Exminster Community Primary School Full Governing Board Meeting 5/2016-17 Thursday, 19 Jan 2017, 19:00 at Exminster Community Primary School MINUTES

		Pre	sent		
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)
Stephen McDonald	SM	Governor (Par)	Becky Mason	ВМ	Governor (Co-opted)
Hamish Cherrett	НС	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)
Helen Fisher	HF	Governor (Co-opted)	Helen Hibbins	НН	Clerk
Claire Norman	CN	SENCo	Ian Moore	IM	Deputy Headteacher
Apologies					
Name	Initial	Position	Reason		

Summary of Meeting

Resolutions:

To request an updated road safety report following the closure of the Townfield Gate and for the gate to remain closed until further advice was received.

To increased the Planned Admissions Number to 73+ for the 2017/18 academic year, with 3 Reception classes.

Item		Action
Proced	lural Items (1)	
1.	<u>Welcome</u>	
	TF opened the meeting at 19:03	
2.	Apologies for Absence	
	None received.	
3.	Declarations of Interest on Agenda Items	
	BM declared an interest in items involving PE due to her employment with the Dartmoor School	
	Sports Partnership.	
Monit	oring (1)	
4.	Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) information report	
4.1	CN, Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Coordinator (SENCo) explained the key points of the	
	report which had been circulated prior to the meeting. The Powerpoint associated with the report	
	(also circulated) would be uploaded onto the school website as an interactive way of presenting the	
	information to parents.	
4.2	Staffing, training, funding, accessibility and the difference between Education and Health Care Plans	
	(EHCP) and My Plans was explained.	
4.3	Governors asked the following questions:	
	Q: What reviews of the plans are required? (LA)	

A: With the EHCP, an annual review is required but termly meetings take place, which are summarised and fed back on the anniversary of the plan. My Plan reviews are less formal but still take place regularly to account for the funding. (CN)

Q: If there are other professionals associated with a child's requirements do they have input in the termly meetings? (LA)

A: They are invited to the meetings, but rarely attend. Reports can be requested from the professionals ahead of meetings. (CN)

Q: Were there any gaps in the staff SEND skill set in school? (SM)

A: Historically there had been a gap where a child required a specific type of therapy that the school did not have the expertise to provide. An external professional was brought in to train staff. The skills learned had then been transferred to another child. (CN/SW)

Q: Were the questions on the front of the report statutory? (LA)

A: They were information that the school is required to provide but not statutory. Schools have to provide certain information, but not necessarily presented in the same way. (CN)

Q: How much time does it take to do the SENCo role? (AR)

A: All of my time working in school and occasionally more. The workload varies. (CN)

4.4 CN was thanked for the report and left the meeting.

Procedural Items (2)

5. Minutes and Actions from Previous Meeting

It was resolved to approve part I and part II minutes of the Full Governing Board (FGB) meeting held on 8 December 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.
- 6.2 03/03/2016 R5 Premises/Asset Management review PF to compare actions identified from review with the Asset Management Plan, alongside IM.

There were discrepancies between the report, compiled 5 years ago, and the latest spreadsheet. Further discussion between PF and IM was required. Ongoing.

- 6.3 **28/04/2016 8.5 JC to meet with AM to explore costs and efficiencies with respect to the budget.** JC was considering income generation rather than cost efficiencies and a meeting with AM had not taken place. Done.
- 6.4 **28/04/2016 10.7 All Governors to consider MAT questions. To be fed back to PF.** Ongoing reminder.
- 6.5 **16/06/2016 10.1.1 All Governors to reflect on meetings and fill in shared Ofsted summary sheet on google drive.**

Ongoing reminder.

- 6.6 14/07/2016 11 Working party to be formed to discuss Townfield Entrance. Entrance temporarily closed. To be discussed at January FGB.

 See agenda item 7.
- 6.7 **22/09/2016 14.1.1 RAISE** online data to be discussed in depth after publication and data to be highlighted to parents via a link in a newsletter. Item to be discussed at the January FGB alongside FFT data.

See agenda item 11.

- 6.8 22/09/2016 14.5 Overarching vision to be added to School Development Plan (SDP). PF to draft.
 - The document should be independent of the SDP, strategic and high level. Ongoing.
- 6.9 **13/10/2016 10.3 Final version of SDP to be put on school headed paper with logo etc.** As this was now independent of 6.8 this could now be completed. Ongoing.
- 6.10 **13/10/2016 11.3 -** Is additional parental permission required for photographs when linking to Blog from Facebook? SS to circulate draft letter to parents to Governors before sending out.

- Ongoing.
- 6.11 **13/10/2016 11.4 -** All Governors to populate Stakeholder Engagement ideas document on the google drive.

Ongoing reminder.

- 6.12 **13/10/2016 12.1 Statistic of number of children participating in events as a result of sports premium funding to be added to the document.**Ongoing.
- 6.13 **13/10/2016 12.2.4 Governor visit linking Pupil Premium and Thrive to take place. All Governors to consider whether they could take on the role of pupil premium champion.**The importance of having a Pupil Premium champion was emphasised and anyone with an interest was asked to email TF. Ongoing.
- 6.14 **13/10/2016 14.3 LA** to discuss becoming an associate Governor (linked to Health and Safety) with her contact.

HH to check the reporting requirements for Associate Governors to advise LA before approaching her contact. Ongoing.

- 6.15 **17/11/2016 7.3.4 Data from Somerset Learning Partnership book trawl of PP books to be anonymised as evidence for Governors. Awaiting inspection by a Governor.**Ongoing.
- 6.16 17/11/2016 7.10.1 Governors to consider "What am I proud of in the school" as an Ofsted question.
 Ongoing.
- 6.17 **17/11/2016 7.11.1 -** Written feedback to be available from the Maths Workshops for Governor evidence. Awaiting return of feedback questionnaires.

IM to compile a summary document to upload to the Google Drive. All parents and children found the workshop useful. Games mornings, in place of class assemblies, have been introduced to engage parents with children's learning and has proved successful so far - Done

6.18 **08/12/2016 - 8.1.3 - All Governors to undertake online Prevent training and email certificates to HH.**

Ongoing.

- 6.19 **08/12/2016 9.2 Advertise Governor vacancy with curriculum skill set in newsletter.** Ongoing.
- 6.20 **08/12/2016 11.1 Email list of evidence gathering for SDP to Governors to inform Governor visits for next term.**

See agenda item 10.

Strategic Items

7. **Update on Townfield Entrance**

- 7.1 The main parental concerns since closing the Townfield Gate were outlined as
- difficulty crossings Milbury Lane and Glebelands,
- a narrow stretch of pavement past Pitthayes,
- speeding traffic,
- increased congestion around the school due to more parents driving their children to school.
 SW had spoken to PC Croft who would ask the Community Support Officer to investigate the claims.
- 7.2 LA asked whether the results of the travel plan survey (conducted annually in March) would show that there was an increase in children being brought to school by car.
- 7.3 Devon County Councillor Alan Connett had requested a review of the safety report following the closure of the gate.
- 7.4 BM had researched the impact of the closure of the gate on the residents of Townfield. The residents were grateful for the closure and had not experienced any problems with moving their vehicles during school drop off and pick up times which had previously had to be avoided.

1.6. It was agreed that SW would email the author of the report, reiterating Clir Connett's request for a review. 1.7. It was proposed that the gate should remain closed until further advice was received in an updated report. Resolved. 1.8. The would respond to the email from a parent requesting an update on the situation. 1.8. Update and decision regarding Reception class admissions in 2017/18 1.9. Papers had been circulated summarising the impact on the budget in three different scenarios: 1. No additional Reception class – Plan increased to 70 III. Mixed Reception/Vera 1 class – PAN increased to 70 III. A Reception classes – PAN increased to 73 III. A Reception classes – PAN increased to 73 III. A meeting had taken place with the School Finance Officer who had adjusted the figures from those circulated prior to the meeting. An updated spreadsheet was circulated at the meeting. 1.9. The Following points were highlighted: 1.9. The Finance Officer believed that the pupil number predictions were conservative. 1.9. A new primary school would be opening at Matford in September 2018, but it was difficult to factor in the impact this would have as it was unknown how the phased opening would be conducted. 1.9. The national funding formula was changing. [It was noted that a letter would be sent to the local MP from the Governing Body regarding this.] 1.9. BM and SW had met with Sarah Ratnage from Devon County Council regarding admissions. Sarah Ratnage had been given a tour of the school and had noted the building improvements and adaptions that would be required to accommodate additional children. 1.9. Detailed discussion on the financials for the different scenarios took place. 1.9. J. Cosked whether there would be an educational impact by having three Reception classes. It was suggested that the only negative impact would be the geographical splitting of the year 2 classrooms. 1.9. A parent had raised concerns about the number of children in the school as a whole. SW said that strategies had already been put in pla	7.5	PF stated that the impact of the closure needed to be evaluated by professionals; PC Croft and the Devon County Council safety team. It was possible that the closure of the gate had caused problems elsewhere in the village and these needed to be evaluated.	
7.7 It was proposed that the gate should remain closed until further advice was received in an updated report. Resolved. 7.8 TF would respond to the email from a parent requesting an update on the situation. 8. Update and decision regarding Reception class admissions in 2017/18 8.1 Papers had been circulated summarising the impact on the budget in three different scenarios: 1. No additional Reception class – Planned Admissions Number (PAN) remained at 60 11. Mixed Reception/Year 1 class – PAN increased to 73 11. 3 Reception classes – PAN increased to 73+ A meeting had taken place with the School Finance Officer who had adjusted the figures from those circulated prior to the meeting. An updated spreadsheet was circulated at the meeting. 8.2 The following points were highlighted: • There was likely to be a healthy carry-forward from the current financial year. • The Finance Officer believed that the pupil number predictions were conservative. • A new primary school would be opening at Matford in September 2018, but it was difficult to factor in the impact this would have as it was unknown how the phased opening would be conducted. • The national funding formula was changing. [It was noted that a letter would be sent to the local MP from the Governing Body regarding this.] 8.3 BM and SW had met with Sarah Ratnage from Devon County Council regarding admissions. Sarah Ratnage had been given a tour of the school and had noted the building improvements and adaptions that would be required to accommodate additional children. 8.4 Detailed discussion on the financials for the different scenarios took place. 8.5 JC asked whether by increasing the PAN we were setting a precedent for future years. SW said that the projected pupil numbers were lower for the next few intakes and there was insufficient infrastructure in place to support a further increase in pupil numbers. 8.6 JC asked whether betwe would be an educational impact by howing three Reception classes. It was suggested that the only negative impact would be	7.6	It was agreed that SW would email the author of the report, reiterating Cllr Connett's request for a	
 TF would respond to the email from a parent requesting an update on the situation. Update and decision regarding Reception class admissions in 2017/18 Papers had been circulated summarising the impact on the budget in three different scenarios: No additional Reception class – Planned Admissions Number (PAN) remained at 60 Mixed Reception/Year 1 class – PAN increased to 70 A meeting had taken place with the School Finance Officer who had adjusted the figures from those circulated prior to the meeting. An updated spreadsheet was circulated at the meeting. The following points were highlighted: The rimance Officer believed that the pupil number predictions were conservative. A new primary school would be opening at Malford in September 2018, but it was difficult to factor in the impact this would have as it was unknown how the phased opening would be conducted. The national funding formula was changing. [It was noted that a letter would be sent to the local MP from the Governing Body regarding this.] BM and SW had met with Sarah Ratnage from Devon County Council regarding admissions. Sarah Ratnage had been given a tour of the school and had noted the building improvements and adaptions that would be required to accommodate additional children. Detailed discussion on the financials for the different scenarios took place. JC asked whether by increasing the PAN we were setting a precedent for future years. SW said that the projected pupil numbers were lower for the next few intakes and there was insufficient infrastructure in place to support a further increase in pupil numbers. JC asked whether there would be an educational impact by having three Reception classes. It was suggested that the only negative impact would be the geographical splitting of the year 2 classrooms. A parent had raised concerns about the number of children in the school as a whole. SW said that st	7.7	It was proposed that the gate should remain closed until further advice was received in an updated	SW
 8.1 Papers had been circulated summarising the impact on the budget in three different scenarios: No additional Reception class – PAIn increased to 70 III. Mixed Reception/Year 1 class – PAN increased to 73+ A meeting had taken place with the School Finance Officer who had adjusted the figures from those circulated prior to the meeting. An updated spreadsheet was circulated at the meeting. 8.2 The following points were highlighted: The following points were highlighted: Ther ewas likely to be a healthy carry-forward from the current financial year. A new primary school would be opening at Matford in September 2018, but it was difficult to factor in the impact this would have as it was unknown how the phased opening would be conducted. The national funding formula was changing. [It was noted that a letter would be sent to the local MP from the Governing Body regarding this.] 8.3 BM and SW had met with Sarah Ratnage from Devon County Council regarding admissions. Sarah Ratnage had been given a tour of the school and had noted the building improvements and adaptions that would be required to accommodate additional children. 8.4 Detailed discussion on the financials for the different scenarios took place. 8.5 JC asked whether by increasing the PAN we were setting a precedent for future years. SW said that the projected pupil numbers were lower for the next few intakes and there was insufficient infrastructure in place to support a further increase in pupil numbers. 8.6 JC asked whether there would be an educational impact by having three Reception classes. It was suggested that the only negative impact would be the geographical splitting of the year 2 classrooms. 8.7 A parent had raised concerns about the number of children in the school as a whole. SW said that strategies had already been put in place to manage playtimes and lunch times. 8.8 At the conclusio	7.8	·	TF
1. No additional Reception class – Planned Admissions Number (PAN) remained at 60 11. Mixed Reception(Year 1 class – PAN increased to 70 111. 3 Reception classes – PAN increased to 73 A meeting had taken place with the School Finance Officer who had adjusted the figures from those circulated prior to the meeting. An updated spreadsheet was circulated at the meeting. The following points were highlighted: The finance Officer believed that the pupil number predictions were conservative. A new primary school would be opening at Matford in September 2018, but it was difficult to factor in the impact this would have as it was unknown how the phased opening would be conducted. The national funding formula was changing. [It was noted that a letter would be sent to the local MP from the Governing Body regarding this.] BM and SW had met with Sarah Ratnage from Devon County Council regarding admissions. Sarah Ratnage had been given a tour of the school and had noted the building improvements and adaptions that would be required to accommodate additional children. Letailed discussion on the financials for the different scenarios took place. Letailed discussion on the financials for the different scenarios took place. Letailed discussion on the financials for the ext few intakes and there was insufficient infrastructure in place to support a further increase in pupil numbers. Letailed discussion the scenario accommodate additional children. Letailed discussion discussion the following proposals were made and voted on: Letailed discussion of discussion the following proposals were made and voted on: A parent had raised concerns about the number of children in the school as a whole. SW said that strategies had already been put in place to manage playtimes and lunch times. A the conclusion of discussion the following proposals were made and voted on: The PAN to increase to 70 for 2017/18 academic year and for mixed Reception and Year 1 classes – Refused. The PAN to increase to 73+ for the 2017/18 academic y	8.	Update and decision regarding Reception class admissions in 2017/18	
8.2 The following points were highlighted: • There was likely to be a healthy carry-forward from the current financial year. • The Finance Officer believed that the pupil number predictions were conservative. • A new primary school would be opening at Matford in September 2018, but it was difficult to factor in the impact this would have as it was unknown how the phased opening would be conducted. • The national funding formula was changing. [It was noted that a letter would be sent to the local MP from the Governing Body regarding this.] 8.3 BM and SW had met with Sarah Ratnage from Devon County Council regarding admissions. Sarah Ratnage had been given a tour of the school and had noted the building improvements and adaptions that would be required to accommodate additional children. 8.4 Detailed discussion on the financials for the different scenarios took place. 8.5 JC asked whether by increasing the PAN we were setting a precedent for future years. SW said that the projected pupil numbers were lower for the next few intakes and there was insufficient infrastructure in place to support a further increase in pupil numbers. 8.6 JC asked whether there would be an educational impact by having three Reception classes. It was suggested that the only negative impact would be the geographical splitting of the year 2 classrooms. 8.7 A parent had raised concerns about the number of children in the school as a whole. SW said that strategies had already been put in place to manage playtimes and lunch times. 8.8 At the conclusion of discussion the following proposals were made and voted on: 8.8.1 The PAN to increase to 70 for 2017/18 academic year and for mixed Reception and Year 1 classes – Refused. 8.8.2 The PAN to increase to 73+ for the 2017/18 academic year with 3 Reception classes – Resolved. 8.8.3 The PAN to increase to 73+ for the 2017/18 academic year with 3 Reception classes – Resolved. 9. Policies and procedures 9. Policies and procedures 9. Policies and procedures 9. Lettings Policy 1. Lod	8.1	 I. No additional Reception class – Planned Admissions Number (PAN) remained at 60 II. Mixed Reception/Year 1 class – PAN increased to 70 III. 3 Reception classes – PAN increased to 73+ A meeting had taken place with the School Finance Officer who had adjusted the figures from those 	
 The Finance Officer believed that the pupil number predictions were conservative. A new primary school would be opening at Matford in September 2018, but it was difficult to factor in the impact this would have as it was unknown how the phased opening would be conducted. The national funding formula was changing. [It was noted that a letter would be sent to the local MP from the Governing Body regarding this.] BM and SW had met with Sarah Ratnage from Devon County Council regarding admissions. Sarah Ratnage had been given a tour of the school and had noted the building improvements and adaptions that would be required to accommodate additional children. Detailed discussion on the financials for the different scenarios took place. JC asked whether by increasing the PAN we were setting a precedent for future years. SW said that the projected pupil numbers were lower for the next few intakes and there was insufficient infrastructure in place to support a further increase in pupil numbers. JC asked whether there would be an educational impact by having three Reception classes. It was suggested that the only negative impact would be the geographical splitting of the year 2 classrooms. A parent had raised concerns about the number of children in the school as a whole. SW said that strategies had already been put in place to manage playtimes and lunch times. At the conclusion of discussion the following proposals were made and voted on: The PAN to remain at 60 for the 2017/18 academic year and for mixed Reception and Year 1 classes – Refused. The PAN to increase to 73+ for the 2017/18 academic year with 3 Reception classes – Resolved. Parents would be advised of the decision in a letter from the Governing Board. Wording for the letter was briefly discussed. It was agreed that SW would be thanked for her work on exploring the options. Policies and proce	8.2		
A new primary school would be opening at Matford in September 2018, but it was difficult to factor in the impact this would have as it was unknown how the phased opening would be conducted. The national funding formula was changing. [It was noted that a letter would be sent to the local MP from the Governing Body regarding this.] BM and SW had met with Sarah Ratnage from Devon County Council regarding admissions. Sarah Ratnage had been given a tour of the school and had noted the building improvements and adaptions that would be required to accommodate additional children. B.4 Detailed discussion on the financials for the different scenarios took place. JC asked whether by increasing the PAN we were setting a precedent for future years. SW said that the projected pupil numbers were lower for the next few intakes and there was insufficient infrastructure in place to support a further increase in pupil numbers. JC asked whether there would be an educational impact by having three Reception classes. It was suggested that the only negative impact would be the geographical splitting of the year 2 classrooms. A parent had raised concerns about the number of children in the school as a whole. SW said that strategies had already been put in place to manage playtimes and lunch times. At the conclusion of discussion the following proposals were made and voted on: The PAN to increase to 70 for 2017/18 academic year – Refused. The PAN to increase to 73+ for the 2017/18 academic year with 3 Reception classes – Resolved. Parents would be advised of the decision in a letter from the Governing Board. Wording for the letter was briefly discussed. It was agreed that SW would be thanked for her work on exploring the options. Policies and procedures Policies and procedures CSY Lettings Policy JC had reviewed the policy and made minor changes. Noted. Education of Children in Care Policy HC and AR had reviewed the policy. The Safeguarding Lead had been changed from Carol Glover to		 There was likely to be a healthy carry-forward from the current financial year. 	
to factor in the impact this would have as it was unknown how the phased opening would be conducted. • The national funding formula was changing. [It was noted that a letter would be sent to the local MP from the Governing Body regarding this.] 8.3 BM and SW had met with Sarah Ratnage from Devon County Council regarding admissions. Sarah Ratnage had been given a tour of the school and had noted the building improvements and adaptions that would be required to accommodate additional children. 8.4 Detailed discussion on the financials for the different scenarios took place. 8.5 JC asked whether by increasing the PAN we were setting a precedent for future years. SW said that the projected pupil numbers were lower for the next few intakes and there was insufficient infrastructure in place to support a further increase in pupil numbers. 8.6 JC asked whether there would be an educational impact by having three Reception classes. It was suggested that the only negative impact would be the geographical splitting of the year 2 classrooms. 8.7 A parent had raised concerns about the number of children in the school as a whole. SW said that strategies had already been put in place to manage playtimes and lunch times. 8.8 At the conclusion of discussion the following proposals were made and voted on: 8.8.1 The PAN to remain at 60 for the 2017/18 academic year - Refused. 8.8.2 The PAN to increase to 70 for 2017/18 academic year and for mixed Reception and Year 1 classes - Refused. 8.8.3 The PAN to increase to 73+ for the 2017/18 academic year with 3 Reception classes - Resolved. 8.8.9 Parents would be advised of the decision in a letter from the Governing Board. Wording for the letter was briefly discussed. It was agreed that SW would be thanked for her work on exploring the options. 9. Policies and procedures 9.1 Lettings Policy JC had reviewed the policy and made minor changes. Noted. Education of Children in Care Policy HC and AR had reviewed the policy. The Safeguarding Lead had been changed from Carol Gl		 The Finance Officer believed that the pupil number predictions were conservative. 	
Same and SW had met with Sarah Ratnage from Devon County Council regarding admissions. Sarah Ratnage had been given a tour of the school and had noted the building improvements and adaptions that would be required to accommodate additional children. Petailed discussion on the financials for the different scenarios took place. JC asked whether by increasing the PAN we were setting a precedent for future years. SW said that the projected pupil numbers were lower for the next few intakes and there was insufficient infrastructure in place to support a further increase in pupil numbers. Same and the conclusion of the concerns about the number of children in the school as a whole. SW said that strategies had already been put in place to manage playtimes and lunch times.		to factor in the impact this would have as it was unknown how the phased opening would	
Ratnage had been given a tour of the school and had noted the building improvements and adaptions that would be required to accommodate additional children. 8.4 Detailed discussion on the financials for the different scenarios took place. 8.5 JC asked whether by increasing the PAN we were setting a precedent for future years. SW said that the projected pupil numbers were lower for the next few intakes and there was insufficient infrastructure in place to support a further increase in pupil numbers. 8.6 JC asked whether there would be an educational impact by having three Reception classes. It was suggested that the only negative impact would be the geographical splitting of the year 2 classrooms. 8.7 A parent had raised concerns about the number of children in the school as a whole. SW said that strategies had already been put in place to manage playtimes and lunch times. 8.8 At the conclusion of discussion the following proposals were made and voted on: 8.8.1 The PAN to remain at 60 for the 2017/18 academic year — Refused. 8.8.2 The PAN to increase to 70 for 2017/18 academic year and for mixed Reception and Year 1 classes — Refused. 8.8.3 The PAN to increase to 73+ for the 2017/18 academic year with 3 Reception classes — Resolved. 8.9 Parents would be advised of the decision in a letter from the Governing Board. Wording for the letter was briefly discussed. It was agreed that SW would be thanked for her work on exploring the options. 9. Policies and procedures 9.1 Lettings Policy JC had reviewed the policy and made minor changes. Noted. 8.2 Education of Children in Care Policy HC and AR had reviewed the policy. The Safeguarding Lead had been changed from Carol Glover to			
8.5 JC asked whether by increasing the PAN we were setting a precedent for future years. SW said that the projected pupil numbers were lower for the next few intakes and there was insufficient infrastructure in place to support a further increase in pupil numbers. 8.6 JC asked whether there would be an educational impact by having three Reception classes. It was suggested that the only negative impact would be the geographical splitting of the year 2 classrooms. 8.7 A parent had raised concerns about the number of children in the school as a whole. SW said that strategies had already been put in place to manage playtimes and lunch times. 8.8 At the conclusion of discussion the following proposals were made and voted on: 8.8.1 The PAN to remain at 60 for the 2017/18 academic year – Refused. 8.8.2 The PAN to increase to 70 for 2017/18 academic year and for mixed Reception and Year 1 classes – Refused. 8.8.3 The PAN to increase to 73+ for the 2017/18 academic year with 3 Reception classes – Resolved. 8.9 Parents would be advised of the decision in a letter from the Governing Board. Wording for the letter was briefly discussed. It was agreed that SW would be thanked for her work on exploring the options. 9. Policies and procedures 9.1 Lettings Policy JC had reviewed the policy and made minor changes. Noted. 9.2 Education of Children in Care Policy HC and AR had reviewed the policy. The Safeguarding Lead had been changed from Carol Glover to	8.3	Ratnage had been given a tour of the school and had noted the building improvements and	
the projected pupil numbers were lower for the next few intakes and there was insufficient infrastructure in place to support a further increase in pupil numbers. 8.6	8.4		
suggested that the only negative impact would be the geographical splitting of the year 2 classrooms. 8.7 A parent had raised concerns about the number of children in the school as a whole. SW said that strategies had already been put in place to manage playtimes and lunch times. 8.8 At the conclusion of discussion the following proposals were made and voted on: 8.8.1 The PAN to remain at 60 for the 2017/18 academic year – Refused. 8.8.2 The PAN to increase to 70 for 2017/18 academic year and for mixed Reception and Year 1 classes – Refused. 8.8.3 The PAN to increase to 73+ for the 2017/18 academic year with 3 Reception classes – Resolved. 8.9 Parents would be advised of the decision in a letter from the Governing Board. Wording for the letter was briefly discussed. It was agreed that SW would be thanked for her work on exploring the options. 9. Policies and procedures 9.1 Lettings Policy JC had reviewed the policy and made minor changes. Noted. 9.2 Education of Children in Care Policy HC and AR had reviewed the policy. The Safeguarding Lead had been changed from Carol Glover to	8.5	the projected pupil numbers were lower for the next few intakes and there was insufficient	
strategies had already been put in place to manage playtimes and lunch times. 8.8 At the conclusion of discussion the following proposals were made and voted on: 8.8.1 The PAN to remain at 60 for the 2017/18 academic year – Refused. 8.8.2 The PAN to increase to 70 for 2017/18 academic year and for mixed Reception and Year 1 classes – Refused. 8.8.3 The PAN to increase to 73+ for the 2017/18 academic year with 3 Reception classes – Resolved. 8.9 Parents would be advised of the decision in a letter from the Governing Board. Wording for the letter was briefly discussed. It was agreed that SW would be thanked for her work on exploring the options. 9. Policies and procedures 9.1 Lettings Policy JC had reviewed the policy and made minor changes. Noted. 9.2 Education of Children in Care Policy HC and AR had reviewed the policy. The Safeguarding Lead had been changed from Carol Glover to	8.6	suggested that the only negative impact would be the geographical splitting of the year 2	
 8.8.1 The PAN to remain at 60 for the 2017/18 academic year – Refused. 8.8.2 The PAN to increase to 70 for 2017/18 academic year and for mixed Reception and Year 1 classes – Refused. 8.8.3 The PAN to increase to 73+ for the 2017/18 academic year with 3 Reception classes – Resolved. 8.9 Parents would be advised of the decision in a letter from the Governing Board. Wording for the letter was briefly discussed. It was agreed that SW would be thanked for her work on exploring the options. 9. Policies and procedures 9.1 Lettings Policy JC had reviewed the policy and made minor changes. Noted. 9.2 Education of Children in Care Policy HC and AR had reviewed the policy. The Safeguarding Lead had been changed from Carol Glover to 	8.7	strategies had already been put in place to manage playtimes and lunch times.	
 8.8.2 The PAN to increase to 70 for 2017/18 academic year and for mixed Reception and Year 1 classes – Refused. 8.8.3 The PAN to increase to 73+ for the 2017/18 academic year with 3 Reception classes – Resolved. 8.9 Parents would be advised of the decision in a letter from the Governing Board. Wording for the letter was briefly discussed. It was agreed that SW would be thanked for her work on exploring the options. 9. Policies and procedures 9.1 Lettings Policy JC had reviewed the policy and made minor changes. Noted. 9.2 Education of Children in Care Policy HC and AR had reviewed the policy. The Safeguarding Lead had been changed from Carol Glover to 			
Refused. 8.8.3 The PAN to increase to 73+ for the 2017/18 academic year with 3 Reception classes – Resolved. 8.9 Parents would be advised of the decision in a letter from the Governing Board. Wording for the letter was briefly discussed. It was agreed that SW would be thanked for her work on exploring the options. 9. Policies and procedures 9.1 Lettings Policy JC had reviewed the policy and made minor changes. Noted. 9.2 Education of Children in Care Policy HC and AR had reviewed the policy. The Safeguarding Lead had been changed from Carol Glover to		·	
Parents would be advised of the decision in a letter from the Governing Board. Wording for the letter was briefly discussed. It was agreed that SW would be thanked for her work on exploring the options. 9. Policies and procedures 9.1 Lettings Policy JC had reviewed the policy and made minor changes. Noted. 9.2 Education of Children in Care Policy HC and AR had reviewed the policy. The Safeguarding Lead had been changed from Carol Glover to	8.8.2		
letter was briefly discussed. It was agreed that SW would be thanked for her work on exploring the options. 9. Policies and procedures 9.1 Lettings Policy JC had reviewed the policy and made minor changes. Noted. 9.2 Education of Children in Care Policy HC and AR had reviewed the policy. The Safeguarding Lead had been changed from Carol Glover to	8.8.3	The PAN to increase to 73+ for the 2017/18 academic year with 3 Reception classes – Resolved.	SW
 9. Policies and procedures 9.1 Lettings Policy JC had reviewed the policy and made minor changes. Noted. 9.2 Education of Children in Care Policy HC and AR had reviewed the policy. The Safeguarding Lead had been changed from Carol Glover to 	8.9	letter was briefly discussed. It was agreed that SW would be thanked for her work on exploring the	TF
9.1 Lettings Policy JC had reviewed the policy and made minor changes. Noted. 9.2 Education of Children in Care Policy HC and AR had reviewed the policy. The Safeguarding Lead had been changed from Carol Glover to	9.		
JC had reviewed the policy and made minor changes. Noted. 9.2 Education of Children in Care Policy HC and AR had reviewed the policy. The Safeguarding Lead had been changed from Carol Glover to			
9.2 Education of Children in Care Policy HC and AR had reviewed the policy. The Safeguarding Lead had been changed from Carol Glover to	J.±		
	9.2	Education of Children in Care Policy	
SW. NOIEG.		SW. Noted.	

40	RV had reviewed the policy. Noted.	
4.0	The state of the post of the court	HH
10.	Allocation of evidence gathering for School Development Plan (SDP)	
10.1	SW had circulated a list of suggested monitoring opportunities, with deadlines for reporting back.	
10.2	The Instead review was taking place during the week beginning 23 January. This would be a	
	rehearsal for an Ofsted inspection. All Governors were invited and encouraged to take part if	
	available.	All
Monito	ring (2)	
11.	Outcomes for Pupils	
11.1	Further scrutiny of RAISE online data	
	Not discussed.	
11.2	Fischer Family Trust (FFT) data	
11.2.1	The dashboard data was circulated and would be uploaded onto the Google Drive alongside the	
	Powerpoint presented at the meeting.	
11.2.2	SW explained that the FFT data was being used in school for target setting.	
11.2.3	National and regional data was considered.	
11.2.4	TF noted the importance of data in informing a strategic view for the Governing Board.	
Governi	ing Body	
12.	Housekeeping	
12.1	Governor Handbook	
	A new version of the Governor Handbook and Competency Framework had been issued by the DfE.	
	These were available in the Governor Information folder on the Google Drive.	
12.2	Staff Code of Conduct	
	A document called "Safer Working Practice Guidelines" includes all the information required within	
	a Staff Code of Conduct. (As mentioned on the Spring Term checklist).	<u> </u>
	The meeting closed at 21:12	

Signed:...... Date:.....09/02/2017.....