

Exminster Community Primary School Full Governing Board Meeting 5/2015-16
Thursday, 28 Apr 2016, 19:00 at Exminster Community Primary School
MINUTES

Present						
Name	Initial	Position	Name	Initial	Position	
Sarah Whalley	SW	Headteacher	Paul Frazer	PF	Governor (Parent)	
Helen Hibbins	HH	Clerk	Becky Mason	BM	Governor (Co-opted)	
Tony Fripp	TF	Governor (Co-opted)	Sue Wilkinson	SWi	Governor (Co-opted)	
Richard Vain	RV	Governor (Co-opted)	Ian Moore	IM	Deputy Headteacher	
Gordon Peacock	GP	Governor (Co-opted)	Alison Munslow	AM	Staff Visitor	
John Collins	JC	Governor (Co-opted)				
Sam Slingsby	SS	Governor (Staff)				
Absent						
Name	Initial	Position	Apology			
Libby Ash	LA	Governor (Co-opted)	Work commitment			
Hamish Cherrett	HC	Governor (Co-opted)	Work commitment			
Alwyn Reeves	AR	Governor (LEA)				
Summary of Meeting						
Resolutions:						
To elect TF and LA as co-chairs of the Governing Body.						
To elect PF as Vice Chair of the Governing Body.						
To approve the budget for the 2016/17 Financial Year.						
To approve the SCITT Partnership Agreement.						
Item					Action	
<i>Procedural Items</i>						
1.	<u>Welcome</u> As LA was absent, TF opened the meeting.					
2.	<u>Apologies for Absence</u> It was resolved to accept the apologies as listed above.					
3.	<u>Election of Co-Chairs</u> Nominations had been received by email prior to the meeting for LA and TF. There were no other nominations offered at the meeting. LA had confirmed by email that she would accept the nomination, and had stated that this would be the last time that she stood as chair. A vote took place and it was resolved to elect LA and TF as co-chairs until the election cycle in the next academic year.					HH
4.	<u>Election of Vice Chair</u> Nominations had been received by email prior to the meeting for PF. There were no other nominations offered at the meeting. A vote took place and it was resolved to appoint PF as Vice Chair until the election cycle in the next academic year. The need to consider succession planning was mentioned.					HH
5.	<u>Declarations of Interest on Agenda Items</u>					

	<p>BM declared an interest in items related to PE, as she was employed by the Dartmoor School Sports partnership.</p> <p>It was noted that agenda item 11 referred the approval of a report on the spending of the sports premium funding.</p>	
6.	<p><u>Minutes and Actions from Previous Meetings</u></p> <p>As the committee structure was no longer in place, it was necessary to approve the minutes of the final committee meetings within a Full Governing Board (FGB) meeting.</p>	
6.1	<p>Approval of the minutes of the Resources Committee meeting on 3 March 2016</p> <p>Resolved.</p>	
6.2	<p>Approval of the minutes of the Teaching and Learning Committee meeting on 11 March 2016</p> <p>Resolved.</p>	
6.3	<p>Approval of the minutes of the Full Governing Board Meeting on 17 March 2016</p> <p>Resolved.</p>	
7.	<p><u>Progress on Actions (not included elsewhere on agenda)</u></p>	
7.1.1	10/12/2015 - 7 - All Governors to book onto a training course - ongoing	All
7.1.2	26/03/2015 - 11.1 - Research into local schools with a recently awarded outstanding Ofsted rating – SWi was not aware of any schools that had recently been awarded an outstanding rating - ongoing	SWi
7.1.3	10/12/2015 - 10.4 - Learning walk to investigate embedding of Rainbow Values – HC had advised by email that this was to be arranged in mid May. BM and PF both mentioned examples of evidence of the embedding of the values that they had personally experienced – ongoing	HC/ AR
7.1.4	10/12/2015 - 10.5 - Carry out assessment lead interview regarding implementation of the Venn Diagram method of assessment – BM had undertaken some research and would present findings at a future meeting - ongoing	BM
7.1.5	17/03/2016 - 3.2.3 - Questions, criteria, considerations for collaboration to be sent to PF for compilation – see item 10	
7.1.6	17/03/2016 - 3.2.10 - Respond to skills audit - ongoing	All
7.1.7	17/03/2016 - 4.1 - Governance review to be circulated - done	
7.1.8	17/03/2016 - 4.3 - TF and LA to discuss Governor delegated duties/Lead Roles with all Governors - ongoing	TF/ LA
7.1.9	17/03/2016 - 4.4 - SW to advise staff of abolition of class/subject linked Governors - done	
7.1.10	17/03/2016 - 4.4 - Edison areas to be considered alongside Lead Governor Roles - ongoing	SLT
7.1.11	07/05/2015 - R10 - Site blitz to take place before summer half term. SW to advise date, possibly after half term – ongoing	SW
7.1.12	23/11/2015 - R4 - H&S Policy to be reviewed – review complete, to be approved at FGB meeting on 26 May. SW noted that there was a Health and Safety audit taking place on 11 June. AM and PF agreed to meet to discuss possible Governor involvement - ongoing	AM/ PF
7.1.13	23/11/2015 - R7 - Review of insurance arrangements to ensure best deal. Alternative providers to be approached by AM – AM outlined the insurance reviewed/renewed to date and advised that a further discussion was due to take place – done	
7.1.14	15/01/2016 - R9 - New Governors to take SFVS GEL module - done	
7.1.15	03/03/2016 - R4.1 - Policy template to be designed - done	
7.1.16	03/03/2016 - R5 - Premises/Asset Management review to take place in Summer term – AM to liaise with PF to find a suitable time to undertake this - ongoing	AM/ PF
7.1.17	03/03/2016 - R5 - TF to update SFVS for recommendation to Governors - done	
7.1.18	11/03/2016 - T4 - Discuss "As a pupil of Exminster Primary School" section of Home/School Agreement with School Learning Team to ensure that they understand the requirements and circulate any amendments as necessary to GB for information – The School Learning Team had come back to SW with comments and suggestions. The agreement would be updated and circulated to Governors for information - ongoing	SLT

7.1.19	11/03/2016 - T6 - Circulate Exeter Consortium data comparison to all Governors - done	LA BM/ GP
7.1.20	11/03/2016 - T9.1.1 - Ask KS how evidence for Humanities report was gathered - ongoing	
7.1.21	11/03/2016 - T7 - Data Team Governors to attempt to fill in RAISEonline section of Ofsted Preparation document before the data team meeting on 22/3/16 – BM and GP agreed to arrange a date to look at this together - ongoing	
Strategic Items		
8.	<u>Approval of Budget</u>	JC/AM
8.1	Paperwork associated with the budget had been circulated prior to the meeting.	
8.2	SW explained that the School Finance Officer, Charles Woodland, had checked the budget and agreed that it was acceptable.	
8.3	The 2016/17 budget had been influenced by cuts in SEN funding and increased costs related to National Insurance and pension contributions and the National Living Wage. The September intake into Reception would be relatively low, which would affect the AWPU funding, however it was believed that this was unlikely to be an ongoing issue in future financial years.	
8.4	JC, the Lead Governor for Finance, had been involved in the latter stages of the budget setting process and had noted concerns about the deficit budget going forward, particularly in relation to staffing costs, but had been advised that there was a plan in place to address this.	
8.5	JC stated that he would like to understand more about the schools spending and would meet with AM to explore areas where costs could be kept down.	
8.6	Looking further afield on the 5 year plan, JC commented on the uncertain future due to the new school opening at Matford impacting on the role, the possibility of further government cuts, a recession and costs related to joining and Multi Academy Trust (MAT) and suggested that a financial buffer would be advisable to mitigate against this uncertainty.	
8.7	JC had asked about the linking of the budget with the School Development Plan and had been satisfied by the response.	
8.8	JC stated that he was happy to recommend the budget for approval.	
8.9	<i>PF sought clarification on the teaching staff pay increasing on the 5 year plan.</i> IM explained that incremental pay scale rises and a 1% inflationary increase was automatically applied, based on the current staff.	
8.10	<i>PF asked whether a contingency had been applied in the other staff budget line to factor in the increasing National Living Wage.</i> SW advised that a £17K contingency had been applied.	
8.11	<i>GP asked when it was likely that the impact of the new school at Matford would be felt.</i> SW suggested that it would depend on how the new school was populated; whether it started from reception upwards, or otherwise.	
8.12	<i>GP asked whether it would be easier to budget with a 6 year plan.</i> SW replied that a 6 year plan would allow the pupil numbers to rise to the maximum 420.	
8.13	It was resolved to approve the budget for the 2016/17 Financial Year.	
9.	<u>To approve the migration of Devon School Centred Initial Teacher Training (SCITT) from a teaching school over to a new partnership agreement</u>	
9.1	SW explained how SCITT worked. Two documents had been circulated relating to this item: A migration note for Governors and a copy of the proposed partnership agreement.	
9.2	TF had raised the following questions by email prior to the meeting. The questions were repeated at the meeting for the benefit of all Governors. <i>Q: Regarding clause 5.3 of the partnership agreement, were the costs met from the £300 per annum chargeable to each school and did the school have any other budget allocated to SCITT?</i> <i>A: Yes, the costs were met from the funding received from each school of £300. Exminster school paid this fee to the partnership and received payment for the school based tutor, weekly conferencing with trainees and cover for training events.</i>	

9.3	<p>The following additional questions were raised:</p> <p>Q: <i>Were the SLT happy with the cost to benefit ratio of entering into the SCITT, in view of the fact it cost £300 per annum in monetary terms plus the time and resources to commit to the training requirements?</i></p> <p>A: The SLT were more than happy with the value. It was training staff in supporting trainees and also coaching methods that were used school-wide. It also gave the school access to strong candidates if they chose to apply for jobs when advertised. The time commitment was factored into the annual plan.</p> <p>Q: <i>How would the SCITT arrangement benefit the pupils?</i></p> <p>A: There were two teachers in the classroom during the trainees teaching practice. This was particularly beneficial in the summer term when it allowed the staff to schedule in additional teaching groups based on the needs of the class.</p> <p>Q: <i>Would the management and steering of the scheme change?</i></p> <p>A: No, just the legal aspect</p> <p>Q: <i>Did the school have any influence in which trainees were taken on?</i></p> <p>A: No</p> <p>Q: <i>Were the cohorts who had had a trainee teacher tracked, so that they did not have trainee teachers in their class year on year?</i></p> <p>A: Consideration was given to the placement of trainees based on the experience of the class teacher.</p>	
9.4	It was resolved to approve the partnership agreement.	
10.1	<p>10. Collaboration update</p> <p>PF had produced a report entitled “Multi Academy Trust (MAT) selection process”, and explained how the grouping of questions and quantitative analysis would work. Governors could still add further questions if required.</p> <p>SW noted that a number of schools in Exeter were already grouping, and there was a concern about missing the boat. The school had already been approached to be part of MAT(s), and visits to several potential options had taken place, but there were no favoured options to date. Discussion took place about the pros and cons of joining a MAT both early in the process and later.</p> <p>PF suggested that there should be mention that the school were looking at options regarding the Academy status in a newsletter, as there had been so much publicity in the press, and asked whether there had been any questions raised by parents.</p> <p>BM asked whether geography was a key consideration. SW replied that ideally, it would be good to be associated with schools within a half hour drive of Exminster.</p> <p>It was asked whether any of the options explored so far had been written off. SW replied that originally there had been a driver to be within a MAT with the feeder secondary school. However, in several years’ time there may be another secondary school nearer to Exminster which could change the situation.</p> <p>SW commented that when exploring MAT options, it was important to speak to a range of stakeholders within the MAT, rather than just the people who were showing you around.</p> <p>It was resolved to adopt the selection process outlined in the report as a principle. All Governors should consider the questions within the report, group them and weight them, feeding back their thoughts to PF for compilation. The selection process could then be applied to the options already considered.</p>	All
Monitoring		
11.1	<p>11. Approve sports premium and pupil premium spending reports for publication</p> <p>BM remained in the meeting as the reports were only for noting, and no vote was required on their content.</p> <p>Sports Premium funding:</p>	

11.2	<p>SW outlined the expenditure and explained how the participation rates were tracked, with the aim that participation was increased. GP noted the high cost of transport. A pilot program was taking place within school this year to encourage families to engage in physical activity. BM was attending the sessions as a Governor. It was noted that this was a costly but valuable resource.</p> <p>Pupil Premium funding: Funding was primarily spent on curriculum learning, in order to close the attainment gap. It was noted that there was a large cross over between Pupil Premium, SEN and Social and Emotional needs. <i>PF asked whether the £19000 for a programme supporting social and emotional development was a one off cost.</i> SW noted that it was effectively an ongoing cost towards staffing costs for providing programmes such as Thrive. GP and LA had visited Years 2 and 3 and had witnessed the positive impact that the interventions had had. SW reported on a new initiative to undertake a forensic analysis, by observing individual Pupil Premium children, to identify their learning barriers. The child would then be mentored to overcome these barriers. This strategy was proving effective. TF suggested that this process was observed by a Governor and SWi agreed to carry out the observation as a Governor visit.</p>	SWi
Governing Body		
12.	<p><u>Ofsted Grade Descriptors</u> There had been little progress with evidence gathering to date. It was suggested that all Governors viewed the Youtube videos regarding questions that may be asked at an Ofsted visit (as outlined in the Maintained Schools' Checklist – circulated by email) before the meeting on 26 May, with the intention for a further discussion at the meeting on 16 June. Additionally, Governors could access the documents on the Google Drive and add any evidence, thoughts or questions to be kept as a central record.</p>	All
13.	<p><u>Housekeeping</u> 13.1 HH reported: 13.1.1 Governors needed to re-register for Governors E-Learning (GEL). 13.1.2 DBS checks were required for longer established Governors who previously had a CRB check. This affected LA, SWi, AR and possibly BM. Governors could make arrangements to do this with AM. 13.1.3 Provisional dates had been set for the next academic year's meetings and a Google Calendar link would be circulated. 13.2 BM asked that Governors helped to run the bar and BBQ at the School Fayre on Friday 8 July.</p>	All LA/ SWi/ AR/ BM All
The meeting closed at 20:28		

Signed:.....Libby Ash..... Date:.....26 May 2016.....