



**Sussex Road Community Primary School
Minutes of the Meeting of the Governing Body
held on 13 May 2019 at 6.30pm at the School**

| | | | |
|----|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | Present: | Nicola Furlonger (Chair) Sarah Bowles (SB) (Headteacher) Andrew Chesworth (AC) Alison D'Alton (ADA) (SBM) Vanessa Lines (VL) Andrew Pembroke (AP) Louisa Rowlands Emma Sangster (ES) Michael Webber (MW) Jo Winkler(JW) | |
| | In attendance | Lesley Hardwick (Clerk) | Action |
| 1. | APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE Apologies from Clare Robertson and Des O Dwyer (childcare) and Carla Thompson (ill health) were received and accepted. The Chair reported that John Tomlinson had sent apologies due to his work commitments (having recently started a new job) and had asked if Governors would grant a 'leave of absence' until September, when he anticipated being in a position to confirm whether or not he would be able to commit sufficient time to his Governor role going forward. She commented that JT was independent of the School, and a representative from the wider community, and that, although he was no longer directly involved with the Oaklands Nursery, he still retained that knowledge base. Governors agreed to grant JT a leave of absence until September 2019 , although it was agreed that in the meantime, any potential new Governors could be identified in case JT decided that he did not wish to continue. | | |
| 2. | DECLARATION OF BUSINESS INTERESTS No declarations of interest were received in respect of any item on the Agenda. | | |
| 3. | MINUTES OF LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING Minutes of FGB meeting held on 18 March 2019 The minutes of the meeting held on 18 March 2019 were approved as an accurate record and signed by the Chair. Action Points Governors reviewed progress against outstanding actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Slope outside main gate</u>– The SBM advised that the first attempt to resolve the problem raised at the previous meeting had been unsuccessful, and that she would continue to explore alternative solutions. • <u>Safer Recruitment Training</u> – MW explained that he had not yet completed the safer recruitment training, as he intended to do so through another organisation of which he was a trustee. • <u>Statement of Behaviour Principles</u> – The SBM confirmed that the current Behaviour Policy included a statement of principles and that a second document was not needed. • <u>SEND Visit</u> - it was confirmed that the next SEND monitoring visit would take place on 24/5/19 • <u>Safeguarding Update</u> – It was suggested that Governors could attend the staff Safeguarding update session (held during an inset day at the beginning of Term 1) | | ADA MW SEND Govs All |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| | <p>It was confirmed that all other action items had been completed or were covered under other agenda items.</p> <p>Other Matters Arising There were no other matters arising from the minutes.</p> | |
| 4. | <p>SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT/HEADTEACHER'S REPORT</p> <p>Headteacher's Report The HT commented on a number of issues raised within her report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staffing – The HT commented that one of the main areas of concern was the ongoing absence of the Caretaker, and the impact, both in financial terms and also with regard to the extra staff workload. She reported that one teacher had secured a post elsewhere and that she was now advertising for a NQT to start in September 2019. She advised that if it was not possible to recruit a high-quality replacement teacher, the DHT would continue to spend a proportion of her time in class, although she confirmed that she would wish to avoid this if possible. The HT also reported that she had successfully appointed an EYFS Leader. • September Year R admissions – The HT advised that three families had rejected offers for September (one moving out of area and two opting for private schools), but that confirmed that the School would be full. • Feedback from School Improvement Advisor – In response to a Governor question, the HT reported on the SIA's recent 'introductory' visit to the School. The SIA had commented that the atmosphere in school was calm and purposeful and had suggested that Sussex Road was ahead of other schools in its curriculum development. She had also praised the curriculum that was in place for Year R and Year 1 and reported that she had observed good behaviour in the playground. The HT advised that the SIA would not be producing a Note of Visit, as this had not been a formal visit, and had asked her to suggest areas of focus for her next formal visit, which was likely to be during Terms 1 or 2 of the next academic year. She suggested that, based on comments arising from the most recent Teaching and Learning monitoring visit, the assessment of foundation subjects could be an area for SIA review. • New Inspection Framework - The HT remarked that the SIA had suggested that the new Ofsted framework would recommend that schools should reduce data collection to no more than two data drops a year. A Governor remarked that this was a significant change to the recommendation from the previous SIA, who had suggested collecting data every term (i.e. six times a year). Another Governor commented that a Leadership & Management visit the previous week had discussed work/life balance and workloads, and what monitoring governors should investigate during their visits. A Governor asked if two data drops a year would give the HT sufficient information. The HT clarified that the recommendation was for data to be entered onto a formal database twice a year, but that more regular reviews of progress would continue. A Governor commented that it should be possible to assess progress by looking at children's books. The Chair commented that, although robust procedures would be needed, this approach lent itself to the Circle model, with Governors looking at books when they came into school for visits. The HT pointed out that the new Inspection Framework would not be fully implemented until September 2020 (with 2019/20 being a 'transition' year), commenting that the School's next Inspection would therefore be completely under the new Framework. She added that it had been proposed that Inspection Teams would be on site for longer than previously (telephoning to advise schools of an Inspection by 10.00am and coming on site during the same afternoon), although she remarked that this might not go forward, due to concerns that HTs might not be in school at such short notice. A Governor | |

asked whether it would be worth discussing the merits of ‘skills v knowledge’ with the SIA. The HT confirmed that this had been mentioned, and commented that she would be looking for teachers to identify and record the knowledge that children would be gaining within each curriculum topic, adding that, although this might not be necessary to meet the new Framework’s ‘Intent, Implementation and Impact’ criteria, it would be best practice. **The Chair suggested that consistency and staff being confident in what they were doing would be key success factors.** The HT commented that the school would need to make sure that children were progressing and that the resources that teachers were using to support the curriculum would lead to stronger KS2 outcomes. **A Governor asked if the workshops that the HT had referred to were helpful.** The HT confirmed that they were useful.

- **Wellbeing – The Chair asked the HT to explain the difference between the Thrive and Headstart wellbeing initiatives, and how they worked together.** The HT commented that it was frustrating that schools were currently being overwhelmed by the number of organisations offering resources or training as a result of the focus on wellbeing and mental health, but that there was no central ‘joined up thinking’ or advice on the best approach to follow. She advised that ‘Thrive’ was based on research into how adults’ physical and mental health was impacted by what they had experienced in childhood, and also on how a child’s home environment (for example, parents with an addiction) would impact on their neurological and emotional development and health. She advised that Thrive would provide a framework and resources to enable children’s development to be tracked and monitored, formalising what was already done in school in a less formal way. She also commented that the LA was increasingly expecting schools to take responsibility for providing advice on parenting, and that Thrive would provide training for staff on how to do this. She remarked that this was something that SLT members did already and also commented that the training was relatively expensive at £1000 per practitioner for 10 days’ training. **In response to a question she advised that she did not believe that there would be a further annual cost for use of Thrive’s resources and suggested that the next step would be to invite them into School to run the film connected with the initiative to staff; Governors requested that they might be invited to attend this.** With regard to Headstart, the HT advised that the School had secured £2,000, having signed up to take part in the programme, which would be used to provide a ‘safe space’ within school. Headstart also offered support for peer mentoring and transition for Year 6 students and provided a pupil profiling assessment tool which would enable the school to apply for further grants. **In response to a question, the HT explained that Sussex Road’s involvement had stemmed from it being a feeder school for local secondary schools that had already been involved through the pilot project, and also because it offered a source of additional funding. A Governor asked whether there would be barriers to involvement with Thrive, in that schools needed evidence from children’s home life.** The HT advised that to secure funding, families would need to be happy to share the assessment and that children would be asked what they would want to do, but that adults could not guide their decision. **A Governor asked whether there was any potential within the Headstart project to track children’s resilience through secondary schools who also engaged with the project, if these were schools that Sussex Road’s students would move on to.** The HT did not think that this would be possible, not least because primary and secondary provision was so different. She commented that primary schools were better at working out what children needed and personalising their provision so that they received the support they needed, whereas secondary schools did not have / are unable to have the same individual focus. She added that she was aware of a number of incidences where children who had managed in primary schools with extensive support had been excluded from secondary school after a short amount of time because they could not manage there. The HT also commented

that the School would receive Headstart funding for the current year but that it was too late in the year for it to realistically have any impact for Year 6

- **EYFS** – The HT confirmed that the challenges within the cohort had not changed, as they were linked to SEN. She commented that moderation had been successful and that there had been positive comments from moderators about the EYFS and Year 1 environment.
- **SEN** – **A Governor asked whether the Improvement Plan that Kent would be putting in place in response to the very poor Ofsted report on its SEND services would have an impact for Sussex Road.** Another Governor commented that provision within Kent had deteriorated over the past 18 months. The HT commented that the most significant impact for schools was the inability to make contact with members of staff at the LA, because so many had left or were absent. This made it difficult to get updates on pupils with SEND, or reports for key meetings, although she remarked that the situation was no worse at Sussex Road than for other local primary schools. A Governor noted that information on the LA's KELSI site indicated that the LA would be talking to HTs and other stakeholders when drawing up its Plan of Action and asked whether this had happened. The HT advised that she was not aware of any approach from the LA, although this had also been mentioned at the most recent HTs' briefing. A Governor remarked that the deterioration in provision seemed to have stemmed from the introduction of EHCPs and the new SEN Code of Practice, and that the situation had spiralled out of control since then. He added that there had been a promise of funding for more special school places, but that none had yet been forthcoming. The HT commented that, in the meantime, there are five children at Sussex Road whose EHCPs stated that they needed special school provision, and that the School was expected to meet those needs with considerably less funding than a special school would receive for the same children, at a cost to the support that it was able to provide for other students. A Governor asked if the Improvement Board that the LA planned to introduce would help resolve this issue. Another Governor commented that the key need was for more financial resource, remarking that from his experience as a Governor at a special school, where all students had EHCPs, the Plans themselves often contained incorrect information, resulting in special schools being allocated students with needs that were inappropriate for their particular designation and that they were also unable to meet. The HT added that cuts to High Needs Funding resulted in schools receiving considerably less than the cost of the support that they needed to provide, sometimes less than half, taking staffing on-costs into consideration. She pointed out that this had an impact on the emotional health of staff and other students and that in some cases there was an additional cost in repairing damage to school buildings and property as a result of students' actions.

Governor Monitoring Reports

- **QTLA** – The two monitoring Governors confirmed that this had been a good visit and that issues discussed at the meeting with the HT were set out in their monitoring report. The focus of the visit had been progress in delivering Foundation subjects and they had been pleased to note that the curriculum was being driven by class teachers. They had also noted that 2018/19 was a transition year, with teachers trying a range of different things and reported that they had discussed the assessment of foundation subjects. The Governors had also met with the PE Leader and had discussed the PE and Sports Premium. The PE Leader had been very positive about assessment and how teachers knew how that students were progressing. One of the Governors remarked that it was refreshing that the School was not spending funding on external agencies, which was not sustainable in the long term, as the Government PE grant was not guaranteed. Previous external support had been used to build skills amongst the teaching staff, such that the external support was no longer needed. She

reported that students spent at least the expected 30 minutes a day on physical activities, including games and activities using the MUGA. The PE Leader had also commented that teachers were supportive and happy and confident to lead activities themselves. The Governor confirmed that from a governance point of view the monitoring governors had been confident that the Sports Premium Funding was being spent responsibly. **She asked how the HT intended to spend the balance of the Sports Premium Funding, noting that it could no longer be spent on capital projects.** The HT advised that she hoped to be able to use some of the funding for wellbeing initiatives and for Forest School Leaders' training. She explained that the School had previously paid into the School Sports Partnership, but no longer did so and that staff were happy to be involved in providing PE and were confident in doing so. A Governor remarked that it was clear from the displays that Governors had looked at before the meeting that the leaders were more confident promoting their subject. **Another Governor asked if there was evidence of PPG students' increased involvement with sport and extra-curricular activities.** One of the monitoring Governors commented that the PE Leader had talked about clubs for next year and the use of PPG funding to support PPG students to attend and commented that this was another sign of her increasing confidence and awareness of what the School could do and the impact that it could have. **A Governor asked if the HT had any plans to introduce the 'Daily Mile'.** The HT did not feel that there was any reason to do so, as the children were sufficiently active during the day and took part in a range of activities. She added that the School did not have enough outdoor space to offer anything other than multiple laps of the playground for the 'Daily Mile' and that the space made available to Sussex Road within the Judd School site was not suitable. **She agreed to speak to the County Coordinator for any further suggestions. A Governor asked if the HT intended to introduce more competitive sports.** The HT advised that the School could arrange more football and netball matches, but believed that its approach was the right one, commenting that Sussex Road did not shy away from competitive sport. The Chair commented that the display boards that the Governors had seen reflected the richness of the curriculum and the quality of work that students produced in the wider Curriculum subjects.

- **Pupil Outcomes** – The Governors who had carried out the monitoring visit reported that they had viewed a RAG-rated schedule of data, including Year 6 predictions. They had noted that Year 3 was the most challenging cohort and the cohort of greatest concern, although they had been confident that everything possible was being put in place to provide support. The HT commented that this cohort, similar to the 2018 Year 6 cohort, had a high number of very able students, but also a high level of SEND and a significant number of EHCPs, with a large number of families who required support and students who did not have good lives out of school. She provided some detailed examples and commented on the amount of support provided to parents and the extent of Early Help involvement. **One of the monitoring Governors commented that from the cohort data they had reviewed, there was not one solution that would fit all students in the cohort. She advised that Year 3 was currently RAG-rated 'green', but commented that the amount of support that the students had received before their Year 2 SATs could not be sustained until they reached Year 6.** The HT commented that attendance and lateness was a problem within Year 3 and that work was being done with families to resolve this; she advised, however, that the LA's School Liaison Officer was not prepared to issue fines in many cases due to family circumstances. She pointed out that the School had no power to intervene, especially as parents would not engage, that it was also difficult to make contact with the Early Help Team and that the issues involved would not meet the Social Services' threshold. A Governor noted that overall attendance was still good at just under 97%.

SB

Other issues arising from the Strategic Plan

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| 5. | <p>No other issues were identified.</p> <p>FINANCE</p> <p>2018/19 Outturn Position The SBM reported that the final Revenue Outturn had been £120,509, as confirmed in the LA’s Oracle Report, which was subsequently signed by the Chair.</p> <p>Draft 2018/19 Budget and Three-Year Financial Plan The Chair referred to the notes of the Finance Monitoring Team’s meeting with the SBM and the SBM’s own notes on the Budget. The SBM confirmed that the Year 3 Outturn estimate was a surplus of £13,323,02, but that there would be a negative in-year revenue balance in each of the three years. She explained that the budgets reflected increased staffing costs and the fall in level of high needs funding that the School was able to secure. She advised that the teaching staff budget was protected (although some money had been reallocated following a resignation), but that the budget for Education Support staff showed a downward trend, reflecting the end of contracts across the three-year period. Other areas of expenditure had been cut ‘to the bone’ and there was no contingency. A Governor expressed concern at the gap between the cost of employing support staff and the funding that the School was receiving. She asked if there is a backlog of applications and to what extent further successful HNF applications would resolve this imbalance. The HT confirmed that the SENCO was completing applications whenever possible, but that this would not completely resolve the imbalance.</p> <p>A Governor remarked that any budget needed to be realistic and believed this budget to be so, although he commented that it gave a stark message, highlighting the consequences of schools not being given sufficient funding to meet their unavoidable costs. He added that this demonstrated the unintended consequences of employment protection laws, which protected some workers but made others vulnerable and led to a position where staff were on the same pay scale, regardless of performance (due to the implantation of the Living Wage across KCC which had removed some of its lower pay ranges). The SBM reported that two members of support staff had resigned, and would not be replaced. In response to a question she advised that both had moved to work where they would earn more for working fewer hours. A Governor remarked that Sussex Road was nevertheless in a more fortunate position than many schools, in not having reached a point where it needed to ask for financial support from parents.</p> <p>A Governor questioned the impact of not receiving enough High Needs Funding to cover the staffing costs of support. The HT explained that ultimately the School would not be able to employ ‘general’ classroom TAs, and that all TAs would be providing 1:1 / small group support. In response to a question, the HT explained that because schools needed to prove that they had provided support before they could successfully apply for funding, support staff needed to be deployed from elsewhere to meet these requirements. She also pointed out that it could take 18 months for a school to obtain an EHCP and that a school would therefore need to fund support itself during this period, so that even a small number of children with high SEND could therefore had a significant impact on the budget. She added that increasingly mainstream schools were required to meet the needs of very challenging children without the resources to support them. A Governor remarked that it would be equitable if mainstream schools were able to access the same level of funding as a special school if they were educating children with a Special School assessment because there were not sufficient special school places for them.</p> <p>A Governor commented that the SRSA could raise more money for the school and that, in addition to parents who wished to make a financial donation, there might also be parents who would be prepared to donate in a different way.</p> | |
|----|---|--|

Another Governor pointed out that any funds raised by the SRSA needed to be used for the benefit of all children in the School. It was also noted that these donations were not intended to subsidise necessities and 'shore up' foundations. A Governor remarked that although funds from SRSA could not be used to fund support staff, they could be used to support the curriculum, for example by providing additional resources. The HT added that the SRSA funding could potentially be used to support improvements to the lower playground.

A Governor remarked that there were organisations that focussed on provided grant funding for special needs schools and suggested that they might also be prepared to provide funding or resources to support SEND children in mainstream schools. The HT commented that in mainstream schools, it was non-SEND children who were likely to miss out (for example from the loss of a class TA) because SEND children were supported by law and that schools had no choice in implementing their provision plans 'to the letter'.

A Governor asked what the GB could do to support the school. It was suggested that the Chair could write to the local MP or KCC through local County Counsellors or the Cabinet Member for Education to highlight the impact of its decision to implement the Living Wage without providing any funding for schools to meet the additional costs. Another Governor suggested lobbying the LA regarding the lack of support schools were receiving through Early Help. **A Governor asked whether it would be more effective if schools lobbied jointly. However, another Governor pointed out that it would not be in Sussex Road's best interests to be linked with schools who might be in a much more difficult financial position.** The HT advised that feedback on the issues Governors had raised was regularly given at head teachers' meetings and forums such as the Kent Association of Headteachers.

Following the above discussion the 2019/20 Budget and Three Year Financial Plan was approved.

Nourish Kitchen Proposal

The HT advised that the terms of the contract with Nourish had been amended in line with suggestions from the School. **A Governor noted that the DfE School Food in England: Advice for Governing Boards, March 2019** states that the governing body should ensure that it receives regular reports on compliance with the school food standards as well as take-up of school lunches and financial aspects of school food provision. **Governors agreed that the school should request an annual report on the nutritional standards of suppliers' menus, to ensure that they had to follow the relevant regulations. In response to a question, the SBM advised that the Borough Council inspected schools to check on school hygiene, and that KCC also carried out kitchen audits, to ensure they were compliant with health and safety regulations.** She agreed that the school could request for a review of menus at the point that they were changed (three times a year). **A Governor asked if the School had a view regarding the extent it would wish take-up to increase once food was cooked on site.** The ADA advised that this had not been discussed, although she commented that any increase in take-up was likely to be from students in KS2, as take up from EYFS and KSI (where all children were entitled to free school meals) was already high.

The Contract with Nourish was approved.

[MW left the meeting]

Other Financial Issues - Pupil Premium Strategy

The HT advised that she was reviewing the format and content of the report on the use of PPG and its impact, having reviewed the documents produced by other schools, and referred to the draft document that she had circulated with the meeting papers. She explained that the first page of the document provided some context regarding the numbers of PPG students in each year group (by percentage) and referred to the cross-

| | | |
|----|--|-----|
| | <p>over with SEND and the impact that PPG students with SEND were likely to have on PPG data. The HT advised that the document also referred to Sussex Road's 'core' and 'personalised' offer for PPG students. She explained that the 'core' offer covered the support provided to all PPG children at the school, and that the 'personalised' offer was determined from pupil progress meetings to provide specific support and interventions for individual children to accelerate their progress. The document would also include data on outcomes for PPG students, with information about barriers to progress and success criteria. The HT commented that staff, and particularly the SLT, spent a great deal of time reviewing research, and advised that she intended to list some of this research and particularly refer to some of the research from the EEF which informed the decisions that the School had taken regarding the areas of focus and interventions that were likely to have the greatest impact. A Governor remarked that he had attended a workshop on PPG and that the facilitator had commented that over 50% of reports on PPG published by schools included errors. Another Governor suggested that the percentage of PPG students in Year 3 was incorrect, because the calculation had not taken account of the fact that this was a larger year group. The HT commented that reporting on PPG was a challenge due to the way in which the grant was paid and that she had decided to report funding on a 5/12:7/12 basis. She remarked that in the past Sussex Road's reports had covered the minimum requirement, with regard to outcomes (which were usually strong), but that she wished to produce something that mirrored the more detailed information provided by Outstanding schools.</p> <p><i>The HT asked Governors to contact her if they had any further comments on her draft report.</i></p> <p>There were no other financial issues to discuss.</p> | All |
| 6. | <p>PREMISES</p> <p>The SBM reported on a number of premises issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Replacement of Flat Roof</u> - The SBM advised that she still did not have a date for the work or full details of the specification but believed that it would be completed over the Summer holiday period. • <u>Kitchen Refurbishment</u> – The SBM advised that the refurbishment work was also due to take place over the Summer. | |
| 7. | <p>SAFEGUARDING/HEALTH AND SAFETY</p> <p>Health and Safety Monitoring <i>The SBM confirmed that she would contact the Health & Safety Governor (Des O'Dwyer) to arrange a visit during Term 6.</i></p> <p>Safeguarding Monitoring It was confirmed that a monitoring visit would take place on 17 May 2019.</p> <p>Other Health & Safety/Safeguarding issues The HT had no Safeguarding or Health and Safety issues to report.</p> | SB |
| 8. | <p>POLICIES</p> <p>No policies were due for review.</p> | |
| 8. | <p>GOVERNANCE</p> <p>Self-Evaluation</p> <p>The Chair reported that a Working Group of Governors had met to carry out a self-evaluation of the GB, using the NGA's '20 questions' framework. She referred to the document that had been uploaded to Sharepoint that recorded the Working Group's findings and asked Governors if they wished to make any comments. The following points were raised:</p> | |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Succession</u> – Governors acknowledged that this was an area of potential concern, especially as a number of Governors’ terms of office would expire during 2020. They also discussed the NGA’s recommendation that Governors should serve no more than two consecutive terms of office at one school (moving on to share their expertise with another school if they wished to continue to be a Governor), but commented that this ‘expectation’ did not take account of the difficulties that schools faced in recruiting new Governors. <i>The Chair advised that she intended to arrange 1:1 meetings with all governors before the end of the academic year and that these discussions would include their future intentions.</i> • <u>Chair’s Appraisal</u> – The Clerk outlined a process for Chair’s appraisal, which she had used successfully in other schools. <i>It was agreed that this process should be undertaken during Term 6. The Clerk agreed to send the Chair a sample appraisal form for her comments.</i> • <u>Data</u> – <i>Governors noted that, as discussed earlier, there would be fewer official data collection points and less focus by Ofsted on schools’ data and asked what Governors should now be reviewing during monitoring visits.</i> The HT suggested that monitoring governors should concentrate on progress seen in children’s books, rather than data, for example making sure that marking and feedback was in line with the school’s policy. <i>A Governor asked if the HT could provide some training or guidance on the School’s processes for assessment of foundation subjects so Governors knew what to look for on visits.</i> • <u>Sharing information</u> – <i>It was agreed that each monitoring pair should continue to give a brief summary of their remit and report on what they reviewed whilst in school (including abbreviations and terminology used in their reports) to increase the whole GB’s knowledge base.</i> • <u>Engagement with and feedback from staff</u> – The Chair noted that this was an area that the Working Group had felt needed improvement and asked Governors for suggestions regarding the format that this could take – for example whether Governors could attend staff meetings to engage with staff, or arrange a more formal staff survey. The HT suggested that Governors needed to have a greater presence in school. <i>A Governor asked if staff knew who the Governors were, and what they did.</i> Another Governor commented that from her conversations with staff, they were aware that Governors came in to review the School, as this was the only time that they were ‘visible’ to staff. A Governor advised that the other school at which he was a Governor was introducing Governor ‘surgeries’ which would provide the opportunity for staff to meet Governors informally as a way of raising Governors’ profile with the staff. The HT commented that it would be positive for Governors to be seen in school outside formal monitoring visits, for example helping out by accompanying children on visits to the Tonbridge Care Home or to Forest School, or to visit exhibitions and open mornings. <i>A Governor asked if the HT could include details of forthcoming events in her HT’s report.</i> The HT advised that these events were all listed on the website, and on Twitter, and felt that this would be the most effective way for Governors to keep themselves aware of forthcoming events that they could involve themselves with. <i>A Governor asked if governors could be included in information sent out to parents to advise them of a forthcoming event. The SBM agreed to follow this suggestion up to explore if it would be practical to do this.</i> A Governor commented that he believed that there was a perception amongst staff that all Governors were parents because these were the Governors they had more contact with. A Governor, who was also a parent, commented that she was aware that staff were sometimes more cautious in discussion with her, even when she was visiting as a parent rather than a Governor. <i>A Governor recalled that Governors’ involvement with a parents’ evening previously had been successful and asked whether Governor attendance at staff meetings or</i> | <p>LH/NF</p> <p>LH</p> <p>SB</p> <p>ADA</p> |
|--|--|---|

| | | |
|------------|--|----------------------|
| | <p>other events would help to create engagement. Another Governor remarked that monitoring visits had always been arranged through, and with, the HT but suggested that, as other leaders became more confident and were 'upskilled' there was now potential to meet with a wider range of staff during formal visits. The HT remarked that it could be difficult to meet with leaders who were also class teachers during the school day and that she would not wish to ask staff to stay after school to meet with Governors.</p> <p><i>The Chair asked Governors to let her have any further feedback outside the meeting.</i></p> <p>Joint Panel Agreement The Chair confirmed that Woodlands School's GB had now approved the Joint Panel Agreement <i>and that signature versions would now be exchanged.</i></p> <p>Monitoring Arrangements The Chair confirmed that monitoring arrangements for 2019/20 would be discussed at the next meeting.</p> <p>Governor Training VL advised that she had completed First Aid at Work training. ES confirmed that she had now attended a New Governor induction course. The Chair confirmed that she would be attending the District Governor briefing on 16 May.</p> | <p>All</p> <p>NF</p> |
| <p>9.</p> | <p>ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS It was reported that former Sussex Road Governor Pam Evans had died recently. The Chair asked that condolences be passed on.</p> <p>There was no urgent other business.</p> | |
| <p>10.</p> | <p>CONFIDENTIALITY. No items of confidentiality were identified at the meeting.</p> | |
| <p>11.</p> | <p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING It was confirmed that the next meeting would be held on 8 July 2019 at 6.30pm</p> <p>The meeting closed at 8.45pm</p> | |

Signed.(Chair).....Date

ACTION LOG

| Meeting Date | Agenda Item | Details | Deadline | Responsibility | Status |
|---|------------------------|--|----------|----------------|---|
| 11.9.18 6.12.18 22.1.19 18.3.19 13.5.19 | 5 10 9 8 8 | Consideration to be given to entering into a joint panel arrangement with another school/schools | End T2 | NF | Approved by Woodlands FGB. Signature versions to be exchanged |
| 22.1.19 18.3.19 13.5.19 | 7 3 3 | The slope outside the main gate to be treated to make it less slippery in wet weather | End T3 | ADA | Remedial action still being explored |
| 18.3.19 13.5.19 | 4 3 | Governors to complete Safer Recruitment training | End T4 | MW | MW to undertake online training |
| 18.3.19 13.5.19 | 8 3 | A SEND monitoring visit to be carried out in Term 5 | 13.5.19 | AP/ES | Taking place on 24/5/19 |
| 18.3.19 13.5.19 | 8 3 | The GB to receive updated Safeguarding training | End T5 | ADA | Governors invited to Term 1 Staff training |
| 13.5.19 | 4 | The HT to contact the County Coordinator for suggestions for the use of the School's PE/Sports Funding | End T5 | SB | |
| 13.5.19 | 6 | Governors to contact the HT with any further comments on her draft PPG Impact Statement | End T5 | All | |
| 13.5.19 | 8 | A H&S monitoring visit to be arranged for Term 6 | End T6 | DOD/MW | |
| 13.5.19 | 8 | 1:1 meetings to be arranged with Governors before the end of the current academic year | End T6 | NF | |
| 13.5.19 | 8 | A sample Chair's appraisal form to be sent to the Chair | End T5 | LH | |
| 13.5.19 | 8 | The practicality of sending texts to advise Governors of forthcoming school events to be explored | End T5 | SB/ADA | |
| 13.5.19 | 8 | Governors to pass any further feedback on the self-evaluation report to the Chair | End T5 | All | |