



**Sussex Road Community Primary School**  
**Minutes of the Meeting of the Governing Body**  
 held on 9 December 2021 at 1.30pm\* through virtual governance arrangements

**\*The start of the meeting was delayed until 1.50pm, due a power outage at the school**

	<b>Present:</b>	Michael Webber (MW) (Chair) Sarah Bowles (SB), Headteacher (HT) Emma Burns (EB) Isabelle Campbell (IC) Abby Jeffrey (AJ) Emma Sangster (ES). Olly Swan (OS) Jo Winkler (JW) (Vice Chair) (Item 2 onwards)	
	<b>In attendance</b>	Lesley Hardwick (Clerk)	<b>Action</b>
1	<b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> Apologies for absence from Alison D’Alton and Carla Thompson were received and accepted. The Clerk reported that Andrew Pembroke had resigned from the Board, due to ongoing health problems. The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced Isabelle Campbell, who was attending her first FGB Meeting. The Clerk confirmed that the meeting was quorate.		
2.	<b>MEMBERSHIP</b>  <b>Appointment/Reappointment of Co-opted Governors</b> The Chair advised that Jo Winker’s Term of Office had just ended and confirmed that she had indicated that she would like to stand for a further term. Governors commented that her skills and experience had been extremely valuable, not least during the recent Ofsted inspection and agreed that they would wish her to continue. <u><b>Jo Winker was appointed as a Co-opted Governor for a four-year term of office, from 9 December 2021</b></u> Jo Winkler joined the meeting. The Chair congratulated her on her reappointment.  Governors then reviewed the CV from Lucy Bett, which had been circulated with the meeting papers. The Chair confirmed that he had spoken with Ms Bett and that she had also visited the school and both he and the HT recommended her appointment. He also explained that she was currently abroad and therefore unable to join the meeting. <u><b>Lucy Bett was appointed as a Co-opted Governor for a four year term of office from 9 December 2021.</b></u>  <b><i>The Chair confirmed that he would discuss training and arrange an induction programme for Isabelle Campbell and Lucy Bett.</i></b> He noted that Carla Thompson had been a governor at Sussex Road previously and would not need a full Induction. In response to a question IC confirmed that she had already booked onto a Governor Services Induction Course.  The Chair had not yet heard directly from Andrew Pembroke but noted he had made a valuable contribution to the Board and it was a pity his circumstances had led to his unfortunate decision to step down.		MW

3.	<p><b>DECLARATION OF BUSINESS INTERESTS</b></p> <p>No declarations of interest were received in respect of any item on the Agenda. The Chair reminded Governors to declare any interests that might arise as the result of discussions at the meeting.</p>	
4.	<p><b>MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING</b></p> <p><b>Minutes of meeting held on 14 October 2021</b>  <u>The Minutes of the meeting held on 14 October 2021 were agreed as an accurate record.</u></p> <p><b>Update on Action points</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Staff safeguarding declarations</u>– <b>The Chair confirmed that he would pick this action up as part of safeguarding monitoring.</b></li> <li>• <u>GovernorHub declarations</u> – <b>The Clerk confirmed that she would contact Governors who had not yet completed their declarations individually.</b></li> <li>• <u>Monitoring Responsibilities</u> – <b>The Chair confirmed that he would prepare and circulate a schedule of revised monitoring responsibilities.</b></li> </ul> <p>It was confirmed that all other actions had been completed or dealt with through other agenda items.</p> <p><b>Matters Arising</b>  There were no other matters arising from the minutes</p> <p><b>Non Confidential Minute of Pay Committee Meeting 11/11/21</b>  Governors noted the content of the Pay Committee minutes. <b>In response to a question the Clerk confirmed that she would ask the SBM to provide details of the total financial impact of the performance management process.</b></p>	<p>MW</p> <p>LH</p> <p>MW</p> <p>LH</p>
5.	<p><b>STRATEGIC PLAN/HT'S REPORT</b></p> <p><b>Draft 2021/22 Strategic Plan</b>  The HT commented that the SLT had been focussing on the Ofsted Inspection and the resultant feedback and had not recently met to review the Strategic Plan. She therefore did not have any significant updates to report, but commented on the key areas of focus:</p> <p><b>Quality of Education</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Catch Up</b> - The HT reminded governors that the school was employing two full time experienced teachers, one working in KS1 and the other in KS2, who were providing support to the children who needed it most to catch up. She advised that that there had been a focus on Maths, Phonics (which had been praised by the Ofsted Inspection), Metacognition and Forest School, and that the impact of the interventions and consistency of the provision was being monitored.  <b>In response to a question, the HT advised that interventions were being delivered through 1:1 and small group working, with nurture sessions to restore and support mental health.</b> She remarked that it was pleasing that the Inspector had supported the SLT's view of the school's position.</li> <li>• <u>Early Excellence</u> – The HT advised that, although the Early Excellence consultants had not been able to visit the school as initially planned, the school continued to embed Early Excellence principles and practice in Years 1 and 2.</li> <li>• <u>Assessment</u> – The HT reported that formative assessments were being used well and that the use of summative assessments was being embedded for Writing and Maths, although it had not yet been expanded to foundation subjects. She confirmed that, following some interesting comments by the Ofsted Inspector, the</li> </ul>	

SLT would be thinking about how the school's ethos needed to be reflected in its assessment practice, which might not necessarily involve quantitative 'levels'.

- Pupil Premium and Covid Recovery Grants – **A Governor noted that the SBM's finance note referred to the large reserves of funding as yet unallocated.** The Chair confirmed that he had raised this with the HT and had suggested that the Acting DHT could come to a FGB meeting to discuss SEND provision. The HT confirmed that the PPG funding had now all been allocated, and that the Catch Up funding would be allocated after Pupil Progress meetings which would identify where the gaps were. She pointed out that a large proportion of the Catch Up funding would be spent on the two intervention teachers.

### ***Ofsted Inspection***

The HT remarked that she had been impressed by the way in which the Inspector had 'got under the skin' of the school, and had been extremely complementary in her feedback, even though her comments would not form part of her final report. A Governor remarked that the Inspector's findings accurately reflected the position of the school. The HT reported that the Inspector had carried out deep dives in Geography (which had been the subject of recent governor monitoring), Maths and Phonics and in her feedback had talked about the need to include assessment within the Strategic Plan. She had noted that curriculum planning was good, although the HT confirmed that the planning needed to be further embedded and the impact reviewed. The HT commented that this was covered within the Leadership and Management section of the Plan but needed to be more explicit. She confirmed that she would make sure that this was in place from Term 3 onwards but remarked that most primary schools were still working on how to apply and embed consistent assessments to measure progress. A Governor commented that the Inspector's feedback had emphasised the way in which the school was supporting greater educational need and building on the work which had been done during the pandemic, which he felt reflected very positively on the SLT, both in terms of expectations but also the strength of leadership. The HT commented that she believed that if a school's SEND practice was strong, other elements of its provision fell into place, pointing out that the school was mindful of and was monitoring the progress being made by all children, according to their needs.

### ***Cultural Diversity***

The HT advised that there would be a focus on cultural diversity in Term 3, including a staff meeting with the LA's Cultural Diversity lead, and work with teachers during planning meetings, commenting that this area of the Plan was not entirely based on the curriculum but required a wider and different perspective and culture. She explained that actions would involve children taking part in tours as translators and becoming 'language ambassadors', becoming 'eyes and ears' on the playground to spot derogatory language, and linking with a contrasting school, hopefully on a face-to-face basis. The HT advised that she had also introduced 15-minute 'Spotlight' sessions to talk with parents about what was going on and to feedback on ideas, and that the school would continue to roll out Zones of Recognition across the school.

**A Governor asked if the HT was planning a survey for parents who might not be able to attend the 15-minute sessions.** The HT commented that dialogue was more effective, as it provided an opportunity to share ideas and give direct feedback and noted that parents could send her questions if they were unable to attend one of the Spotlight sessions

**A Governor remarked that the HT might find that the same parents attended the Spotlight sessions every time and suggested that alternative ways of delivering the information might need to be considered.** The HT pointed out that expectations of how much more the school could do needed to be manageable and take account of staff workload.

**A Governor commented that this was a new priority in the Strategic Plan and asked**

**how it would be monitored and how (or if) it fitted in the curriculum. Another Governor commented that the board's usual monitoring practice might need to be adapted. A Governor noted that the Inspector had asked questions about diversity and inclusion and how the school would be able to evidence that it was an inclusive school. Another Governor asked why the SLT had included cultural diversity as a strategic priority and whether it was perceived to be a problem at Sussex Road.** The HT confirmed that the school met all the expectations of the national curriculum in terms of teaching of diversity issues but pointed out that the school's demographic was predominantly white and middle-class and that the SLT wanted children to learn in an open-minded school and be aware of the wider world beyond Tonbridge.

### **Wellbeing**

The HT noted that the Inspector had felt that the school's approach to wellbeing was good, although she believed that there was still more to be done. She advised that response to the staff survey had been positive, in that staff felt that they were well supported, and that the results were currently being collated and would inform further actions in Term 3. The HT confirmed that staff had attended Mental Health Lead training, although she noted that the school had already gone beyond the training in some areas. She advised that the OPAL playground programme was running well and that feedback from the children was positive. The decision to open both playgrounds to all children had been very successful and, in line with the school's ethos, staff talked to children about assessing the risks arising from their play themselves and taking a view of their own safety. The school was introducing more creative play and the introduction of music and provision of bicycles and tricycles into the playground had been very positive. The HT advised that the momentum would continue to build in January with the introduction of Small World and Den Building and commented that the Playleaders were being well led and were changing their mindsets about the way in which children played with and managed the equipment.

**A Governor commented on the additional value that might be gained from being able to use Hayesbrook's or Judd's fields and asked whether either school had been approached about this.** The HT explained that there were too many logistical difficulties in using another school's facilities, including the time taken to take children to and from the site and having appropriate facilities, such as toilet facilities close to hand and accessible for younger children.

**The Governor who had asked the question clarified that he had been referring to access for PE lessons, rather than lunchtime or break-time access.** The HT confirmed that the school was able to use an area of Judd's fields in the Summer, although the same logistical issues applied. She pointed out that the school used its outdoor space well, and had the advantage of a MUGA, which was less common within primary schools, as well as to Judd's all-weather pitch. A Governor commented that, having spoken to some prospective parents, the lack of a school field did not appear to be a significant issue. The HT acknowledged that the impact of the restricted site was most evident at lunchtime because the children did not have a large open area to run around in but confirmed that the logistical difficulties she had referred to previously made any other options unfeasible.

**A Governor noted that the guidance about the use of Sports Premium made reference to the 'mile a day' and asked whether the logistical difficulties of the restricted site also made this activity unfeasible.** The HT advised that the school was opened at 8.00am each Friday for children wishing to take part in a mile run.

**A Governor remarked that it was clear that there was a great deal of activity in the playground and that the effort of leaders and staff was clear and suggested running another parent survey to measure the impact of the changes.**

A governor reported that she had met with the HT to discuss the Sports Premium funding and the PE and Play Policy and planned further developments. The HT confirmed that the SLT wanted to spend the Sports Premium effectively and to ensure that all children benefited from high quality PE provision, including extra-curricular activities. She confirmed that the Finance Committee would monitor how the Premium was spent and

remarked that in some cases the school needed to engage parents to encourage them to allow their children to access extra curriculum activities. A Governor commented on the positive impact of the training for play leaders.

### **Leadership**

The HT noted that wellbeing was not specifically referred to in the Leadership section of the Plan but had been picked up in a favourable way by the Inspector. In this connection she confirmed that Subject Leaders were given release time and were supported by the DHT and she advised that an Inset day in January would focus on upskilling subject leaders to measure the impact of subject-related strategies. The HT commented that, although the curriculum was embedded in most areas, later in the year subject leaders might have to have some difficult conversations and hold their peers to account and confirmed that the leaders would be supported to develop the necessary skills to do this. She also confirmed that the school continued to support the Early Career Teachers (ECTs) and would also support the SLT members currently in Acting roles to develop their careers when they returned to their substantive posts, although she was aware that, as a consequence of their acting-up experience, they might decide move on from Sussex Road for a permanent promoted post. She finally reported that the staff performance management process had been completed and that teachers' targets for 2021/22 included completing a research project on a topic of their choice. They would present their findings at the end of the year, and their conclusions would feed into the next Strategic Plan to help move the school forward. A governor asked whether the school subscribed to an accredited programme for its ECTs. The HT confirmed that it did.

### **Following the above discussion, the 2021/22 Strategic Plan was approved.**

#### **HT's Report**

There was no separate report from the HT

#### **Pupil Premium Grant Impact Statement**

**The Chair pointed out that it was the GB's responsibility to ensure that the Statement was published on the school's website by the end of December.** The HT explained that, whereas previously schools were expected to spend its grant funding on interventions or support for individual Pupil Premium pupils and needed to cost interventions accordingly, this guidance had been changed and schools were now required to use the funding for all children in the school to make sure that gaps were closed and that Pupil Premium children were attaining in line with their peers. She confirmed that the school would receive £90,219 in Pupil Premium Grant, Tuition Grant and Catch-Up funding and that she and the SBM were now identifying evidence of how the funding was being used to improve outcomes, including for the most vulnerable children. She reminded governors of the EEF research which had confirmed the effectiveness of the three-stage model of (1) Quality First Teaching, (2) Targeted Intervention and (3) wider strategies such as buying uniform or paying for swimming lessons. She referred to a number of specific uses for the funding:

- Quality first teaching – the HT confirmed that the funding was being used to fund the two intervention teachers (£25,000 per teacher including oncosts) and to buy books for PPG children to take home (£10,000)
- Forest School – The HT referred to the focus on metacognition in the EEF research, noting that the Forest School was used as a targeted intervention for vulnerable pupils and those in nurture groups, led by TAs and initially prioritising PPG children but subsequently opened up to other children (£22,500).
- School Trips – funding for school trips, including 21 places for the year 6 trip (approximately £4,000)
- Additional spending – spending on items such as uniform, taxi fares, swimming lessons etc.

	<p>The HT confirmed that the list above was not exhaustive but in total the anticipated spend was £95.419. She advised that if the full funding allocation was not spent, any surplus monies would be moved into the general school budget and used for other projects. <b>She advised that she would circulate the draft statement to governors before it was published but asked if governors agreed with the school's approach.</b>  <u><b>Governors approved the school's approach to the use of Pupil Premium Grant, Tuition Grant and Catch-up funding.</b></u></p> <p><b>Governor Monitoring Reports</b>  There were no monitoring reports from Governors, as the areas which would have been monitored before the FGB meeting had been covered as part of the Inspection. The Chair remarked that it had been helpful to receive an independent view of the school from the Inspector.</p> <p>A Governor noted that a revised programme needed to be agreed for Term 3 and 4 monitoring. <b>The Chair confirmed that he would discuss this further with the HT, and with the new governors, and would prepare a new monitoring schedule.</b> He also remarked that it would be useful to include some pupil voice sessions within the next round of monitoring.</p>	<p>SB</p> <p>MW</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p><b>SAFEGUARDING AND WELLBEING</b>  <b>[This item was taken after agenda item 7]</b>  The HT reported that the number of Covid-19 cases in school had reduced to 14, with the greatest proportion of cases being among school staff.</p> <p><b>The Safeguarding governor confirmed that he would produce a safeguarding monitoring report for the next meeting.</b></p>	<p>MW</p>
<p>7</p>	<p><b>FINANCE AND RESOURCES</b></p> <p><b>LA's Feedback on the Six Month Financial Monitoring</b>  Governors noted the LA's feedback on the submitted monitoring report.</p> <p><b>Budget Monitoring</b>  Governors reviewed the October and November monitoring reports and the SBM's financial summary. <b>In the SBM's absence, the Chair asked them to send any specific questions to her after the meeting.</b></p> <p>Governors noted the October and November projected year-end position:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>October</u> – In year Revenue deficit -£53,121 (a positive variance against the budget estimate of -£88,519), projected Revenue rollover £166,046 (a positive variance against the predicted budget rollover of £130,647), Capital in-year and rollover £0).</li> <li>• <u>November</u> - In year Revenue deficit -£44,609, projected Revenue rollover £174,557, Capital in-year and rollover £0.</li> </ul> <p><b>Write Offs or Virements for approval</b>  There were no write offs or virements requiring FGB approval.</p> <p><b>Contracts, tenders and expenditure for approval</b>  There were no contracts, tenders or expenditure requiring FGB approval.</p> <p><b>Premises/Maintenance issues</b>  The SBM had not had any urgent premises or maintenance issues to report.</p>	<p>aLL</p>

8	<p><b>GOVERNANCE</b></p> <p><b>GovernorHub Declarations</b> This item had been dealt with under agenda item 4.</p> <p><b>Training attended since the previous meeting</b> The Chair reported that he had attended a NSPCC course on online safety, which had featured a self-audit tool for organisations in respect of peer-on-peer abuse.</p> <p><b>TEP Monthly Governance Bulletin</b> Governors noted the content of the November Bulletin. The Clerk drew governors' attention to the revised guidance on the SFVS, which would be submitted by 31 March 2022, and to the new DfE guidance on Managing Staff in schools.</p>	
9	<p><b>CHAIRS ACTIONS AND CORRESPONDENCE</b> The Chair confirmed that he had not taken any Chair's Action or dealt with any correspondence since the previous meeting.</p>	
10	<p><b>ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS</b></p> <p><b>PE and Sports Premium Monitoring</b> In response to a question, the Chair asked Governors to confirm if they agreed to the use of the Premium being reviewed by the FRP Committee within its regular programme of meetings. The Chair noted that this monitoring had been incorporated into the Committee's Terms of Reference. <b><u>This proposal was agreed.</u></b></p> <p>There were no items of other business.</p>	
11	<p><b>CONFIDENTIALITY.</b> No items of confidentiality were identified.</p>	
12	<p><b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b> The next meeting was confirmed as Thursday 27 January 2022.</p>	
13	<p><b>IMPACT OF MEETING</b> Governors agreed that it had been useful to spend time reviewing the draft plan and the school's use of the Pupil Premium and Catch-Up Funding.</p> <p>The Chair congratulated the school on the positive Ofsted Inspection and wished all governors a Happy Christmas and New Year.</p> <p>The meeting closed at 15.06pm</p>	

Signed.(Chair).....Date .....

## ACTION LOG

Meeting Date	Agenda Item	Details	Deadline	Action By	Status
14.9.21	9	Staff declarations regarding KCSIE and safeguarding update training to be reviewed as part of a safeguarding visit	End T2	MW	Completed
19.10.21 9.12.21	3, 5, 8 4, 5	Monitoring responsibilities to be discussed by the Chair, Vice Chair and HT and a schedule circulated	Term 2 FGB	MW/SB/ JW	In progress
19.10.21 9.12.21	8 4	Reminders to be sent to governors who have not yet completed GovernorHub declarations	Term 2 FGB	LH	Completed
9.12.21	2	An Induction programme to be arranged for the new Co-opted Governors	MW	End T3	In progress
9.12.21	4	The SBM to provide details of the total financial impact of the performance management process	LH/ADA	End T2	Completed
9.12.21	5	The draft Pupil Premium Impact Statement to be circulated to governors before its publication on the website	SB	31.12.21	Completed
9.12.21	6	A Safeguarding monitoring report to be produced for the next meeting	MW	27.1.22	Deferred to T4 meeting
9.12.21	7	Any questions on the October or November financial monitoring to be passed on to the SBM	All	End T2	Completed