

## Minutes of Governing Body Meeting, 14<sup>th</sup> October, 2019

Present:	Phil Perry (Chair), Cian Gilbey, Rob Campbell, Kate Davies, Geoffrey Firth, Trudie Chesworth
In Attendance:	N/A (clerk absent, notes taken by KD)
Apologies:	Katrina Davies, Natalie Wiltshire, Barbara Calvert, Chris Ditch

<b>20/11</b>	<b>1. Receive Apologies for Absence</b>	
Summary of Discussion (including questions and responses)	Lead – Chair Purpose - Decision  Apologies received and consented to.	
<b>Actions Arising / Resolutions</b>		
Resolution: Apologies consented; accepted unanimously		<b>N/A</b>

<b>20/12</b>	<b>2. New declarations of interest and any declarations relevant to this agenda.</b>	
Summary of Discussion (including questions and responses)	Lead – Chair Purpose - Decision  No new declarations of interest received.	
<b>Actions Arising / Resolutions</b>		
N/A		<b>N/A</b>

<b>20/13</b>	<b>3. Agree previous minutes and consider any matters arising.</b>	
Summary of Discussion (including questions and responses)	Lead – Chair Purpose – Decision and Action  Amendment proposed: GF to be added to Resources / Finance working party as link governor, as discussed.  Action Log reviewed and all completed.	
<b>Actions Arising / Resolutions</b>		
Amend link governor / monitoring calendar to reflect GF role on Finance and Resources. Resolution (1515); Previous minutes a true reflection following amendment and accepted as such unanimously.		<b>Clerk</b>

<b>20/14</b>	<b>4a. Consider meeting focus - School Improvement Focus: CPD on new EIF</b>	
Summary of Discussion (including questions and responses)	Purpose: Briefing, Governor Training, and Discussion Lead: RC RC presented two briefing papers and Powerpoint training on new EIF, including implications for T&L, L&M, and SEF / SIP. See these resources. Strong emphasis on curriculum.	

**What will be the impact on progression in foundation subjects?**

Should see greater robustness in tracking and T&L within Foundation Subjects. However, also need to avoid unnecessary burdens on staff, particularly with regards to data collection

**How will the new EIF affect T&L in core subjects?**

National Curriculum remains unchanged, which puts significant focus on core subjects, including highly prescriptive requirements on what is taught in each year group. Whatever new curriculum design looks like, this will need to be maintained.

**Does the new EIF include any reference to SATs? Will these be continuing?**

Refers to statutory outcomes, and makes clear a good curriculum will lead to good quality outcomes (Impact). SATs in Y6 unchanged. Proposal currently is for KS1 SATs and Teacher Assessment to be removed next academic year.

**How does this feed into current SIP priorities and previous inspection outcomes?**

SIP KPIs. Strong focus this year on intent and readiness for implementation, including CPD. Links to the aspects of previous inspection that were praised – e.g. RAF 100 week. Capitalise on these things and build from there. Also note inclusion of Phonics in SIP, as per Ofsted report outcomes.

**Will this mean more topic work, e.g. linking maths to Roman topic on Hadrian's wall?**

Likely to have a topic based approach, but this is the focus of development for next year, so unable to determine this at this point. Important to discern transferrable skills and reflect on needs of our pupils specifically.

Potentially shift focus from 'learning about Romans' to 'learning about how to research', using Romans etc. as a vehicle. Also need to ensure staff wellbeing – linking all subjects to topics can result in arduous planning if not well managed.

**With regards to internal data – what does this mean for us?**

Difficult to know until new framework is more embedded, but potential concern, as the in-year progress data was a strong element in last Ofsted discussion. One aspect already under consideration by SLT is removal of certain data points in light of staff welfare and priorities of EIF.

Also important to know that inspectors will want to discuss with leaders and governors the use to which data is put, rather than the actual numbers. In this school, SLT use internal data as vehicle to drive pupil progress, through analysing trends, picking out groups of underperformance, discussing individual cases, and, where required, to challenge teachers.

**What other elements of wellbeing are being considered?**

New EIF refers to amount of support offered, particularly to vulnerable staff (NQTs, Supply etc.) with regards to management of challenging behaviour. Pastoral approach and availability of SLT strong here.

Also, allowing staff to select their own CPD needs, and resourcing this, alongside identified areas.

*Briefing continued.*

Highlighted priority of reading in new framework, and of SMSC. All agreed this was positive, but a high challenge. Need to be realistic in expectations, and realise school is one part of a child's life. Noted character "development" not character 'perfectly formed'. Consideration of link roles being amended in future to reflect evolving curriculum.

	<p><b>How are staff being involved in process?</b>                  Staff meeting already undertaken (extremely positive, creative input) and numerous others planned through year.</p> <p><b>Where will we get more information?</b>                  The full EIF is on Governor Portal. Over next year, RC to reach out to other Alliance and local schools who have been inspected under new framework to develop understanding and feed this back.</p> <p><b>Will governor monitoring need to change?</b>                  Probably, but unsure as to how this will look moving forward. Depends on ultimate curriculum design. Eager to consider a 'Governor monitoring day' in new year, where team works together and can reflect on their discussions collaboratively.</p>
<b>Actions Arising / Resolutions 20/14</b>	
All governors to familiarise themselves with contents of Briefing Papers and to consider L&M section of new handbook (available on Governor Sharepoint).	<b>All</b>

<b>20/15</b>	<b>4b. Consider meeting focus - School Improvement Focus: SIP and SEF</b>
<p><i>Summary of Discussion (including questions and responses)</i></p>	<p><i>Purpose: Briefing, Discussion, Resolution</i>  <i>Lead: RC</i>  <i>Documents tabled: SIP and SEF.</i></p> <p>Format changed to be more organic, and reviewed regularly over course of year. This was well received.</p> <p>Noted: amendment needed to colour scale on SEF.</p> <p>Discussion and review of judgements given; governors agree these on basis of known information, Ofsted, and previous monitoring.</p> <p><b>No 'outstanding' in the SEF. Why is this?</b>                  SEF is based around good judgements, primarily as this is where school is currently grading itself. As can be seen, to even be securely good under new framework requires significant work, and thus this is current focus. As 'scores' increase over time, may consider examining Outstanding criteria. However, with our contextual challenges, especially around outcomes, unlikely to secure this judgement under new framework which is now based on secure fit Good plus additional criteria.</p> <p><b>Are we, as a board, content that to achieve and maintain 'good' is a great success, and this should be our aim?</b>                  All agreed that vital to prioritise the things that are right for the school, not seeking after 'grades'.</p> <p><b>Note that the SIP focusses primarily on Intent. Lower scores on elements of Implementation and Impact too. Will these be considered through year?</b>                  Yes. Goal is to ensure that sufficient time is spent getting organisation of new curriculum right (intent), but due regard will be given to other aspects as part of this process. For example, CPD already being sourced to raise Implementation scores.</p> <p><i>Discussion continued.</i>                  SIP KPIs shared, governors agree these are appropriate and correlate with school needs, new EIF and previous inspection.</p>

	<p><b>Is any further national data available?</b>                  IDSR still not published, however, Y6 progress banding has been released; school sits in 'average' grouping for progress across key stage (note less than 50% of cohort completed all KS2 in school).</p> <p>Progress scores are: R -1.4 / W-1.8 / M-1.6.</p>
--	--

<b>Actions Arising / Resolutions</b>	
<p>Amend colour scale on SEF for consistency.</p> <p>Resolved (15:55):                  SEF judgements appropriate and agreed – unanimous</p> <p>Resolved: (16:10):                  SIP KPIs appropriate and agreed – unanimous.</p>	<b>RC</b>

<b>20/16</b>	<b>5. Policy Updates</b>
<p><i>Summary of Discussion</i>                  (including questions and responses)</p>	<p><i>Purpose: Discussion, Resolution</i>  <i>Lead: Chair</i></p> <p><i>Document tabled: Staff Pay Policy (NYCC)</i></p> <p><b>Please clarify implications of sickness absence?</b>                  Within the new performance management of staff a form has been added to include staff absence. This will now be something that has to be signed for and considered as part of pay progression in line with policy. Noted that exceptional circumstances will be considered as appropriate.</p> <p><i>Document tabled: Governors' Induction Policy and Procedures.</i>                  Amendments made to bring into line with new guidance, EIF and school organisation.</p> <p><i>Document tabled: Safeguarding and CP policy (NYCC).</i>                  Amendments highlighted on additional paper.</p>

<b>Actions Arising / Resolutions</b>	
<p>Resolution (16:15):                  Pay Policy adopted – unanimous</p> <p>Resolution (16:20):                  Governor Induction Policy adopted – unanimous</p> <p>Resolution (16:25):                  Safeguarding Policy adopted - unanimous</p>	<b>N/A</b>

<b>20/17</b>	<b>6. Receive relevant safeguarding updates.</b>	
Summary of Discussion (including questions and responses)	<p><i>Purpose: Briefing</i>  <i>Lead: RC</i></p> <p>Currently 2 on CP register under CIN. 33 monitored for Safeguarding Concerns.</p> <p><b>This seems disproportionately high. How does it compare with other schools?</b>                  Difficult to determine as threshold for concern will vary between schools, according to safeguarding culture, and ability to track. Note that a safeguarding concern can be a very light touch issue, through to something more substantial.</p> <p><b>How do you, as DSL, make the call of when to refer?</b>                  Look for patterns, frequency, other links (e.g. siblings etc.). Review vulnerability checklist as required. Serious incidents always immediately referred. Also look at responses and compliance from parents when concerns are discussed.</p> <p>Advice can be (and is) sought informally from Early Help before referral if unsure about threshold.</p>	
<b>Actions Arising / Resolutions</b>		
N/A		N/A

<b>20/18</b>	<b>7. Receive H&amp;S updates.</b>	
Summary of Discussion (including questions and responses)	<p><i>Purpose: Briefing</i>  <i>Lead: RC</i>  <i>Document tabled: HANDS Inspection Outcome</i></p> <p>Outcomes of document audit fed back.</p> <p><b>Concern re: Governor H&amp;S inspections requested by HANDS advisor in report. At recent governor training, were explicitly informed governors should not be signing off H&amp;S inspections.</b>                  Noted. Will pursue clarification with HANDS.</p>	
<b>Actions Arising / Resolutions 20/18</b>		
Explore notes / reference re: governors not involved in premises inspections Contact HANDS for clarification on governor involvement in premises inspections		TC RC

20/19	8. Discuss AoB	
<p>Summary of Discussion (including questions and responses)</p>	<p>Purpose: Discussion Lead: Chair</p> <p>May bank holiday incorrect on website.</p> <p>Board resilience – no one has currently offered themselves as Vice Chair. Please could all governors consider in advance of next meeting. Also consider safeguarding position for future, PP offers substantial skill in this area which will be lost from the board in a year.</p> <p>Parent governor elections underway.</p>	
Actions Arising / Resolutions 20/19		
<p>Amend website dates All to consider availability as Vice Chair Consider safeguarding role after appointment of new parent governor</p>	<p><b>YS</b> <b>All</b> <b>PP / RC</b></p>	

20/20	9. Confirm Date of Next Meeting	
<p>Summary of Discussion (including questions and responses)</p>	<p>Purpose: Resolved Lead: Chair</p> <p>Need to reflect on new board members and confirm most appropriate time for FGB. RC to prepare availability matrix and share with all governors, to be reviewed and most agreeable time established.</p> <p>Date confirmed: 18<sup>th</sup> November, time TBC following matrix.</p>	
Actions Arising / Resolutions 20/20		
<p>Availability matrix to be sent out</p> <p>Resolved (16:40): Date confirmed: 18<sup>th</sup> November, time TBC following matrix – unanimous.</p>	<p><b>RC</b></p>	