governors

	academies onto the learning platform.	
12.	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>Policies: MR agreed to format policies. JO would forward policies to MR for modification. MR would forward to the clerk for uploading to the learning platform.</p>	MR Clerk

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