

**Exminster Community Primary School Full Governing Board Meeting 3/2017-18**  
**Thursday, 16 Nov 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)
Ian Rogers	IR	Governor (Co-opted)	Becky Mason	BM	Governor (Co-opted)
Paul Herring	PH	Assistant Headteacher	Gordon Peacock	GP	Governor (Co-opted)
Alwyn Reeves	AR	Governor (LEA)	Ian Moore	IM	Deputy Headteacher
John Collins	JC	Governor (Co-opted)	Sam Slingsby	SS	Governor (Staff)
Helen Fisher	HF	Governor (Co-opted)	Helen Hibbins	HH	Clerk
Frankie Hyde	FH	Teacher (Visitor)	Claire Norman	CN	Teacher (Visitor)
<b>Apologies</b>					
<b>Name</b>	<b>Initial</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reason</b>		
Stephen McDonald	SM	Governor (Par)	Abroad		
Richard Vain	RV	Governor (Co-opted)	Childcare issues		
Hamish Cherrett	HC	Governor (Co-opted)	Family Commitment		

**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>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SEND policy approved</li> </ul>

<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>1. <u>Welcome</u></b> The meeting opened at 18:02	
<b>2. <u>Apologies for Absence</u></b> Apologies were accepted as listed above.	
<b>3. <u>Declarations of Interest on Agenda Items</u></b> 3.1 BM declared an interest in items associated with PE due to her employment with the Dartmoor School Sports Partnership. 3.2 PF declared an interest in staffing matters due to his wife's employment as a Learning Support Assistant (LSA) at school.	
<b>4. <u>To receive a report on Pupil Premium (PP) Strategy</u></b> ❖ <b>Related Documents: Pupil Premium Report</b> 4.1 The report had been circulated prior to the meeting.	

Item	Action
<p>4.2 The structure and content of the report were explained by SW and FH.</p> <p>4.3 The following questions were raised:  <i>Q: Did dyslexia testing take place within school? (IR)</i>  A: SW explained that the school had an association with QE school in Crediton that had specialists in dyslexia and literacy difficulties. The assessments used at QE were replicated within school to identify areas of difficulty. The school was unable to fund diagnostic testing due to its high cost and the assessments were a cost effective way to identify children with literacy difficulties to ensure that they received appropriate help.  <i>Q: When and how would the results of the PP strategy be measured? (TF)</i>  A: There would be data available on a termly basis. (FH)  <i>Q: Would the data differentiate between PP children with Special Educational Needs and those without? (CN)</i>  A: Yes.</p> <p>4.4 The PP Strategy report would be uploaded to the school website as it was a statutory requirement to make it publicly available.</p> <p>4.5 FH was thanked for her attendance and left the meeting.</p>	PH
<p><b>5. <u>To review the Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) report and approve amendments to the SEND policy</u></b>  ❖ <b>Related Documents: SEN Information Report 2017-2018 (annotated), SEN Policy – final 2017-2018 (annotated)</b></p> <p>5.1 The report and policy had been circulated prior to the meeting.</p> <p>5.2 Updates were needed to the policy due to changes in agency involvement and terminology.</p> <p>5.3 A new IT system for the management of SEND had been implemented. The gap between the take up of the system between Education and Health and Social Care was highlighted.</p> <p>5.4 The consultation on a new banding system for Education and Health Care Plans (EHCP) had closed but to date, there was no confirmation on the outcome.</p> <p>5.5 The process of statutory assessment had become more difficult. The school were required to highlight the needs of a child that it was unable to meet.</p> <p>5.6 The provision in the SEND information report had been updated; reflecting current practice in school with changing needs. As with the SEND policy, there were changes in terminology and with the amounts for element 2 and element 3 funding.</p> <p>5.7 <i>TF asked whether the school had adequate provision for SEND now that the multisensory room had been removed?</i> CN advised that, over the last few years, the use of the multisensory room for its intended purpose had declined. A multipurpose room was much more valuable.</p> <p>5.8 It was resolved to approve the updated SEND policy.</p> <p>5.9 The SEND report and SEND policy would be uploaded onto the school website.</p> <p>5.10 CN was thanked for her attendance and left the meeting.</p>	PH/HH
<p><b>6. <u>To approve the minutes of the Full Governing Board Meeting on 12 October 2017</u></b>  ❖ <b>Related Documents: 2017-10-12 Draft Minutes</b></p> <p>6.1 It was resolved to approve both the part I and part II minutes. (The part II minutes were circulated in hard copy at the meeting).</p>	
<p><b>7. <u>Progress on Actions (not included elsewhere on agenda)</u></b></p> <p>7.1 All Governors to book onto a training courses (via the Clerk) or undertake online training and inform the Clerk on completion to update the Governors' training record. Click for link to online training. (You will need to register in your own name) – Ongoing reminder.</p> <p>7.2 21/09/2017 - 13.8 - Explore charitable status of Exminster School Association (ESA) in conjunction with its current constitution – <i>TF would circulate a written report on his findings, but overall there</i></p>	

Item	Action
<p><i>needed to be more alliance between the Governing Board and ESA. BM requested that more Governors attended the ESA meetings - Ongoing</i></p> <p>7.3 12/10/2017 - 6.4 - Priority projects for income generation to be explored further by SLT and SM- Ongoing</p> <p>7.4 12/10/2017 - 9.3 - Report to FGB on Pupil Premium, THRIVE and narrowing the attainment gap between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged children - Ongoing</p> <p>7.5 12/10/2017 - 9.3 - Report to FGB on narrowing the gender gap in attainment - Ongoing</p> <p>7.6 12/10/2017 - 9.3 - Report to FGB on improving writing attainment through development of SPaG throughout the school - Ongoing</p> <p>7.7 12/10/2017 - 9.3 - Report to FGB on embedding of GOAL throughout the school - Ongoing</p> <p>7.8 12/10/2017 - 10.4 - Governor visit to observe and monitor impact of Achievement Team meetings - Ongoing</p>	TF
<p><b>8. To receive a report from the Lead Governor for Finance on the October Budget Monitor</b></p> <p>❖ <b>Related Documents: Budget Monitor – October 2017</b></p> <p>8.1 The budget monitor had been circulated prior to the meeting.</p> <p>8.2 JC had prepared a comparison document between the figures discussed in June and the October figures, highlighting the differences in variance forecasts.</p> <p>8.3 The following questions were answered by the Headteacher before the meeting and were reported by JC:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>Q: Why was SEND forecast income down by £15473?</i> A: DCC had claimed back £10,000 for a child who had left the school, £2,500 was owing for a child and the remaining £3,000 was due to Individual Assigned resources.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>Q: Why was the SEND forecast expenditure up by £8493?</i> A: This was due to a child who currently accessed some education off site. This was currently funded; partly paid, with further reimbursement expected.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>Q: Why was Teaching Staff forecast expenditure down by £35,174?</i> A: Positions were not confirmed until July and there had been further changes since then.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>Q: Why had the forecast for LSA costs increased by £10,756?</i> A: This was due to the differences in children’s needs since June. This would increase further as a new member of staff was being appointed.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>Q: Why had the Supply Illness Cover forecast increased?</i> A: Some insurance had been received to offset this; recorded in a separate income line.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>Q: Why had the Office Costs forecast expenditure increased?</i> A: Due to the costs of running and maintaining the three new photocopiers and their increased usage. Staff have been advised about the high costs.</p> <p>8.4 JC would investigate the office costs overspend and teaching staff underspend further, to fully understand the issues.</p> <p>8.5 <i>PF asked whether the teaching staff underspend would offset the LSA overspend?</i> SW explained that the LSA’s supported individual children and therefore there was no relationship in the budget lines.</p> <p>8.6 It was noted that PE funding was increasing. <i>JC asked whether this increase could be used to offset lower SEND funding in specific cases.</i> SW explained that the PE funding was ringfenced with stringent rules on expenditure.</p> <p>8.7 <i>TF asked whether the Supply Illness insurance covered costs?</i> SW explained that the insurance only applied after 10 days absence. SW would ask for this insurance income to be shown separately in future months so that it was directly comparable.</p> <p>8.8 <i>IR noted that surpluses may be capped in 2020 and that it may be worthwhile putting income such as residential costs in a school fund rather than keep it as part of DSG.</i></p> <p>8.9 SW would ask AM about the notes on the budget monitor.</p>	<p>JC</p> <p>SW</p> <p>SW</p>
<p><b>9. Headteachers Report</b></p>	

Item	Action
<p>❖ <b>Related Documents: Headteacher's Report</b></p> <p>9.1 The report had been circulated prior to the meeting.</p> <p>9.2 SW briefly outlined the report. The following points were noted for action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IR and SS expressed an interest in undertaking a safer recruitment course. It was possible that this could be accessed online.</li> <li>• All Governors had a responsibility for Safeguarding. When visiting school Governors could, for example, ask to check the single central record (noting any gaps) or ask safeguarding questions of staff. SW would provide a suitable list of questions. Any issues should be immediately notified to a member of the safeguarding team. A spreadsheet for recording visits would be made available in the Safeguarding for Governors folder on the google drive.</li> </ul> <p>9.3 Governors asked the following questions on the report:</p> <p><i>Q: How were the new teaching staff settling in [as there had been a large turnover with a number of staff on maternity leave this term]? (JW)</i></p> <p>A: They were being supported within their units with mentors and buddies for the NQT's. All the NQT's were progressing well. (SW)</p> <p><i>Q: Was there any further news on information on Multi Academy Trusts? (PF)</i></p> <p>A: None currently. (SW)</p>	<p>IR/SS/ SW</p> <p>SW/ HH</p>
<p><b>10. Analyse School Performance (ASP) data</b></p> <p>❖ <b>Online ASP data</b></p> <p>10.1 Governors had been given access to the anonymised online data.</p> <p>10.2 The Ofsted Inspection Data Summary Report (IDSR) had only just been released and would be discussed at the next meeting. However, it was noted that the areas for investigation were all positive although it was unlikely that Ofsted would visit in the next year.</p> <p>10.3 SW explained that the ASP KS2 data reported on the Year 6 children who left in July 2017.</p> <p>10.4 The school was above national average in progress in reading and maths and average in writing. The progress of disadvantaged children was in line with national average but the data was volatile due to it being based on fewer than 10 children.</p> <p>10.5 The combined results for reading, writing and maths saw 81% of children achieving the expected standard against a national average of 61%. The percentage of children achieving the higher standard was 3% above the national average.</p> <p>10.6 The KS1 data showed the school as being 1% below the national average in reading and writing and 3% below the national average in maths. The IDSR did not identify this as a trend.</p> <p>10.7 The phonics screen result was above national average.</p> <p>10.8 PH explained that the question level analysis allowed performance to be broken down further so that areas of weakness could be focused on in the lesson planning for this year. For example, geometry would be a focus in maths. The question papers were scrutinized against the data to identify the gaps.</p> <p>10.9 <i>IR asked how the in-school data had compared with the ASP data? PH said that it was mainly aligned, but with more children achieving at the higher level than anticipated.</i></p>	<p>HH</p>

Signed:.....T Fripp..... Date:.....7 Dec 2017.....