

**Exminster Community Primary School Full Governing Board Meeting 5/2019-20**  
**Thursday, 16 Jan 2020, 18:00 at Exminster Community Primary School**  
**MINUTES**

Present					
Name	Initial	Position	Name	Initial	Position
Sarah Whalley	SW	Headteacher	Jonathan Wood	JW	Governor (Co-opted)
Talitha Kerrigan	TK	Governor (Co-opted)	Paul Frazer	PF	Governor (Co-opted)
Stephen McDonald	SM	Governor (Par)	Sam Slingsby	SS	Governor (Staff)
Ian Rogers	IR	Governor (Co-opted)	Liam Hatton	LH	Governor (Co-opted)
Alwyn Reeves	AR	Governor (LEA)	Bec Dupre	BD	Governor (Par)
John Collins	JC	Governor (Co-opted)	Paul Herring	PH	Assistant Headteacher
Kate Beale	KB	Governor (Co-opted)	Ian Moore	IM	Deputy Headteacher
Helen Hibbins	HH	Clerk			

Apologies			
Name	Initial	Position	Reason
Hamish Cherrett	HC	Governor (Co-opted)	Family 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.**

Summary of Meeting
<b>Resolutions: To adopt the Babcock model complaints procedure</b>

Item	Action
<b>1. Welcome</b> 1.1 New Parent Governor, Bec Dupre, introduced herself and outlined her background in secondary education. 1.2 <b>Apologies for absence</b> Approved as listed above.	
<b>2. <u>Declarations of Interest on agenda items</u></b> None declared.	
<b>3. <u>To approve the part I and part II minutes of the Full Governing Board meeting on 12 December 2019</u></b> ❖ <b>Related Documents: 2019-12-12 FGB Draft Minutes</b> 3.1 Amendment to item 9.3 in the part I minutes to include that the reading element of the budget would be reduced by the amount spent on the new books. It was resolved to approve the minutes with this amendment. 3.2 It was resolved to approve the part II minutes as circulated at the meeting.	
<b>4. <u>Update on actions (not included elsewhere on agenda)</u></b>	

4.1	All Governors to book onto training courses (via the Clerk) and inform the Clerk on completion to update the Governors' training record. <i>Ongoing reminder</i>	
4.2	14/11/2019 - 11.3 - Monitor parking in Hillcrest <i>Remove from actions list</i>	
4.3	12/12/2019 - 5.1.1 - IR to download certificate from Headteacher Appraisal Course and send to HH for training record <i>Done</i>	
4.4	12/12/2019 - 6.1.2 - Complaints policy to be agreed at the January FGB <i>See agenda item 9</i>	
4.5	12/12/2019 - 7.4 - Publicity for SATS results/school comparison tables etc <i>A link the DfE tables were publicised in the newsletter and on the website</i> <i>Done</i>	
4.6	12/12/2019 - 9.3 - Publicise fund donations being used for the purchase of books chosen by the children in newsletter <i>Done</i>	
4.7	12/12/2019 - 9.7 - JC and SW to discuss how spending from donations could be tracked against the budget <i>Meeting arranged with LH, SW and JC</i> <i>Ongoing</i>	
4.8	12/12/2019 - 10.8 - Read article in Governance Today regarding safeguarding and site security <i>Ongoing reminder</i>	
<b>5.</b>	<b><u>Fundraising update</u></b>	
5.1	Parents were supportive of the Amazon Wish Lists.	
5.2	The resources being purchased would impact on the resources budget.	
5.3	The lists would be refreshed each month in accordance with class requirements.	
5.4	The positive uptake and outcome of purchases from the Wish Lists should be celebrated in the newsletter and on the facebook page.	SW
5.5	The Fundraising Committee should be advised of progress.	SW
5.6	It was suggested that the request for monthly contributions could be publicised alongside the Wish Lists.	SW
<b>6.</b>	<b><u>Premises, Health and Safety Update</u></b>	
6.1	PF and IM would meet in early February.	PF/IM
6.2	IM reported that there had been several central heating pump failures over the last few months.	
6.3	A fascia board on the hub had become detached as the wood behind it had rotted. NPS did not believe that it was their responsibility to rectify this and stated that it was a maintenance issue. However, the maintenance contractor who repaired it noted additional issues. These would be advised to DCC to liaise with NPS regarding rectification.	IM
6.4	Churchills risk assessment had noted some updates needed in the hub relating to plumbing - this would be reported back to NPS/DCC as should have been completed at the time of construction. Rectification work had taken place after the H&S audit in October and the rating had improved from 93% to 100%.	
6.5	The grounds maintenance day, during the October half term had proved successful. It was suggested that a future event could be planned for a weekend. JC to liaise with Frankie to organise.	JC
6.6	Referring to the safeguarding and site security article in Governance Today, AR asked about the overlap between the Safeguarding Lead Governor role and the Buildings, Health & Safety Lead Governor role. SW responded that site security was checked as part of a standard safeguarding check. SM noted that security of the site was not just about premises; signing in procedures should also be considered.	

6.7	AR noted how he had recently talked to children about feeling safe in school as part of the safeguarding audit and would continue to do this on his safeguarding visits.	AR
7.	<p><b><u>Ofsted Self Evaluation Form (SEF)</u></b></p> <p>❖ <b>Related Documents: 2020-Jan SEF, School Inspection Handbook</b></p> <p>7.1 Governors were divided into 5 groups to compare the SEF with the school inspection handbook. Each area was compared with Ofsted criteria using evidence from the SEF to inform a grading.</p> <p>7.2 Governors should validate the evidence provided on the SEF during Governor visits.</p> <p>7.3 <b>Leadership and Management – Governor opinion: good</b></p> <p>7.3.1 It was suggested that the SEF document reflected the Framework document more closely. SW noted that it may initially make the document unwieldy, due to overlap between criteria in the different areas, but could be edited down.</p> <p>7.3.2 Some evidence in the SEF was not defined clearly enough to justify an outstanding rating.</p> <p>7.3.3 There were more initiatives in place in school (such as subject leadership development) than were outlined in the SEF. It was acknowledged that some of the initiatives were still in development.</p> <p>7.3.4 It was asked whether Governors needed additional training to support the school in this area.</p> <p>7.3.5 SLT agreed with the good judgement.</p> <p>7.4 <b>Quality of Education – Governor opinion: on the cusp between good and outstanding.</b></p> <p>7.4.1 There were a couple of areas that needed more research/evidence to be able to qualify as outstanding; notably SEND and most disadvantaged children.</p> <p>7.4.2 There was plenty of evidence of high quality achievement and progress but more needed to support an outstanding judgement.</p> <p>7.4.3 SW noted that from listening to school leaders who had been through the new framework, they had identified the new framework as much harsher.</p> <p>7.4.4 Incremental coaching was explained and its applicability to early career teachers. This would be evidenced by CPD.</p> <p>7.5 <b>Behaviours and Attitudes – Governor opinion: good</b></p> <p>7.5.1 It was noted that evidence was within the SEF, but it was difficult to correlate with the Framework and therefore it was unclear whether an outstanding rating was warranted.</p> <p>7.5.2 Governors who were parents should be cautious that their opinion on behaviour was not influenced by their child/children’s perspective.</p> <p>7.5.3 It was felt that this was a difficult area to quantify and judge. It was suggested that an explanation of how the school “measured” this, was presented at a future meeting.</p> <p>7.5.4 It was suggested that pupil voice could be used to inform the SEF.</p> <p>7.5.5 It was felt that outstanding was achievable but not necessarily evidenced at this time.</p> <p>7.6 <b>Personal Development – Governor opinion: good</b></p> <p>7.6.1 The wording extensive and consistent, used in the Ofsted framework, were difficult to measure, evidence and monitor.</p> <p>7.6.2 SW noted that it was a difficult area to show impact. There was no data to evidence it. Pupil voice was required from different viewpoints.</p> <p>7.6.3 It was suggested that a parental survey could also be used for evidence.</p> <p>7.7 <b>Early Years – Governor opinion: good</b></p> <p>7.7.1 The school either met, or were in the process of meeting, the good criteria.</p> <p>7.8 The strengths outlined in the SEF were more about social and developmental issues rather than, for example, phonics.</p> <p>7.8.1 There were several initiatives that were not listed in the SEF such as maths projects.</p> <p>7.8.2 The phonics data, although good, was not comprehensive; fluency was not evident.</p> <p>7.8.3 School were reviewing the phonics scheme being used and the need for fidelity to one scheme to ensure more consistency.</p>	SLT
8.	<b><u>School Development Plan (SDP) and Governor Visits</u></b>	

8.1	An exercise took place where Governors were asked to consider the four strands of the school development plan and think of appropriate questions that could be asked during Governor visits, or of the SLT, to evidence its implementation and impact.	All
8.2	Governors were asked to feedback the questions, by email, to the SLT so that appropriate monitoring visits could be suggested.	
8.3	IR reported on an initial Governor Visit on Personal Development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Personal Development section of the Ofsted Framework was extensive, including sex education, religion and British values.</li> <li>There was a wide range of opportunities available at school to enable development; a list would be produced by the SLT.</li> <li>When teachers had considered how the activities and requirements could be incorporated into the curriculum, a further visit would take place to see how these were being implemented.</li> <li>AR asked whether there was a workload issue? IR commented that only time would tell. It may be that some of the requirements were already being met but had not been formally recognised.</li> </ul>	
9.	<b><u>To receive a recommendation on the structure of the Complaints Procedure/Policy</u></b> ❖ <b>Related Documents: DCC Model Complaints Procedure part 1, DCC Model Complaints Procedure part 2, School's existing Complaints Procedure</b>	HH/ SW
9.1	SM explained that the school's current procedure and the model procedure provided by Babcock were misaligned.	
9.2	It was agreed that the Babcock model would be easier to implement in school and was more straightforward for parents to follow.	
9.3	It was resolved to adopt the Babcock Model.	
The meeting closed at 20:02		

**Dates of next FGB meetings:**

Spring Term	Summer Term
13 February	23 April
12 March	21 May
	18 June
	16 July

Signed:.....S McDonald..... Date:.....13/02/2020.....