

Exminster Community Primary School Full Governing Board Meeting 2/2016-17
Thursday, 13 Oct 2016, 19:00 at Exminster Community Primary School
MINUTES

Present					
Name	Initial	Position	Name	Initial	Position
Sarah Whalley	SW	Headteacher	Libby Ash	LA	Governor (Co-opted)
Tony Fripp	TF	Governor (Co-opted)	Paul Frazer	PF	Governor (Parent)
Alwyn Reeves	AR	Governor (LEA)	Becky Mason	BM	Governor (Co-opted)
John Collins	JC	Governor (Co-opted)	Gordon Peacock	CP	Governor (Co-opted)
Helen Fisher	HF	Governor (Co-opted)	Richard Vain	RV	Governor (Co-opted)
Ian Moore	IM	Deputy Headteacher	Sam Slingsby	SS	Governor (Staff)

Apologies			
Name	Initial	Position	Reason
Hamish Cherrett	HC	Governor (Co-opted)	Family commitment
Sue Wilkinson	SWi	Governor (Co-opted)	

Summary of Meeting

Resolutions:
To co-opt Helen Fisher onto the Board of Governors.
To approve the Teachers' Pay and Governors' Expenses policies.
To approve the School Development Plan.

Item	Action
Procedural Items	
1. <u>Welcome</u> The meeting opened at 19:02.	
2. <u>Apologies for Absence</u> Accepted as listed above. It was noted that SWi was absent without apology.	TF
3. <u>Co-option of Helen Fisher onto the Board of Governors</u> HF briefly introduced herself, outlining her background as a retired secondary school modern languages teacher. A vote was taken and it was resolved to co-opt HF onto the Board of Governors.	HH
4. <u>Declarations of Interest on Agenda Items</u> BM declared an interest in items associated with PE, due to her employment with the Dartmoor School Sports Partnership.	
5. <u>Minutes and Actions from Previous Meeting</u> It was resolved to approve the minutes of the Full Governing Board (FGB) meeting on 22 September 2016.	
6. <u>Progress on Actions (not included elsewhere on agenda)</u>	
6.1 10/12/2015 - 7 - All Governors to book onto a training course Ongoing reminder. JC, PF and TF had all booked on courses.	
6.2 26/03/2015 - 11.1 - Research into local schools with a recently awarded outstanding Ofsted rating SWi was not present - Ongoing	

6.3	17/03/2016 - 4.3 - Governor Lead Roles (including Edison Leads) to be checked and then agreed by Governors. Ongoing
6.4	03/03/2016 - R5 - Premises/Asset Management review - PF to compare actions identified from review with the Asset Management Plan, alongside IM. Ongoing
6.5	28/04/2016 - 8.5 - JC to meet with AM to explore costs and efficiencies with respect to the budget. Arranged ahead of the next meeting - Ongoing
6.6	28/04/2016 - 10.7 - All Governors to consider MAT questions. To be fed back to PF. Ongoing
6.7	26/05/2016 - 6.1.1 - SDP priorities to be listed at the top of agendas as a reminder Awaiting final version - Ongoing
6.8	16/06/2016 - 8.1.2 - SS and PH to discuss implementation of a school facebook page. Update 14/07/2016 SS meeting with Irfan Hussain to check set up is suitable. See agenda item 11
6.9	16/06/2016 - 8.1.2 - LA to start document on google drive to accept ideas for raising Governors profile and communication. To be an agenda item in Autumn. See agenda item 11
6.10	16/06/2016 - 10.1.1 - All Governors to reflect on meetings and fill in shared Ofsted summary sheet on google drive. Ongoing reminder
6.11	14/07/2016 - 10.2 - HC to populate the Safeguarding Checklist to be shared with all Governors Ongoing
6.12	14/07/2016 - 11 - Working party to be formed to discuss Townfield Entrance. Update 22/9/2016 - SW to explain in a newsletter that the matter remained under discussion. The matter had been reported in the newsletter - Ongoing
6.13	22/09/2016 - 7.7 - Summary sheet to be prepared following recent data review meeting to be shared with all Governors SW to send information to HH to put on Google Drive - Ongoing
6.14	22/09/2016 - 12.2 - Re-run Parent Governor election. Ongoing
6.15	22/09/2016 - 14.1.1 - RAISE online data to be discussed in depth after publication and data to be highlighted to parents in a newsletter. To be on agenda for FGB 17 November - Ongoing
6.16	22/09/2016 - 14.5 - Add "children's health" (suggested by BM) and "Governor learning" (suggested by PF) sections into SDP Has been added - Done
6.17	22/09/2016 - 14.5 - Overarching vision to be added to SDP. PF to draft. Ongoing
Strategic Items	
7.	<u>Update on plans for collaboration</u>
7.1	SW had attended a meeting on Multi Academy Trusts (MATs) and summarised the content in a presentation to Governors.
7.2	<i>LA asked whether there was a financial incentive still available for the initial set up of a MAT. SW replied that there were funds available for legal costs, but it was unknown whether there was an incentive over and above that.</i>
7.3	The school was informally collaborating with Hazeldown. BM had visited Hazeldown (through her work) and had been impressed with the Y6 children's work. IM and PH would be visiting Hazeldown in the next few weeks.
7.4	It was noted that Hazeldown were considering a partnership with Watcombe school in Torquay.

<p>7.5</p> <p>7.6</p> <p>7.7</p>	<p><i>RV asked whether the school was being left behind in the process of joining up with other schools. SW replied that the evidence presented at the MAT meeting showed that there were many schools in Devon that were still not in a formal collaboration.</i></p> <p><i>JC asked whether the school was interested in collaborating with schools across local authority boundaries. SW said that she felt it was important that the schools were geographically close.</i></p> <p><i>AR asked how much schools relied on their own local authorities once they become an academy. SW explained that academies were able to buy in services from whichever company or local authority they chose and were not tied to their geographical local authority.</i></p>	
<p>8.</p> <p>8.1</p> <p>8.2</p>	<p><u>Policies and Procedures</u></p> <p>Approval of Teachers’ Pay policy RV had reviewed the Devon County Council (DCC) model policy. It was resolved to approve the policy.</p> <p>Approval of Governor Expenses Policy JC had reviewed the policy. It was resolved to approve the policy.</p>	<p>HH</p> <p>HH</p>
<p>9.</p> <p>9.1</p> <p>9.2</p> <p>9.3</p> <p>9.4</p>	<p><u>Report from Pay and Performance Committee</u></p> <p>LA reported that the Pay and Performance Committee had met on 29 September to hear recommendations from the Headteacher and make decisions on pay progression.</p> <p>The Committee had noted that the appraisal objectives for the 2015/16 academic year had not been met in all cases due to uncertainty with the new assessment system when set. However, they were satisfied that the recommendations had taken this into account.</p> <p><i>TF asked how it was possible to measure outcomes for teachers with the removal of levels. IM said that it had been difficult in the transitional year, last year, but should now become more straightforward.</i></p> <p>Refer to part II for summary of outcomes.</p>	
<p>10.</p> <p>10.1</p> <p>10.1.1</p> <p>10.1.2</p> <p>10.1.3</p> <p>10.1.4</p> <p>10.1.5</p> <p>10.1.6</p> <p>10.1.7</p>	<p><u>Approval of School Development Plan (SDP)</u></p> <p>The SDP was discussed in depth and a one page summary document outlining the decisions behind the priorities would be uploaded onto the google drive. The following questions and comments were noted and responded to by IM and SW:</p> <p><i>Was there a statistical reason behind the gender gap in priority 2? (PF)</i> Yes, there was a crossover of groups of boys, Special Educational Needs (SEN) and Pupil Premium (PP).</p> <p><i>Were the targets too light as they would not align the school’s results with national average in some cases? (RV)</i> The SLT had set the targets to be challenging but achievable.</p> <p><i>Could the blanket 10% across priorities 1, 2 and 3 be construed as coasting? (TF)</i> It was suggested that the precise percentages were used.</p> <p><i>The priority and intended outcomes for priorities 1 and 2 were too similar. It was suggested that the priority was to narrow the gap and the intended outcome was to be in line with or better than the national average. (TF/PF)</i></p> <p><i>The priorities seemed focused on attainment rather than progress (LA)</i> Progress was still measured.</p> <p><i>What would the impact of priority 4 be, and had any pupil voice been used when determining the priority? (LA)</i> Where “Get On And Learn” (GOAL) time/books had been implemented in school, children had engaged with it. Children were able to articulate where they were in their learning and what their next steps should be.</p> <p><i>How could the impact of priority 4 be evidenced? (LA)</i> Comments were gathered from children and Governors were encouraged to visit to see how it worked in practice. LA suggested that teachers could have GOAL books to reflect on their successes throughout the year.</p>	<p>IM</p>

<p>10.1.8 <i>Priority 4 would address the comment made in the last Ofsted inspection about the lack of independent learning in school. (AR)</i></p> <p>10.1.9 <i>Would there be data available to support the impact of priority 4? (JC)</i> The evidence would not be immediate and would develop throughout the year, and would not necessarily be measurable in numbers.</p> <p>10.1.10 <i>The Rainbow Values only appeared in the learning outcomes section. (LA)</i> Although the Rainbow Values continued to be a focus in school, they were already embedded and not a development point.</p> <p>10.1.11 <i>Within the leadership section it suggested that the quality of teaching and learning was consistently good or better. As the overarching aim was to move the overall effectiveness to securely outstanding, was the aim not too low? (JC)</i> It was explained that teaching needed to be considered good or better to achieve outstanding.</p> <p>10.2 Assign Governors to SDP priorities It was agreed that a further meeting would be arranged to discuss the lead Governor roles and the assignment to the SDP priorities would take place after that.</p> <p>10.3 It was resolved to approve the SDP subject to amendments suggested during the discussion. The final version should incorporate the school logo.</p>	<p>TF/PF/ SLT</p> <p>SLT</p>
<p>11. <u>Ideas for raising the profile of Governors within School</u></p> <p>11.1 SS had met with Irfan regarding setting up a facebook page for school, to be used to inform parents of upcoming events, newsletters, profiles of Governors and linked to the school blog for promotion of teaching and learning throughout school. Other schools had been using this method of communication for some time.</p> <p>11.2 It was not possible to have a non-interactive facebook page, so parents would be able to comment on posts, but moderators could delete comments if they were not appropriate. The page would be publicly accessible.</p> <p>11.3 Concerns were raised about photographs of children appearing on the page. It was noted that a consent form was sent out each year asking whether parents consented to their children being photographed. This may need to be looked into further to consider whether any additional permission was required.</p> <p>11.4 LA had put a document entitled Stakeholder Engagement Ideas on the google drive to gather ideas about raising the profile of Governors. Governors were encouraged to add to the document so that an action plan/annual cycle of Governor publicity could be put together.</p>	<p>SW</p> <p>All</p>
Monitoring	
<p>12. <u>Receive monitoring report on Pupil Premium and Sports Premium spending</u></p> <p>12.1 Sports Premium SW circulated the Sports Premium Data Publication for the 2015-16 Academic Year. <i>AR asked how Governors would know that more pupils were involved in sport.</i> SW explained that at there was a figure for the number of children who had participated in events at the end of the year. It was suggested that this statistic was shown on the document.</p> <p>12.2 Pupil Premium</p> <p>12.2.1 The Pupil Premium Strategy Statement was a new requirement for publication on the school website. SW had based the report on a template document.</p> <p>12.2.2 <i>LA asked why writing had been shown as the main barrier to future attainment when the data suggested that it was Maths.</i> SW would amend the document to reflect that. <i>BM suggested that "Family Fun" and the use of the allotment should be added in the Social and Emotional wellbeing section.</i></p> <p>12.2.3 SW circulated Page 40 of the Ofsted Handbook, detailing the use of Pupil Premium. Several points had been highlighted about the expectation of Governors.</p> <p>12.2.4 Discussion took place on the impact of Thrive. SW explained that Thrive was difficult to measure in the classroom, although easy to measure on the programme itself. <i>PF noted that as Thrive was 30%</i></p>	<p>SW</p>

<p><i>of the PP budget, the expenditure needed to be justified. It was suggested that a Governor visit linking pupil premium and Thrive took place.</i></p> <p>12.2.5 <i>LA asked how regularly the effectiveness of the interventions and Continual Professional Development (CPD) were measured. SW replied that interventions were analysed on a half termly basis.</i></p> <p>12.2.6 <i>RV asked whether there was any external validation. SW said that INSTEAD and the collaboration with Hazeldown provided it.</i></p>	SWi
<p>13. <u>Safeguarding Update</u></p> <p>13.1 AR reported that a Safeguarding Review meeting would take place on 21 November.</p> <p>13.2 The Safeguarding Audit would be completed by the end of the Autumn Term.</p>	
<p>14. <u>Premises, Health, Safety and Welfare Update</u></p> <p>14.1 No update was required.</p> <p>14.2 The accident and fire logs would be inspected and signed by the end of this term.</p> <p>14.3 LA noted that a parent had offered to assist with Health and Safety matters. It was suggested that this parent could become an Associate Governor.</p>	PF LA/HH
PART II	
<p>15. <u>Report from Pay and Performance Committee</u></p> <p>SS, as a member of staff, left the meeting before part II.</p>	
Meeting Closed at 21:02	

Signed:.....Tony Fripp..... Date:.....17/11/2016.....