

**Exminster Community Primary School Full Governing Board Meeting 1/2017-18**  
**Thursday, 21 Sep 2017, 18:00 at Exminster Community Primary School**  
**MINUTES**

<b>Present</b>					
<b>Name</b>	<b>Initial</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Initial</b>	<b>Position</b>
Sarah Whalley	SW	Headteacher	Jonathan Wood	JW	Governor (Co-opted)
Tony Fripp	TF	Governor (Co-opted)	Paul Frazer	PF	Governor (Parent)
Stephen McDonald	SM	Governor (Par)	Becky Mason	BM	Governor (Co-opted)
Hamish Cherrett	HC	Governor (Co-opted)	Gordon Peacock	GP	Governor (Co-opted)
Alwyn Reeves	AR	Governor (LEA)	Richard Vain	RV	Governor (Co-opted)
John Collins	JC	Governor (Co-opted)	Sam Slingsby	SS	Governor (Staff)
Ian Rogers	IR	Governor (Co-opted)	Helen Hibbins	HH	Clerk
Paul Herring	PH	Assistant Headteacher			
<b>Apologies</b>					
<b>Name</b>	<b>Initial</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reason</b>		
Helen Fisher	HF	Governor (Co-opted)	Illness		

**Advice given by Governors at this school, in this meeting, is incidental to their professional expertise and is not being given in their professional capacity.**

**Governors must not disclose what individual governors have said or how they have voted within a meeting.**

**Governors must respect the confidentiality of Part Two items of business as agreed by the Governing Board.**

<b>Summary of Meeting</b>
<p>Resolutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TF elected as Chair</li> <li>• PF elected as Vice Chair</li> <li>• IR Co-opted</li> <li>• Term dates for 2018/19</li> <li>• Teachers' pay award</li> </ul>

<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
<p><b>1. Welcome</b> TF opened the meeting at 18:03</p>	
<p><b>2. Apologies for Absence</b></p> <p>2.1 Apologies accepted as listed above.</p> <p>2.2 Suzannah Bower, potential Governor, had also intended to come to the meeting but had sent apologies due to illness.</p>	
<p><b>3. Election of Co-Chairs</b></p> <p>3.1 As there was only one nomination for Chair, it would not be possible to follow a co-chairing model this year.</p> <p>3.2 It was resolved to elect TF as Chair of the Governing Board for a term of one year ending at the first Full Governing Body (FGB) meeting of the 2018/19 Academic Year.</p>	HH



<p>Option 1: a 1% increase to the minima and maxima of all pay ranges with the exception of the main pay scale where a 2% increase to the minima and maximum would apply, or Option 2: a 1% increase to all teachers' salaries, with the exception of those on the main pay scale where a 2% increase would apply. (This option includes an increase to the discretionary points within scales).</p> <p>The unions were recommending option 2.</p> <p>11.3 SW noted that the 2% pay rise had not been budgeted for, as the information was not available at the time of budget setting and would cost between £3,000 and £4,000.</p> <p>11.4 It was clarified that this was a cost of living rise and not a performance related rise.</p> <p>11.5 RV noted that if the increment was not applied universally, the bands would become non-competitive over time.</p> <p>11.6 Discussion took place about funding. SW noted that Governors were booked onto the funding consultation events in October.</p> <p>11.7 It was resolved to apply the uplift in accordance with Option 2. This was the default that HROne would apply automatically. Therefore, no action would be required by the school.</p> <p>11.8 PF, SS and PH returned to the meeting.</p>	
<p><b>12. <u>To consider the Governance assessment section of the Excellence for All document</u></b></p> <p>❖ <b>Related Documents: Excellence for All</b></p> <p>12.1 SW explained that the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) had completed the document; due for submission to Devon County Council (DCC) by the end of September. On receipt, DCC would RAG rate the document and contact schools if their answers raised concerns.</p> <p>12.2 The Governance section of the document (1B) was discussed:</p> <p>12.2.1 <i>AR asked how the Governing body/SLT could evaluate that the school was outstanding in particular areas when the recent Ofsted inspection judged it as good.</i> SW replied that the Ofsted judgement had been due to a gap in the data with 7 out of 10 children attaining as expected at KS1 then the assessment standards changing with increased emphasis on spelling. This meant that some children were not able to attain as expected in KS2 for the spelling strand alone. The inspection that took place was a section 8 inspection which could not change the judgement from the existing Good and only a section 5 inspection could change the judgement in any of the Ofsted sections.</p> <p>12.2.2 Debate took place about "Governors systematically challenge senior leaders"; evaluated as outstanding by the SLT. Some Governors felt that the challenge was not always apparent in FGB meetings due to lack of time and depth of discussion. Other Governors disagreed with this, citing the level of scrutiny in the Data Team meetings and Safeguarding meetings. The evaluation was taken to the vote and it was resolved that the evaluation should remain outstanding. However, when Governors fed back to the FGB meetings about their Lead Role areas, they should emphasise the challenge and evidence gathered.</p> <p>12.2.3 "Governors have a deep and accurate understand of the school's effectiveness" should be changed from outstanding to good.</p> <p>12.2.4 There were currently low governor vacancies (less than 10%).</p> <p>12.2.5 Debate took place about the financial planning and management, taking account of the following Finance section (1C). Consideration was given to how other schools would judge the question, the current political climate and unknown changes to funding and it was decided that the financial planning and management should be evaluated as strong and not robust due to the proposed deficit in years 4 and 5 of the 5 year plan.</p>	SW
<p><b>13. <u>Update from the Income Generation Working Group</u></b></p> <p>❖ <b>Related Documents: Exminster School Income Analysis v0.4, Fundraising for Exminster Primary School</b></p> <p>13.1 JC explained that £93,000 would need to be raised over the next 5 years. The Governing Board needed to decide on a fundraising approach and it was suggested that several smaller projects were tackled simultaneously, taking into account that there may be an initial capital outlay before benefits could be recouped.</p>	

<p>13.2</p> <p>13.3</p> <p>13.4</p> <p>13.5</p> <p>13.6</p> <p>13.7</p> <p>13.8</p>	<p>The Income Analysis presentation was intended to generate discussion and further fundraising ideas. SM explained the complexity/benefit matrix; validation of the figures in the report was required; consideration needed to be given to any potential operational disruption that may be caused by the projects.</p> <p>It was noted that in addition to fundraising, cost efficiencies would need to be explored.</p> <p>Parental engagement was discussed. It was suggested that Parents Evenings would be a good opportunity to raise awareness.</p> <p>JC noted that Exminster School Association (ESA) was needed as a vehicle to maximise return due to its charitable status.</p> <p>SW outlined what was already being done to generate income:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Solar Panels were being explored. The roof had been surveyed last term, but a report was not available to date.</li> <li>• There was approximately £4,000 income from successful grant applications in the last academic year. It had proved fruitful targeting the smaller, local, grant opportunities. In the past, the School had used a Grant Finder, when funding was secured for the Y1 outdoor area.</li> </ul> <p>It was asked whether partnering up with other schools would assist with funding. It was agreed that this topic warranted further discussion as a separate agenda item.</p> <p>Next steps were identified as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SM to produce a spreadsheet/matrix for Governors to feedback/rank the projects and identify new ideas, for discussion at the October FGB meeting.</li> <li>• TF to explore the Charitable Status of ESA in conjunction with its current constitution.</li> <li>• SW to ensure that the cashback link was included on a newsletter as soon as possible.</li> </ul> <p>This item would be on the agenda for the FGB meeting on 12 October.</p>	<p>SM/ All TF SW</p>
<p><b>14.</b></p> <p>❖</p> <p>14.1</p> <p>14.2</p> <p>14.3</p> <p>14.4</p> <p>14.5</p> <p>14.6</p>	<p><b><u>School Development Plan update</u></b></p> <p><b>❖ Related Documents: SDP Summary 2016.2017 – Context Sheet</b></p> <p>SW presented data that would be scrutinised in depth by the Data Team.</p> <p>The gap between PP and non-PP children was closing in all cohorts except last year’s Y3 in maths. It was noted that there was a large crossover between Special Educational Needs (SEN) and PP.</p> <p>The gap between boys’ and girls’ attainment in reading was closing overall, but was changeable within different cohorts. Targeted support was being put in place to address this. Likewise, the gap in writing attainment was narrowing, but required further work. It was noted that there had been a change to the writing assessment, making it less technical.</p> <p>The drive to increase writing standards would continue within Get On And Learn (GOAL) time.</p> <p>The new Assessing Schools’ Performance (ASP) data – a replacement for RAISEonline - would be released in October.</p> <p>DfE provisional progress figures were 0.4 in writing, 2.4 in maths and 2.4 in reading, showing an improvement on last year.</p>	
<p><b>15.</b></p> <p>❖</p> <p>15.1</p> <p>15.2</p>	<p><b><u>Safeguarding Training</u></b></p> <p><b>❖ Related Documents: 2017-07 Safeguarding Policy</b></p> <p>SW presented a Safeguarding training powerpoint.</p> <p>All Governors need to read Keeping Children Safe in Education – September 2016 edition, and Exminster School’s Safeguarding Policy by the next FGB meeting and sign to say that this has been done.</p>	<p>All</p>

Signed:.....T Fripp..... Date:.....10/12/2017.....