# Minutes of Governing Body Meeting February 4th, 1330, 2025

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Present: | S Moss (Chair)  R Campbell (Head teacher)  B Calvert  V Sadd  K. Russell  M Welsh  N Wiltshire (Staff Governor  H Halliwell (Staff Governor) |
| In Attendance: | Clerk to Governors |
| Apologies: | C Gilbey, A Holland, N Maycock |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **25/34** | **Receive Apologies for Absence –** | |
| *Summary of Discussion*  (Including  questions and responses) | *Lead – Chair*  *Purpose - Decision*  Apologies received in advance via email | |
| **Actions Arising / Resolutions** | | |
| Accepted | | **Chair** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **25/35** | **New Declarations of Interest and Interests Relevant to this Meeting** | |
| *Summary of Discussion*  (Including  questions and responses) | *Lead – Chair*  *Purpose – Information*  Nil received | |
| **Actions Arising Resolutions** | | |
| N/A | | **NA** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **25/36** | **Agree Minutes of Past Meeting and Consider Matters Arising and CPD (Continuing Professional Development) question** | |
| *Summary of Discussion*  (Including  questions and responses) | *Lead – Chair*  *Purpose – Information*  All actions completed for 25/32 | |
| **Actions Arising / Resolutions** | | |
| Previous minutes a true reflection and accepted as such unanimously to be uploaded to school portal | | **Clerk** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **25/37** | **Consider Meeting Focus – School Improvement** | |
| *Summary of Discussion*  (Including  questions and responses) | Lead – CoG - Headteacher  Purpose – Information  Policy documents tabled in advance to all Governors via portal.  Headteacher’s Report – to include.   * Data Report * Pupil Premium Progress (including DPP, SP and CuP) * SEND updates (received in a fully digital document held on portal) * Safeguarding Updates * Discuss SIP (School Improvement Plan) Progress Report, including related monitoring. * Receive Autumn SEA Outcomes   General updates – points to note.   * Exclusions and Suspensions as of writing two in total. * SIP progress Autumn, largely green, not a vast number of actions, progression on content. * Nurture progress is continually evolving. Building on success of being in school, can still cycle into vicious cycle of not able to be here. New strategies are applied continually to meet differing and specific needs, we continue to learn both staff and pupils, no perfect solution but progression. * Attendance, generally positive just had audit by SEA, all good discussions and accepting of discussions re OOA.   **Questions**  **School Improvements**  **How much time do subject leaders receive for monitoring their subjects?**  *Less last term than normal, allocation is often via twilight monitoring, we also have not* *as yet had the ‘drop in’ weeks where the class teachers can drop into classes to see how both teachers and HLTA staff are delivering the subjects and observe content in pupil books/digital records. This will be scheduled by the SL’s.*  **How has GTT been received by staff regarding value and benefit to them?**  *From an SLT point of view it has the benefits to be flexible, on staff’s own terms and in own time where it suits them to learn and enhance knowledge rather than being dictated to by our agendas.*  *We have had a staff GTT feedback meeting where there were positive comments regarding the learning being available in different learning styles enabling a choice that fits the individual, there is something for everyone. They have also noted it is good to have provoked conversation re ideas, reflection, and meaningful discussion amongst peers,* *opens up learning showing how diverse GTT can be. It is also noted how adaptive it has been as areas can be selected for learning appropriate to current knowledge therefore more appropriate for developing learning.*  **Is there any evidence of CPD impact and changes to practice?**  *There is book scrutiny from January and going forward this continues. Within EYFS the drawing club is interesting to see how this method has shown a real enthusiasm and strengthening in vocab. It will be interesting to apply some of the principles into the KS1 rainbow challenges and see development in this area.*  **Re the need-to-know sessions how is this tracking?**  *Not quantified yet. Challenge of the move from 7 to 6 class structure we need to be aware of the repeat of those sessions with enhancements and how this is upskilling the knowledge. Evidence we have for example from one class, three pupils had completed the session before. One of the children was able to explain and voice how much more challenge to the task there was this time (due to the unit having had advancements to its content added to provide this challenge for those who may have studied it already). We do need to continue to tease through this as we develop and continue both through pupil voice and staff evidencing.*  **PP Updates**  **Re: the DP Strategy statement – how are we tracking?**  *We have a mixed picture. DP progress is outperforming no DP peers; however, non disadvantaged are progressing slower than we want. SPP is going well - connected to the GAP embed, we have had levels go up in the thriving lives toolkit. On audit the impact has raised each time and has been externally verified that we have an effective use of SPP. Additionally, we have had an external audit of all ringfenced spending which had a good result to how we manage this which is very pleasing.*  **Data and Progress**  **The 10% below in EYFS are we presuming this remains alongside the high needs pupils within that cohort?**  *Yes.*  **Have any new students, or departures impacted?**  *Yes, as continues our challenge with data and the fluidity of pupils in and out there has been impact in a downward impact from arrivals as can be seen noted in the headteachers report.*  **Is there a higher change in data in the negative or not at target at this report?**  *This is Autumn data and there are three main reasons which can be similar each year: there is the summer lag, 6 weeks out does take a little time for the children to settle back and lift within their work. Significantly, the increased expectations for children in new year groups, particularly from year 2 to 3 and year 5 to 6. All these reasons do have impact within this data period it takes time, but we monitor and manage throughout the academic year.*  **Considering class make up, is this an area that could help?**  *It is a graduated approach with class make up we consider, many needs, from overall class, need, to friendship groups, how we know children transition and that some children for example may benefit more from a 2-3 class to being in a 3-4 class, it is all considered but of course with fluidity of pupils it does indeed change within a year.*  **There is a prominent level of SEND in the 5/6 class how is the data projection and we still are accepting complex SEN arrivals?**  *Yes, we are at 48% within this cohort of students. There is a lot of cognitive SEND - we have had more high functioning SEN in the past which may not have appeared as severe in terms of attainment. There are many challenges from disturbance and gaps and the mixed needs. However, the reality is difficult within our LA and morally and educationally we need to provide and do rise to the challenge for all our pupils. Additionally, the experience we have had this last year with EHCPs has shown that even the application process is a challenge and again we want to provide for our pupils in the best way possible. The data will be the best it can be applicable to the demands for all our pupils within this cohort.*  **Please briefly explain the progress across key stages as a snapshot.**  *Please add the description re how this can be compared to future HT reports, thanks.*  **Mobility**  **Is mobility increased?**  *Interestingly mobility is not as high as normal.*  **Is there any impact then with the mobility being less surely there is more consistency for school?**  *No again the interesting flux with our recent mobility is, despite it being less it has been impactful in a multitude of ways, with a loss of some greater depth pupils (data impact) majority of the arrivals attainment is below, there is a vast complexity of needs, huge demand on pastoral (TA impact), additional parental meetings (SLT and teacher impact), external provider visits increased (Early Help, CP etc), so the reality is needs have been severely impacting across all departments in school despite lower mobility than normal within the academic year time scale.*  **What is the impact on other children?**  *Even when there is an incoming transition without additional needs with our change of class structure from 7 to 6 there is a change of dynamics within a class, from seating and space alone. So, there is always some impact for children*  **SEND**  **Why have we had arrivals in need of EHCPs without these, and what is the process for applications?**  *Normally if a child has an EHCP there is a slightly different process to in year transfers whereby the LA SEND team liaises with the preferred school to assess whether you can meet need and there are time scales and protocols for this. However on some occasions the EHCP has not been fully signed off by the previous authority so the move basically slipped through the systems as an admission without a EHCP as not officially documented. The honouring of said EHCP is then not guaranteed however our LA has honoured these with evidence submitted of the final sign off after tenacious work by SENCO. With overseas MOD schools, they can have a SCAN (different term for EHCP) which under the Armed Forces Covenant is required to be upheld as an EHCP. LA initially wanted us to restart the 20-week process to apply for an EHCP but with the evidence and policy our SENDCO provided again this SCAN was eventually upheld as an EHCP. Put simply the process is never smooth and it frequently needs additionally time and considerable work by Natalie to get the results delivered.*  **Why is an EHCP not standard across all LAs if it is in process why can they not simply be continued from the stage they are at in the next LA?**  *It was discussed at last Green Paper, but it is not clear, all LAs are different therefore it is more of a challenge. The sad reality again is with an EHCP there are so many stumbling points for families with different LA guidelines and structures, even types of school - plus lack of clarity of the impact a move can have (i.e. non awareness that on moving an EHCAR can go right back to the beginning). Other challenges, e.g. 2 children who have left recently one still has no school place since November and the other since January. The system is a real challenge for families and educators.*  **What progress has been made regarding last SEND update with amount of mediations being required?**  *Effectively it almost appears that mediation is being used as an extension of the allowed time protocols in delivering the EHCP by the LA, as frequently we are getting to the day of the mediation that the family and team have additionally prepared for, the mediation is cancelled before the meeting and the EHCP is issued. All four of our outstanding EHCPs have now been issued all at the lowest band four of which we now need to challenge all as the finding is not appropriate to evidenced need*.  **Is this a trend now across the LA regarding the lowest level banding delivery and the real difficulty in securing ECHP?**  *Our school is one of the highest levels SEND within those with such significant military pupil figures (as we have seen this through the GAP project). Due to the tenacity, experience and determination of our SENDCO we are eventually securing the very needed EHCP for our pupils because of her ability and skill driving it forward, but the additional work load is impacting her time with the additional mediation prep, challenges to the funding bands and communication with parents. The LA high needs budget is highly overspent and with government reducing funding and the increased pupil needs this is not changing in the current climate.*  **What is parental engagement on awarding of EHCP is the finding explained regarding ability to provide?**  *This remains a challenge within the wider understanding of EHCP in general, often the presumption is that funding will be provided on receipt of an EHCP that means your child now has a 1:1 provision for all their time in school. This is not reality for EHCP on any of the scales for top up funding we receive as none come in anywhere near what the cost of a 1:1 TA salary would entail. Some as you are aware are delivered an EHCP which equates to approx. £1000 per year which cannot meet the delivery of need. We continue to do our best in challenging times for all our pupils and parents with communication continual regarding what we are provided with. With on-costs, a full time TA equates to £23,135; most Band 4 EHCPs bring just over £1000 into school; even if we add the notional £6000 E2 funding, this still leaves a gap of over £16k.*  **Is the process to request a review/upgrade of the band simple for an EHCP?**  *The annual review form used to have a box where you were asked if the funding band was appropriate to need this has been removed. To note a descriptor at band six for top up funding is that a child requires specialist provision, so we are always on a lower band than that. We challenge where we can.*  **Are you saying there is not a band of top up funding we receive or are able to receive that would cover 1:1?**  *Yes, essentially that is the answer levels of band funding have not changed despite changes to TA terms conditions and pay, so it is not comparative it is simply a figure that is allocated which definitely does not cover the need cost.*  **Are there any more imminent submissions for funding?**  *We have noted some well masked possible ASD/ADHD in some female pupils in school, which may add to the EHCP caseload going forward for both submission and ongoing support.*  **Do we still have pupils with diabetes in school and is training managed?**  *Yes, we have both pupil and staff members with diabetes in school all staff have completed refreshers and those in direct care of the pupil have had advanced training.*  **Safeguarding**  Update two complex cases as below.  One child in need  One child protection  Thirty-nine low level concerns, all together equate to 25% of student roll.  **Is there a national data level on safeguarding across schools?**  *No, and some of the low-level concerns are minor, however it is imperative we log and have the culture which identifies these within school to ensure appropriate monitoring of concerns.*  **How long are they monitored for is it scheduled?**  *The tag stays on for the pupils as long as needed within the CPOMs system, very occasionally we will remove, however we tend to keep them on as it keeps this within our radar and historical data is helpful for ourselves and future education providers for the child making this excellent as part of our transition progress.* | |
| **Actions Arising / Resolutions 25/37** | | |
|  | |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **25/38** | **Policy Update** | |
| *Summary of Discussion*  (Including  questions and responses) | *Lead – Chair*  *Purpose - Decision*  Policy documents all tabled in advance to all governors.  Already reviewed digitally – to be noted.  Policies to be reviewed:   1. SEND and Information Report 2. Drugs Education 3. Feedback 4. Freedom of Information 5. Complaints Procedure | |
| **Actions Arising / Resolutions 25/38** | | |
| Resolutions: All tabled policies carried    The above policies tabled in advance of the meeting have been adopted unanimously.  **Agreed** (All) AbstainNone | | **NA** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **25/39** | **Receive Monitoring Reports –** | |
| *Summary of Discussion*  (Including  questions and responses) | *Lead – Chair*  *Purpose – Information*  *Tabled*   * *EYFS*   The above report was received and noted by governors. Actions and follow-ups to be completed in next visits.  Monitoring discussion – alternative model – as noted in Headteachers Report  **Question**  **How do we hold school to account via the monitoring alternative model?**   * *Take a full afternoon approach.* * *Look at an OfSTED Domain for example curriculum, observe an hour around school as governors, then meet back as a group to discuss and note what observed, have items available from teachers such as books in advance in the zone ready to view or teachers able to drop in and discuss. Then able to feed back to SLT accountability and challenge to our SIP and SEF.* * *This creates a less forced approach to monitoring and a more cohesive team of governors able to discuss different areas they have viewed with an overall focus on the school.* * *Enables more appropriate contact with teaching team awareness of mental health allowing a better format for flow of feedback with a whole school focus. Supports breaking down of barriers between governing body and staff.*   **NW left meeting 1445.** | |
| **Actions Arising / Resolutions** | | |
| RC and CofG to format and arrange first monitoring schedule for 19th March 1:30 -3:30 and publish – invite governors | | **RC**  **CofG** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **25/40** | **Discuss H&S and Capital Expenditure** | |
| *Summary of Discussion*  (Including  questions and responses) | *Lead – Chair*  *Purpose – Information*   * Boiler Annual Service completed on 16/01/2025. * Report received from annual paperwork audit on 06/01/25 viewable in main admin office. * Annual fire report completed on 29/01/25, awaiting report. * Capital spends imminent on three desk top computers, keyboards, and screens to allow full class participation in computer suite. * Full asbestos report received and has been money well spent for the clarity of our risks and ongoing checks and maintenance. | |
| **Actions Arising / Resolutions 25/40** | | |
| NA | | **NA** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **25/41** | **Discuss AOB –** | |
| *Summary of Discussion*  (Including  questions and responses) | *Lead – Chair/Clerk*  *Purpose – Information*   1. Letter received to clerk and CofG re no authorisation of leave of absence requested by a parent for governors to view.   Noted that governors have no authority over this area but that the query can be responded to and request that parent contact headteacher directly re concerns for ongoing discussion-action.   1. Minibus availability still being investigated for school use from within station updates at next meeting. 2. MW – not available for governance from July 2025 for 6 months due to work deployment. | |
| **Actions Arising / Resolutions** | | |
| NA | | **Clerk** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **25/42** | **Confirm Date of Next Meeting –** | |
| *Summary of Discussion* | *March 11th, 2025, 1330, on site unless informed different.* | |
| **Actions Arising / Resolutions** | | |
| NA | | **NA** |