The London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames

Sheen Mount School

Minutes of the Full Governing Board Meeting
Held at School on
6th February 2019 at 7.00pm

Constitution, Membership and Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority Governors - 1</th>
<th>Maria Widdowson (MW)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent Governors – 2</td>
<td>Nikki Christmas (NC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justine Hebert (JH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Governors – 2</td>
<td>Nicola Hope-Evans (NHE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ian Hutchings (IH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-opted Governors – 10</td>
<td>Mona Adams (MA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(attended the meeting until 9pm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kelly -Ann Cahillane (KAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helen Edward (HE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anna Hare (AH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kathryn Higgins (KH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Vice Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pukar Mehta (PM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Read (ER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Standards Committee Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catherine Riley (CR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Pastoral Committee Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Julia Sandell (JS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tilly Walters (TW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Resources Committee Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Governors – 3</td>
<td>Laura Jeffery (LJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maria O’Brien (MOB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marianne Paemen (MP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk to the board</td>
<td>Christine Hare (CH)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Absence(s) in Bold

It was noted that due notice of the meeting had been given to all members of FGB, a quorum was present and that the meeting could proceed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Item</th>
<th>Item (Lead)</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcome by JH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A welcome given to governors at this third FGB of the academic year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# The London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames
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## 1a Declaration of Interests (JH)

There were no declarations of interests.

- Completed and signed Declaration of interest forms for the new academic year 2018/19 received from all present – still to be completed by LJ, AH. Declaration of interest forms to be signed at next FGB meeting.

**Signed………………………………………………...**

**Date** 6 February 2019

## 1b

**A. Minutes and actions from the November meeting (JH)**

Minutes were approved with the additional discussion captured below:

- **Link Governor Reports:** Discussed as an item later in the agenda.
- **Effective School Visits:** MW to look at best practice and guidelines of when governor form is filled in and what is put on it and share with the board. C/o to next FGB meeting.
- **Training – Joint Partnership Meeting:** c/o slides to be shared by JH.
- **Governor Induction:** Add DfE registration of new governors by IH to Induction process.
- **Resources committee:** Schedule a date for the budget presentation – pre-committees in advance of next FGB.

## B. Motion to Amend Something Previously Adopted ref. May 2018 Minutes (See Annex) (JH)

- Unusually, there were factual corrections required to be made on 16 May 2018 FGB Minutes on page 11. An annex distributed to FGB prior to the meeting outlined the proposed amendments to be made. These were relating to Fair Processing Notice and the Data Protection officer role. This motion was adopted by the FGB unanimously.

The previously adopted minutes were amended by making the appropriate correction and the new minutes were signed by the Chair.

**Action:** Maintain and file the new minutes which now become the official record of the 16 May 2018 meeting. Also, upload new minutes to SM website.
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| 20190206_FGB_Minutes_For Approval |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. e-Votes (JH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Voted to allow Helen Edward to fill the vacant Co-opted Governor position &amp; stand on Pastoral committee with full voting rights. There were a sufficient number of e-votes to pass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Voted to approve the revised Safeguarding &amp; Child Protection Policy as of December 2018. There were a sufficient number of e-votes to pass.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2a</th>
<th>Governing Body Membership (JH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Confirmation of new Co-opted Governor: JH introduced the latest new Co-opted Governor, Helen Edward as per the e-vote above. Helen is an independent governor not a parent, thus providing appropriate balance on the board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Re-Election Co-opted Governor: It was acknowledged that Mona Adams’s, four-year term would expire before the next FGB meeting. MA left the room and the board voted to renew her role as Co-opted governor for a further four-year term.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vote</strong> for re-election of Mona Adams as Co-opted governor of the Governing Body. A show of hands at 7.14pm to approve resulting in 13 in favour, 0 against, 1 abstention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2b</th>
<th>Restructuring of Roles, Committees and FGB (JH/All)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Confirmation of Link Governor Roles: The Chair confirmed that with the exception of Data Protection (see below), all governor roles including link roles were now filled. The new appointments are: Behaviour &amp; Anti-Bullying Link - JS; Safeguarding 2nd Link - HE; and SEN 2nd Link - JS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was agreed that more work needed to be done to understand what was needed in the Data Protection role in order to identify the most suitable governor with the appropriate skills to fill this role.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors were comfortable with the allocation of the new roles based on the annex circulated at the beginning of the FGB meeting. (See Annex attached).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Action: Data Protection (GDPR) role is to be discussed. JH and TW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TW/JH |
### Governor Skills, Training and Induction – Update (JH/MW/IH)

**A. Highlights from Governor Training/Meetings:**

The Chair thanked the new governors for their rapid uptake and attendance at recent trainings so quickly after commencing their new governor membership.

Recent training completed includes: Getting to Grips with Governance, Safeguarding, Leading in Governance, Getting it Right as a Parent Governor, The Ofsted Framework.

MW was also thanked for her attendance at The Ofsted Framework training. Very useful as will inform our thinking in the summer term when looking at the SDP for next year.

**Action:** New governors to give an update verbally before Committee meetings on 8 May on recent trainings undertaken, in particular Parent Governor skills.

**Action:** Circulate key notes or relevant material following any training undertaken.

### SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT AND PROGRESS

**3a Head Teacher Report (IH)**

**Overview of school performance and activities including any updates on SDP objectives (other than SEN – as main item and covered below)**

The Head was very pleased to report that on 28/01/19 there were 599 children on roll out of a total capacity of 600 children – 99.8% full - an incredible achievement given the roll status of other local schools. Also have the potential of reaching 100% capacity once a decision on the final vacancy is determined. Reputation plays an important role in driving this and it’s also good for budgetary purposes. However, the waiting list is smaller than it was, although a brief discussion ensued around the Mortlake Brewery development with the potential for 1000 residential units and the development at Manor Road which would also increase demand for places.

**Q: Is it equally reflected across all the schools?**

**A: The current Year 6 is the first of the bulge in the area (SM and East Sheen Primary took a bulge at the same time). As the school is full it is credit to the admin team who have filled**
up the spaces given that other local schools are not full. It shows the systems are working well.

A separate Inspection Data Summary Report (ISDR) 2018 was circulated prior to FGB meeting and this was explained to the governors as how it would be used by Ofsted to form the key-lines of enquiry based on assessment data. IH took everyone through the key highlights of the document indicating that it’s a positive picture for SM.

**Q: What are we hearing from parents about the results?**

**A:** Parents are looking at last year’s schools results including via the league tables and have questions, particularly the reception parents and they have noticed decline in Greater Depth over the last three years (end of KS2). IH will present the results shortly to a group of reception parents addressing some of their concerns, which with the full range of data can be very positively done.

It’s been a discussion at Standards Committee as to how we proactively get our story across as having raw data with no narrative can cause questions and its important to own the narrative. Next year we will be doing an update to address this.

IH gave an update on the recent Behaviour and Anti-Bullying Communication sessions and the Maths Curriculum Evening, where parents were able to give feedback. They were very well received sessions and positive information was shared.

For attendance, as of 28th January 2019 the overall figure is still above the 97% target. Only Year 6 are below this with 96.36% this (caused mainly by the secondary transfer process).

A new Child Protection Online Monitoring System (CPOMS) has been launched this term, giving all staff the ability to log safeguarding and significant behavioural incidents. The software alerts users and allows for a full track and record of actions. Chronologies for specific children can be looked at and it provides a central access point for all safeguarding records.

**Action:** A more in-depth presentation on CPOMS to be demonstrated to Pastoral Committee at a future session to see its effectiveness.

IH acknowledged the great work done by MW in relation to Health and Safety as she has completed the first of her regular visits into school supporting health and safety.
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IH summarised other H&S initiatives such as the completion of some tree safety work, a risk assessment on the demolition and rebuild of a neighbouring property to the school on Derby Road and completion of PAT testing in January 2019 of all electrical equipment in the school.

Pupil Progress Meetings are taking place this week.

**Q: How does the pupil tracking information feed into parents’ meetings?**

**A:** Based on our SDP and target setting, there is now a greater emphasis on the combined scores being achieved by children and overall percentages of children achieving expected standard or greater in reading, writing and Maths. The staff are aware of these scores and can use these in the parent meetings although some are more comfortable with this than others.

There was a discussion around staffing and how the school can retain good staff whilst allowing them flexibility. There is support in connection with recruitment and retention strategy.

**Q: By allowing a 6-month sabbatical for example, is this a good way of retaining staff?**

**A:** IH is keen to retain good staff and having a sabbatical can retain their commitment and therefore be a win win. It was queried whether from a policy covering sabbaticals should be written. It was felt that this might set an expectation and therefore it might encourage this type of request rather than it being an exception.

Regarding Admissions, for Reception in 2019 there have been 344 applications of which 99 are first choice. 37 are siblings. There are no SEN applicants identified at this stage.

**Q: Due to there being no SEN applicants, does this result in the school losing money?**

**A:** This will be part of the SEN presentation later in the FGB meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3b</th>
<th><strong>SEN Update (LJ)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prior to FGB meeting there were a number of annexes distributed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A. SEN overview and progress this year against SDP SEN priority</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A very comprehensive and key update on the progress of SEND for this year was provided with reference to the SDP SEN strategic priority.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The timing of this presentation had been strategically planned to coincide with the Inclusion Manager (LJ) being in the post for over a year and thereby providing helpful insights.

This timely presentation commenced outlining the current SEND profile and then what observations were of marked interest. Next, LJ indicated what changes and improvements have been made in the year and what challenges have been faced. One notable change is the launch of a lunchtime provision called ‘The Nest’ for children with ASD / anxiety.

**Q: Is the school getting good at SEN generally?**

*A: In general, but not wanting to be pigeon holed. It reflects the local community. The data highlights that the school is going above and beyond to take its fair share of SEN in the area compared to other local schools.*

**Q: Are there children that should have EHCPs that don’t and are there other schools that are better at fighting that corner?**

*A: No, it’s a changing platform in terms of all schools struggling financially. The LA and the SEN department have become more rigid in following their agenda. SM has been very successful in the past at getting EHCP plans through. One school isn’t better than another at putting plans through – all the inclusion leaders work together and know how to fill in the paperwork which gets presented at panel.*

**Q: Are there parents not wanting their child to be on a plan?**

*A: Parents have been convinced and won over when it’s explained in detail to them.*

IH thanked the board for questions submitted prior to the meeting and highlighted the question around the number of children on the SEN register needing support but not with EHCPs and whether this was low compared with other schools.

The percentage of children on the SEN register without EHCPs at SM is lower than in other schools in the borough. The leadership team believe this is an accurate reflection of the school community and the children’s needs and the LA agree that SM is following the correct representation on the SEN register which other schools may not be following so precisely.
LJ explained the difference between EHCP’s and SEN Support and also how SEN support plans are reviewed and how evidence shows the SEN notional budget (£6,000) is being used. An example was given showing how the flow chart works (see presentation) when a concern is raised. This then results in actions and SEN support plans. This is a process that parents have to be involved in.

B. Data and financial overview of SEN

The presentation continued with a synopsis of the SEND Notional budget. It was acknowledged that the SEND Notional budget is not additional money received but rather a suggested allocation from the schools’ AWPU money it receives. It’s derived from a formula that includes factors such as EYFS results – it does not take into account actual SEND figures or numbers of EHCPs. Last year the notional SEN was £254,000 which equates to 42 lots of £6000. If a school can prove they have used all of that, then they can go back to the LA and they can provide emergency top up funding. It is set high so in practice that never happens.

Q: If you are one of the 36 schools with 0% SEN children they still keep all that money?

A: Yes, there’s nothing additional.

There was a discussion around complicated nature of the SEND staff costs and the allocation of TA’s. There were helpful examples of three scenarios of staff with the associated costs to show the differences in full time cost for a child with SEND. Recruitment of TA’s is proving challenging and therefore the school need to use agency staff which ultimately is far less cost effective.

The school has an increasing mix of needs across the 36 children with some form of SEND.

There were further questions arising from the governors trying to understand the complexity of staff costs. It was explained that there is a formula based on various factors and the school receives a notional budget regardless. Therefore, it was noted that children with SEND needs have budgetary implications for the school, which need to be considered.

A breakdown of the additional ‘hidden’ costs to the school were highlighted.
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The governors continued to drill down into the detail.

Q: **What does £6,000 equate to?**

*A: 9 hours per week.*

LJ moved on from costs to the benefits to the school of an inclusive approach. The four elements she exemplified were: Staffing ratios; sharing expertise; life skills; and nurture & caring.

Q: **What are the benefits to the school?**

*A: It’s not a choice. Having children with SEND needs encourages more compassion and care among the school community.*

**C. Consideration of future school strategy in relation to SEND**

LJ mentioned that the key strategy is to maintain an inclusive approach to primary education and to continue to support and welcome families of children with SEND.

Q: **What is the cap for children with SEND? Do we cap the number of children with EHCP’s?**

*A: Whilst we can’t say no, they absorb time and commitment. There are financial implications. Areas needing consideration are:**

- What are the implications as numbers increase
- Annual review takes time
- Tip into different resourcing model
- Implications for the budget

One point highlighted was that as a board, it may need to think about a different resourcing model, should the number of children with SEND rise considerably.

Q: **What’s the maximum number of children with SEND needs in a class?**

*A: Two*

Q: **At what point is it difficult?**

*A: Three. Day to day can be very challenging and it depends on the need and depends on the particular class.*
### Q: Do you have a profile on a scale of 1-10 to grade the class?

**A:** No. There is one particular year group that is particularly heavy on EHCP. In total there is 19 EHCPs which corresponds to an average of 1 EHCP per class.

### Q: How are other schools dealing with finance?

**A:** SM is in a fortunate position to be full so the budget is not as challenging as for others, who are struggling. It’s a national problem however, there is a higher proportion of SEND in borough of Richmond due to factors such as average age of mothers is higher and number of multiple births is higher.

Interesting questions were raised by a governor, in relation to class profile.

### Q: Is there a way of calculating stress levels in each class?

**A:** As teachers and SLT, there is a good understanding of what class profiles are like.

### Q: Other than the school’s reputation is there a legal implication if the school says no?

**A:** Given that the school is inclusive by nature, there is no reason to say no.

### Q: Given there is a need, should the school get better at it and should a new unit provision be considered?

**A:** There are space/capacity issues not to mention the funding doesn’t cover the resources required.

### Q: Is the paperwork side of things streamlined?

**A:** Record keeping has improved and monitoring of, in particular, 1:1 support. This results in increased progress checks and any further actions.

**Action:** LJ look into the benefits of using Edu Key and follow up with the SEN team for creative ideas to continue to provide excellent SEND provision.

**Action:** AH to contact a person mentioned who has knowledge of SEND provisioning.

It was noted that when setting the budget to be mindful that EHCP has grown and therefore additional capacity is an important factor.

### Q: What clarity is there for September?

---

Signed: ...........................................................................  
Date: 6 February 2019
A: Already looking at LJ’s capacity and delegating tasks to staff.

The number of children with SEND is growing both at a school and borough level. The school is reviewing systems for early identification and intervention. The focus is on embedding reviews of provision at both a SEND Support and EHCP level, to ensure that interventions are effective and are improving the progress of our children with SEND.

At a borough level, SM Inclusion Leader will be involved in the first Early Intervention Panel, which will enable her to have an insight into this new process and how this can help support SM.

**Action:** Look at budgetary process, staffing model and what impact there would be with an increased SEND population.

FGB were very pleased to confirm that two recently appointed governors will have a particular focus on SEN – AH and JS.

The Chair concluded that this had been a really useful overview of SEND and thanked LJ for her greatly anticipated presentation.

The board was very pleased to reiterate its commitment to maintain the inclusive nature of the school and recognised the value this brings to our whole community.

**D. Approval of updated SEND policy**

The process for approving the SEND policy was omitted from the FGB meeting due to an oversight.

*Post meeting note: The school’s updated SEND policy has subsequently been approved by e-vote and is available on the school’s website. (See Annex)*

3c **New Ofsted Education Inspection Draft Framework (MOB)**

Building on the presentation provided at the last FGB, an update was provided on the newly released draft framework – although not much has changed since the last draft was shared at FGB.

There were 3 separate Ofsted documents that were shared prior to the FGB meeting. ‘Ofsted’s 2019 Framework Explained’ contains all the main information in the form of a five-page summary.
Ofsted’s New Framework includes the 4 key judgement areas:


Quality of Education will be judged and will be divided into three as follows:

- Intent
- Implementation
- Impact

The above are ‘buzz’ words at the moment.

MOB highlighted what SM does well in the context of the headlines on the new Ofsted framework. Specifically looking at intent, SM is focused on building towards clear ‘end points’, the school’s curriculum is planned and sequenced and the curriculum reflects the school’s local context. Unlike other school’s, SM has not narrowed the curriculum and SM does a good job in preparing children for their future lives.

Implementation and impact were addressed next and it was again reiterated that there is a big emphasis on preparing citizens of the future.

There is a focus on the definition of cultural capital and the extent to which schools are equipping pupils with the knowledge and cultural capital they need to succeed in life.

Taking all these things into account means that its not just quality of education but the other areas that will be judged.

MOB emphasized how articulating everything that is being done at SM is important and specific documents are required to capture everything in one place.

**Q: Do the children understand what the curriculum is?**

**A: They think its limited to Maths and English.**

**Q: How do Governors monitor the effectiveness of curriculum/ help?**

- *Visit school as much as possible*
- *Ask questions regarding the curriculum*
- *Take onboard how Ofsted think about curriculum use this in questioning*
MOB continued to speak about the introduction of the new Ofsted framework commencing in September 2019 and how things are being fed in already. With the imminent new framework being introduced, its given SM the opportunity to re-focus on what is important.

**Q:** Is there anything in the new framework that troubles you?

**A:** A change to the no notice of an inspection. *(It used to be a phone call notification between 12-2pm the day before.)*

**Q:** Has anything changed in terms of measuring happiness?

**A:** It’s covered in the Personal Development section. There is more regarding staff wellbeing. *Its part of Personal Development/resilience.*

**Q:** Regarding articulation, what is the confidence level regarding how well staff/governors can articulate and ‘sing from the same page’.

There was further discussion around the area of articulation and how governors can communicate consistently across committees.

**Action:** Committees could focus on the 4 key judgment areas relevant to them and focus on those specific topic areas and explore with MOB/IH.

**Action:** MOB to send around the New Ofsted Draft Framework presentation documents to all governors.

**Action:** Over the next couple of months the school will re-write its self-evaluation which will target those headings (above). This will then lead itself to relevant committees. Committees will then verify and indicate whether they agree with self-evaluation based on those criteria.

**3d**

**A. Financial Management Update**

The school is predicted to finish better than originally thought and previously communicated at the last FGB meeting.

In summary, the forecast £49K deficit for the year is now down to £31K - better than was expected. The carry over stands at £121k. This time last year it was a more negative picture, this year it is good news.
The LA send invoices on 31st March and so the next two months will provide a greater validity to the figures.

B. **Swimming Pool (Swimming Pool Working Party)**

A lot of work has gone on behind the scenes – with clarity gained and conclusions made since the last FGB meeting. Some of which are summarized here.

**Planning** – Planning permission is still to be granted. The target date for planning permission was originally 20 October 2018.

Two areas need addressing before planning can proceed: 1). An ecology report needs to be provided; and 2). The builder needs to provide a Method Statement relating to protection of the hedge.

**Q: What’s the planning consultation period?**

**A: It’s done already and closed.**

**VAT** – the VAT can be recovered, which was previously in question. The only condition is that we must invoice Swimway at a market rate. It’s good news.

**Due Diligence** – As detailed in previous minutes, there has been due diligence performed on Swimway and SM is in a strong position regarding lower risk with a good level of comfort to do the deal.

A discussion followed which highlighted the importance for the legal agreements to be strong. Positive discussions have taken place with Goodwin Procter LLP (“Goodwins”) the legal firm. A meeting took place before Christmas where they were shown the Swimway Agreement. There were some comments back which need to be collated by the working party and will be fed back to the solicitor.

**Building Contractor** – NC met with Bucklands, the building contractor and confirmed the robustness and credibility of this building firm.

The board were assured that the Working Party were covering all areas of the swimming pool project and will bring to FGB when approval is required.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The PSA have raised over £100,000 and the school has received £25,000 from the LA. The school was unsuccessful in one bid and there is one more bid to put in but need planning permission first.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q: Is there any risk if Swimway walks away?

A: No. There are people on the Swimway waiting list for weekend swimming. Swimway are very positive about the opportunity of having a pool for weekend swimming as many of the other pools are private residences and are not available to Swimway on weekends.

There was a comment from a governor regarding what they thought would be the biggest risk and that was if the builder didn’t hold its quote. This is a risk the working party are aware of.

There was assurance given that the questions raised in June are being addressed. A serious discussion ensued regarding how the governing board need to be comfortable. The Working Party reassured FGB that they were working to minimize the risk and acknowledged that it’s a long-term project.

**Action:** Put questions and concerns on any area of the swimming pool project to TW.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3e Governor Survey (CR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. High level summary of Governor Survey timings and content</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A brief discussion took place around key elements of the survey.

There was a useful discussion around the various methods that are used to capture the information from the pupils and their appropriateness: online survey done by children in class, KS1 focus groups, KS2 survey.

There was a discussion about drafting the questions in order that you can get results which can lead to actions – something that caused problems in some areas in the last parent survey.

Some Ofsted standard questions are being used again to allow for benchmarking.

Signed………………………………………………...  Date 6 February 2019
Governors were reminded that the point of the survey is that it is anonymous and independent way to capture feedback.

**Q: How is the survey aligning with the October communication regarding the school fund?**

**A:** Whilst it was agreed that a question around parental contributions will be included, care needs to be taken to ensure this is positioned in a way that doesn’t indicate we will be asking for these in the future.

**Action:** JH to provide JS with feedback on the previous survey process.

**Q: Is there any value in having SEND specific questions for parents of children with SEND?**

There was a discussion regarding having SEND specific questions in the main survey to gather some specific feedback in this area. It was recognized that this raises issues associated with a narrow survey sample and how there is the risk of being able to identify individuals. It was also noted that parents of children with SEND already have 1:1’s and there is feedback from parents in Annual Reviews.

JH summarised this section of the agenda:

- it is agreed that the survey shall be a joint one between governors and school.
- a financial question around parental donations should be included with some careful positioning.
- it’s not appropriate to include SEN specific questions.

**Action:** SEN link governors to consider whether in the future parental views on the provision of SEN could be gathered separately if current feedback is felt insufficient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOVERNANCE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4a</strong></td>
<td><strong>FGB Standing Items</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Safeguarding (CR)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is a termly visit, due to take place later in the term, so there will be a full update provided at the next FGB. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4b</th>
<th><strong>Sub Committee Reports:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A).  Resources Committee (TW)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>B).  Pastoral Committee (CR)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>C).  Standards Committee (SH)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above three committee meeting minutes were circulated prior to the FGB meeting and no further highlights were given. A question was asked about how new governors will know about ways of tracking educational progress. It was agreed that training for governors is to take place either before Committees or FGB in the Summer term.

**Action:** Standards Committee to discuss appropriate training and timing.

| D) | **Link Governor Reports – Pupil Premium (MA)** |

Pupil Premium Report was circulated prior to FGB meeting, however MA had left by time of this item and so unable to provide a verbal summary or take questions. The Chair indicated that there were enough governors in the room to be able to answer any questions relating to Pupil Premium.

**Action:** Any questions/actions relating to the Pupil Premium report to be forwarded directly to MA.

The governors discussed the report amongst themselves which gave rise to some questions.

---

**KAC**

KAC has taken on the link of E&D and will finalise the report recommending to FGB objectives for SM to adopt. This has rolled over from previous minutes and so it is important that FGB agree the final report this term.

**Once completed, we will be fully compliant in this area.**

**Action:** Equality and Diversity will be a main focus of the next FGB agenda. KAC to have the final report ready for FGB to agree the final equality report and discuss objectives.
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Q: Are there any pupils at the school who are eligible for Pupil Premium but who haven’t applied for it?

A: Not that the school are aware of.

Q: Has the impact of Brexit had any effect on Pupil Premium?

Thresholds to achieve Pupil Premium are so low it’s unlikely that Brexit would cause a difference in this respect. A staff member assured the governors that they would look out for vulnerable families and try to pick up on cues such as if a parent loses their job etc.

Q: Regarding achievement of those children who are on Pupil Premium, and how that compares to a borough picture?

A: At the school there are so few children on Pupil Premium that it is essentially looked on an individual level. KS1 data last year was not strong but a lot of those children were children who were adopted from care rather than being under the deprivation factor and they come with such complex needs that however much intervention is put in place for those children they can’t catch up with their peers. There is enough data and evidence to show all the interventions that have been done and what has been achieved. From a reporting perspective there are so few that its easy to identify.

Q: Is there a cross over with EHCP?

A: Yes

The outcomes of the report were as expected. All agreed that in principle the report was fine, although in some areas it requires some additional detail and explanation. Especially as from the above questions it’s clear there is more detail. The narrative needs to come through in the report to make it feel more challenging and robust.

Governors identified one area that could be added to the report - demonstrating ways in which changes can be measured and also what actions were being made to address some of the trends relating to KS1.

A governor observed that the Pupil Premium is a report of fact not of strategy.

**Action:** In concluding notes add extra bullet points showing the impact of why something is included in the report. Without breaking confidentiality around individual
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children, include what the strategy is for specific targets. Look at specific examples and what the key things are that are being addressed in relation to the KS1 point above.

The committee minutes from the January meeting were signed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4c</th>
<th><strong>Policies</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For the benefit of the three people that had left the room earlier, a summary was provided of what the main purpose of updating the Complaints policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Complaints policy was last reviewed October 2018 and has now been updated to reflect the DfE’s new guidance issued in January 2019. The changes are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The addition of sections on Recording Meetings and Audio evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Confidentiality and social media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A significant update to the Unreasonable Complaints section including communication strategies &amp; reviews.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On confidentiality and social media, a governor indicated that when reading this, it seemed to be quite weak. However, when reading the part later on about what constitutes unreasonable behavior it is clearer. In light of this, the governors want to strongly discourage sharing complaint related items in social media and so asked that the following be added into the policy in the confidentiality and social media section: “The school would consider it to be unacceptable behaviour”.

After a lengthy discussion about recordings consent, the board agreed that there should be the addition of “written consent by all parties and any recordings are not to be distributed”. It was agreed that for now no mention would be included of destroying any recording. Although this might be something we revisit when the policy is reviewed annually.

**Vote** for updated Complaints policy February 2019 - JH proposed; ER seconded followed by unanimous approval with a show of hands at 10.31pm with the caveat that the above changes are incorporated into the Complaints policy. (See Annex)

**Action:** Complaints policy to be updated with the changes discussed.
**COMMUNICATION / SCHEDULES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a</th>
<th>Communication to PSA, Staff and Parent (JH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSA meeting – the next meeting is scheduled for 1st April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff meeting – Key messages to staff are to be agreed later due to the length of the FGB meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Action:</strong> ER was nominated to attend the Staff meeting next Friday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newsletter – In the interest of time, bullet points for the newsletter were not discussed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5b</th>
<th>AOB (Anyone)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There was no further discussion or input.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Chair thanked those in attendance and the meeting was adjourned at 10:39pm.

Date of the next Full Governing Board Meeting: 27th March 2019.

Signed by the Chair: _______________________________ Dated: _______________________________

Justine Hebert (JH)