



Minutes

Full Governing Body Meeting (FGB5)

Date: 13th May 2015

Time: 7:00pm

Venue: South Malling CE School

Present: Vickie Appleton (Clerk), Jeremy Bamber, Sarah Brydon, Daniel Horan, Liz Kaye (Chair of Governors), Matt Kent, Jo O'Donoghue (Head teacher), Ian Rothery, Annie Schulte, John Stockdale, Rosalyn St. Pierre, Sue Warren.

Apologies: Scott O'Brien.

Item		Action
1	Apologies for absence Governors accepted apologies from Scott.	
2	Declarations of Interests & Confidentiality Reminder Governors were reminded that they had a duty to declare an interest in any agenda item and to maintain confidentiality. All present signed an attendance sheet (appendix 1) Governors were informed that Scott had had an input into the nursery working group; he has previously declared an interest in this item due to a family member managing a local nursery.	
3	Minutes of the last meeting & follow up of actions 5 Ofsted readiness: The school had received an offer of 'Ofsted readiness' support from Karen Bye (ESCC Education Improvement Partnerships). Action: Liz to facilitate a session between Karen and the governors. 9 New governor recruitment: Governors from the Finance working Group had spoken with a prospective co-opted governor and hoped to be able to report back more fully at FGB6. 18 Lollipop lady: Jo reported that, although a new Lollipop lady had been recruited, she was still waiting for her DBS paperwork to come through.	LK

	The minutes from the FGB meeting held on 18 th March 2015 were approved and signed by the chair.	
4	Reconstitution The new governor categories were agreed as per circulated document (see appendix 2).	
5	Chair Performance Management Ian will be facilitating the Chair of Governors performance management using a form based on one taken from The Key. The document will be circulated to governors and staff. Action: Ian to send out feedback form to governors. Action: Jo to send out feedback form to staff. Action: All forms to be returned by 31 st May Please.	IR JO all
6	Finance Working Group report The School Business Manager (SBM) presented her report. Budgeting had been tight; there had been an underspend of approx. 1.7% which is a very small amount in real terms. Service to schools approved in the sums of £52,550.52 and signed off as agreed at FGB4. There were no governor questions regarding the Contract to Schools. The 1 year + 3 year Budgets for new financial year will be finalised once the figures for staffing are confirmed and the governors agreed to delegate the finalising and approval to Governing Body Finance (GBF) in order to meet the deadline of 22 May 2015. Post meeting update: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One year and three year budget plans approved in the sum of £952,187 carry forward from 2014-15 £15,643 Total Budget £967,830 and duly signed off under the authority delegated by FGB5. • Annual maintenance and contracts agree. Work on Financial Benchmarking was underway. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Governors queried why the underspend was approx. half of that in recent years and were told that this was primarily due to costs incurred by the change to the new curriculum and the extra costs for staffing to cover absence. The actual figure (approx. £15 000) is not large when taken in comparison to the overall budget. ◆ A governor queried how the staffing budget is likely to alter. This figure is expected to reduce; Staffing is due to be covered under item 12 below. ◆ Governors queried if 'contingency' planning was used within the budget. The SBM stated that there is not a budget heading for contingency and that all monies must be allocated to budget headings using estimates. Staffing variations are difficult to predict accurately due to unforeseen absences. ESCC restrict the amount that can be carried forward each year so almost all funding must be spent, leaving little room for carrying over a 'contingency'. 	

	<p>◆Governors expressed concern that a bill had not been presented by British Gas; is the school running the risk of facing additional charges due to unpaid bills? The SBM replied that this was part of the Services to Schools package and that there was no risk involved.</p> <p>◆Governors asked what extra needed to happen to move ‘School finances’ from green to blue on the dashboard. The Head replied that although allocation of budget was excellent, there still needed to be a closer link made between funding and the School Development Plan.</p> <p>Jeremy presented a new format for the Financial Risk Assessment / Risk Management assessment. He requested that the FWG were custodians of the document for the purpose of version control.</p> <p>The current top 3 risks are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in the school budget as a result of the loss of the double entry classes. • Financial risk to the school due to the amalgamation with Windmill Nursery. • Failure to make the best use of Pupil Premium Funding. <p>◆Governors requested that the ownership of each item be reflected in the document and asked what the review process would be. Jeremy proposed that the top few (3?) items should be reviewed at each meeting of the FWG. Governors agreed to go ahead with this document.</p> <p>Governors agreed to change ‘Budget monitoring’ from green to blue on the dashboard and that a Benchmarking box was needed. Both the Benchmarking and Risks management boxes should be amber as they are work-in-progress.</p>	
<p>7</p>	<p>Premises Review</p> <p>Matt presented the Premises report. There is a good paper process for incident reporting in place however online reporting needs to be improved. Appropriate training for this is planned. Fire compliance checks need to be added to the rota.</p> <p>The school achieved 92% in the recent ESCC Health and Safety Audit.</p> <p>◆Governors asked if the school risk assessment had been reviewed in the light of an incident whereby a child had sustained an injury whilst walking to the church and were assured that it had. The Head teacher added that, as a result of this, school trips to the church in their old format were now deemed to be too risky and trips had been postponed pending changes to the protocol.</p> <p>Action: Jo to write to Rosalyn in her capacity as councillor about the incident and to ask for ESCC to repair the road surface on the lane to the church.</p> <p>◆Governors considered whether a similar approach should be made regarding the school’s entrance but it was agreed not to pursue this at this point in time.</p> <p>Action: Matt to forward comments to be added to the dashboard; there</p>	<p>JO</p> <p>MK</p>

	were no proposed colour changes.	
8	<p>Windmill Nursery</p> <p>Governors discussed the Nursery Working Group report. There were good non-financial reasons for the amalgamation, i.e. serving the needs of the local community and facilitating 'school readiness'.</p> <p>◆Governors asked about the level of financial risk involved. The risks were judged to be 'amber' due to the capacity to increase income by extending the breakfast and afterschool club hours and from charitable donations. The nursery would break even with 19 pupils per session. There is already nearly that number booked for the autumn and this figure is well within the norm for the nursery over the past few years when it is believed to have been run at, or very near capacity. Should the venture fail, the costs associated with redundancies would be a 6-figure sum; this would have a substantial negative effect on the school budget.</p> <p>◆Governors asked how the amalgamation would affect the nursery staff. Jo replied that they would be required to work under an ESCC employment contract and that some of the casual arrangements that occur currently would not be possible, however there would be many benefits to the staff namely sick and holiday pay, a pension and defined line management. Governors agreed that FWG would review and recommend the amalgamation to GBF in order for it to proceed.</p>	
9	<p>Equalities Working Group report</p> <p>Ian presented the Equalities Report. Equality issues are generally dealt with well however, Jo commented that she feels that monitoring can be a little 'ad-hoc' at the moment and that staff equality is not specifically addressed but she is anticipating that this will be raised by the Staff survey.</p>	
10/11	<p>Attendance Report and Safeguarding Update – these items were considered together.</p> <p>Problems with monitoring persistent absence were highlighted and it was suggested that this area should be designated "requires improvement" - ie. red on the dashboard. Persistent lateness was also a problem and should be downgraded to amber.</p> <p>◆Governors asked whether absence is categorised. Jo replied that attendance of 85% or less is reported to ESCC however the reasons behind absence is only scrutinised at school level.</p>	
12	<p>Head teacher's report on teaching and learning</p> <p>Action points from previous inspections are being addressed and the role of the Middle Level leaders (MLL) is developing. MLLs need more focus on the impact of their work and on recording this. The Head Teacher requested that all governors ask for evidence for this when visiting and to request sight of / discussion of the relevant management trail. The implementation of the new curriculum will be reviewed with staff in term 6.</p> <p>◆Governors asked how the new curriculum was impacting on the quality of</p>	

	<p>teaching. Annie replied that it had highlighted some areas of difficulty to be addressed, e.g. the focus on mastery in maths requiring the imbedding of knowledge based around confidence and flexibility rather than simply moving onto larger numbers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆Governors asked how science was approached within the new curriculum. Rather than science being the focus of a lesson it was embedded within the topic as a whole. ◆Governors raised concern that some subjects might be missed when timetabling to order to make space for major subjects but were assured that over a period of time all were taught even if in the short term there was need to reshuffle, for example as a result of SATs. ◆Governors asked why the staffing plan was not hierarchical as seen in other schools and the Head teacher replied that the staffing plan was arranged to play to the strengths of her staff. ◆Governors asked why Year 3 was grouped with Key stage 1 and did it affect target setting? The Head teacher stated that the classes had historically been split like this as it gave the children another year within the more nurturing and holistic environment of key stage1. It supports the transition to Key Stage2 and there wasn't an abrupt change between the 2 curriculums. Splitting the classes in this way had no effect on target setting. 	
<p>13</p>	<p>Progress and attainment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆Governors asked if there were parents' workshops for year 1 parents/carers. There have been workshops for Year 1 parents but they have been targeted at specific parents. ◆Governors asked why progress in year 4 reading was poor. Annie replied that there had been a focus on behaviour at the start of the year and it may also indicate that assessments are not as robust as in other year groups. This is a typical pattern for year 4 and care needs to be taken when placing staff in this class. ◆Following a governor query, Annie confirmed that current access to Educational psychologists was adequate. ◆The Head teacher explained to governors that much of the difference seen in the achievement of the year 5 children between the two classes was due to their age difference; the year 5 children in the year 5/6 class were older. 	
<p>14</p>	<p>Pupil Premium Report</p> <p>There is on-going concern that there are eligible families who are not claiming the Pupil Premium; the working group continues to explore ways to prevent this.</p>	
<p>15</p>	<p>Parental engagement</p> <p>An increasing number of parents have added their comments to Parentview; the results indicate improving parental satisfaction. Governors agreed that the Parents survey should be conducted along similar lines to previous years.</p>	

	The parents' survey is an action point for Liz for term 6.	LK
16	<p>Link governor visit reports</p> <p>Governors were reminded that their visit reports should be sent to the clerk who will upload them to the Learning Platform; Jo reiterated the need for governors to ask about the management trail.</p> <p>Action: Visit reports to be sent to the clerk asap.</p>	JB/ DH/ JS/ SOB
17	<p>Items for information</p> <p>The Learning Partnership launch party is on 2nd July 2015; staff and governors and some parents will be invited.</p>	
18	<p>AOB</p> <p>It was agreed that John would take on the Lead for Learning role. He will remain as link governor for literacy and humanities.</p> <p>Action: Liz to meet with John re handing over the lead governor for learning role.</p> <p>Action: John to join the Strategy group, starting 12 June 2015.</p> <p>It was agreed that Daniel would join a working group to review Sex and Relationship Education policies meeting on 11th June.</p> <p>It was agreed that Ian would join a working group to review E-safety policies, provisional meeting date 3rd July.</p>	LK/ JS JS
19	<p>Close of meeting</p> <p>Meeting closed at 9.40pm</p>	

Summary of Action points - FGB4 - 13th May 2015			
Agenda item	Action	When	Who
3	To facilitate a session between Karen and the governors.	asap	LK
5	To send out feedback form to governors	asap	IR
5	To send out feedback form to staff	asap	JO
5	Governors to return forms	by 31st May	all
7	To write to Rosalyn in her capacity as councillor	asap	JO
7	To forward comments to be added to the dashboard	asap	MK
15	To oversee parents' survey	Term 6	LK
16	Visit reports to be sent to the clerk asap	asap	JB/ DH/ JS/ SOB
18	Liz to meet with John re handing over the lead governor for learning role	asap	LK/ JS
18	John to join the Strategy group, starting 12 June 2015.	12/6/15	JS