



**'At Shawfield, We Shine'**

**SHAWFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL  
FULL GOVERNING BODY MEETING  
Virtual Meeting due to COVID-19  
Tuesday 4<sup>th</sup> May 2021 at 6pm  
MINUTES**

**Present:**

Mick Luck (ML)	Chair COP
Stephen Corcoran (SC)	STH
Tom Hilyard (TH)	ST
Darren Speed (DS)	LA
Steve Manning (SM)	PA
Lo Aherne (LA)	PA
Esther Thiong'o-Njenga (ETN)	COP
Attieh Fard (AF)	COP

**In attendance:**

Debbie Green (DG)	Clerk to the Governing Body and Finance officer
-------------------	--

*The meeting started at 6pm*

Governor **SUPPORT** and **CHALLENGE** highlighted. **ACTIONS underlined**

		Action
<b>1</b>	<b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> No apologies received. ETN joined the meeting at 6.20pm	
<b>2</b>	<b>DECLARATION OF INTEREST (<i>statutory</i>)</b> Governors to declare any interest in specific agenda items at this meeting. <i>No governors declared any interest in specific agenda items.</i> <i>AF to return her Declaration of Interest Form.</i>	<b>AF</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>WELCOME NEW GOVERNORS</b> ML welcomed new governors Lou Aherne and Attieh Fard. ML asked DG if pen portraits were on the website for the new governors. DG confirmed LA was on the website. AF and ETN still to be added.	
<b>4</b>	<b>MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS</b> The minutes of the previous meeting held on 9 <sup>th</sup> March 2021 were recorded as an accurate record once amended. ML to sign minutes.	<b>ML</b>

5	<p><b>MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES</b></p> <p>To discuss and minute matters arising which are not covered by this agenda and ensure all actions completed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Inform Cognus of new Chair of the governing body and extend ML's term until 31/08/2022 - <i>Actioned</i></li> <li>2. Vice Chair post to be appointed</li> <li>3. SC to make initial contact with possible new Co-opted candidate and arrange a meeting with ML - <i>Actioned</i></li> <li>4. June FGB meeting – Put Catering review on agenda</li> <li>5. SEF Presentation to Governors <i>Part of SC report - See section 7</i></li> <li>6. SC to report outcome of 'SEND review of Practice' <i>Part of SC report - See section 7</i></li> <li>7. DG to extend TH's term of office to 31<sup>st</sup> November 2021 - <i>Actioned</i></li> <li>8. Governor Training for Sophie Manning <i>New Governor training booked for 6<sup>th</sup> May 2021</i></li> <li>9. Letter of appreciation to Keith Dixon - <i>Actioned</i></li> <li>10. ML to discuss with Isabel Ramsay her report dated 10<sup>th</sup> February <i>ML advised after a discussion with IR she had amended her report. The updated report now received and replaced original.</i></li> <li>11. SC to seek further clarification from Isabel Ramsay re: governors to start looking more strategically at the direct of the school. <i>SC advised governors IR was coming into school the next day for the next validation visit to look at safeguarding and SEND. IR has offered support as the school has a number of new Governors with training and CPD in terms of what the school are looking for in respect of the school's vision and values. SC will share with governors later in the meeting the Governor Monitoring visits schedule, pencilling governors in either remotely or socially distance in school. This will build a portfolio of how the governing body will work.</i></li> </ol>	<p><b>Discharged</b></p> <p><b>Ongoing</b></p> <p><b>Discharged</b></p> <p><b>Ongoing</b></p> <p><b>Discharged</b></p> <p><b>Discharged</b></p> <p><b>Discharged</b></p> <p><b>Discharged</b></p> <p><b>Discharged</b></p> <p><b>Discharged</b></p> <p><b>Discharged</b></p>
6	<p><b>CHAIR'S ACTION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• see Part B</li> <li>• SFVS report completed and sent off the SCC</li> <li>• SC's midterm review had been actioned since last meeting.</li> </ul>	
7	<p><b>HEADTEACHER REPORT</b></p> <p>ML to SC - requested that documents for meetings to be on Microsoft teams at least one week in advance to ensure Governors have time to make notes, this month there was not enough time for governors to read papers prior to meeting. SC advised that due to a very heavy workload this week, the documents were put on Microsoft teams later than planned. ML advised he had pointed out the lateness of the documents, so that governors know they are not expected to read all papers at short notice. SC fully appreciates the need for the documents to be available well in advance. SC suggested to governors if they have any questions after reading the documents, they can bring them up at the next meeting. ML asked SC to give a brief summary of the documents.</p> <p><b>SEF (Appendix A)</b></p> <p>SC informed governors that there are two documents (SIP &amp; Monitoring Schedule) that work alongside the SEF as it was felt at the last meeting the SEF by itself was difficult to follow in terms of the school priorities. SEF shows context and statements around</p>	

<p>effectiveness of school performance. This links to the <b>SIP (Appendix B)</b> priorities of school.</p> <p>Priority 1 – Quality of teaching and learning being consistently good across the school. The school looks at how it comes out of the pandemic to ensure the children receive good quality education. Now children are back to face-to-face teaching and not remote learning the school needs to establish which areas the children need support and staff training and wellbeing.</p> <p>Priority 2 – working on the curriculum. SC referred governors to the document. Presently there are still a lot of gaps where the school would want to be if there had not been a pandemic and where the school currently are. There is a huge amount of CPD focus to ensure staff can match the curriculum to the needs of the children.</p> <p>Priority 3 – Wider school commitment and leadership roles. TH, SENDCO and Pastoral Care Lead/Home School Link Worker have successfully gained the Surrey Healthy School Status for the school. Only 3 schools in Surrey are currently meeting this framework under the new guidance. Will share with Parents shortly. ML asked SC to pass governors thanks to TH/SENDCO and PCL/SHLW. SC also advised governors that the school is close to achieving the Angel Award for the school's work with young carers. Surrey Young Carers have been working with Angela Dixon PCL/HSLW. The school have identified 30 children that would be identified as young carers. PCL/HSLW has been looking at the support the school can offer these children and signpost families to other support agencies.</p> <p>Priority 4 – Is to look at Leadership and Governing Body. Working on Governor recruitment, induction packs, skills audits. This will support the school going forward which then links to the third document–<b>Governor Monitoring Schedule (Appendix C)</b>. SC asked governors before the end of the meeting to decide which areas they could support e.g., Early Years, writing, science and give their time to come into school and meet with subject leads to establish what the school is doing to move these areas forward.</p> <p>Esther joined the meeting at 6.20pm. ML welcomed Esther to the meeting. ML arranged to telephone ETN later to update her on the beginning of the meeting.</p> <p><b>Data Analysis (Appendix D)</b></p> <p>SC talked through Data Analysis document which is based on internal data collected on the children's return in March 2021. Some data more promising than anticipated. Some areas are a concern how the school moves forward post pandemic with the children. Maths in early years has improved. Language and communication-the school is now using Read, Write, Inc in EY's which is showing signs of improvement. ML asked if SC was moving Read, Write, Inc further up the school. SC confirmed the school had identified a third of Year 1 with little or no phonetic knowledge from current scheme and with the break in learning, so will introduce RWI to this group.</p> <p>Also identified small groups in Years 3 and 4 who have got gaps in their phonetic knowledge so will track these children to ensure they receive the right intervention. This was an area that Ofsted picked up in 2018 so this area needs to be addressed.</p> <p>Phonics in Year 2 is looking significantly better and NQT in class is using good practice. There is one ECHP child in Year 2 who will not meet the Phonetic Screening threshold</p>	
--	--

	<p>check. SC pointed out there is a high level of SEND needs in Year 2, so the teacher has worked very hard to meet their needs.</p> <p>SC informed governors that the biggest area for the Senior Leadership Team is Years 2/3/4 results in maths, lower than anticipated. Children's confidence is low. SLT/staff to look at gaps and target the right areas to build up their confidence. Interestingly Reading is still strong – SLT have put a lot of emphasis in this area and the work around E Books, new books in the library and Amazon wish list. TH and Su Purchas (Year 5 teacher) have particularly worked hard in this area during lock down.</p> <p><b>SEND review (Appendix E)</b></p> <p>SC talked through the document – Geographically the school match nationally with girls and boys in these cohorts but the school has a high number of GRT children on the SEND register. SLT and SENDCO still need to do further investigation around what provision needs to put in place and whether there are environmental factors that mean GRT children display SEND needs or is there a barrier for them, as the school is significantly higher than the national average. This impacts on attendance, largely traveller boys have high absence figures. A lot of provision is put in place and then they are not in school to access it.</p> <p>During the review, all the data in terms of class and individual provisional maps were looked at as well as learning walks to look at classroom practice. All these are fit for purpose and the staff are doing all the right things in these areas. Although the school has a high number of children on the SEND register, they should all be there. SC informed governors the Local Authority had produced a profile of need document which is useful as it helps target what specific needs a child has. Teachers have been signposted back to this document to help establish the level of need and what area of support the children need before beginning to refer to external agencies. Helps teachers to think about what practices they need in the classroom. SC drew governor's attention that some of the actions are around CPD/training on the four areas of SEND need.</p> <p>ML advised he thought it was a useful review and concise. ML asked who will carry on the tasks – SENDCO or SLT? SC – SENDCO is on the SLT, suggested particular staff members for tasks. ML agreed - picking out main tasks, nominate a staff member and time frame the actions.</p> <p><b><u>ACTION: SC to ensure actions on SEND review are allocated to staff and time frame</u></b></p> <p><b>Safeguarding Audit (Appendix F)</b></p> <p>SC shared Safeguarding Audit. He advised governors they would not have seen the audit in this format before, however SC thought the governors would find it useful. The Local Authority are now collecting the information electronically, which they started 2 or 3 terms ago, it used to be a paper return. The school has above national average number of vulnerable children. Half of the school cohort have either a special need, Child Protection, Child in Need, or targeted plan. The school has a high level of need within the school community. SC advised, that although SLT are aware of the need, Governors also need to know, and the Local Authority need to be aware and support the school.</p> <p>See Part B</p>	<p>sc</p>
--	--	-----------

7	<p>SM queried in the Contextual Information section (HT report Appendix G) on the report the downward trend in numbers on roll. Spike in Safeguarding in March (16) and then down again in April (2), reasons behind these figures. SM also asked for feedback headlines from the recent Parent Forum – post covid recovery plan any feedback from parents.</p> <p>SC said it was frustrating to lose a number of children in one go – there was various reasons, moving out of area, relocating. Hoping the numbers will build back up. Maximum number to have on roll is 210 however 200 would be ideal, especially from a financial point of view. The school has lower numbers for reception next year however other local schools are the same – national picture of a low birth rate year. This has an impact on the budget next year, which was recently discussed when ML visited school to review final budget, need to be mindful and conservative when looking at expenditure and do not financially overstretch the budget.</p> <p>With regards to the spike in safeguarding in March – SC informed governors it was difficult to discuss and how they are categorised. The number is still reasonable in terms of the context of the number of families the school is supporting and during April school was closed for two weeks for Easter holiday. However, SC would look at the figures again if SM wished. SM – No that is fine, understanding the context in the significant difference in numbers. SC – The school needs to be mindful of families that are more vulnerable at this time. This term the HSLW/PCL spent 34% of her time at multi-agency meetings. SC thinks this number will increase whether its due to financial pressures or mental health wellbeing which the school needs to be aware of and respond to.</p> <p>Parent forum – LA gave feedback from the parent forum as she attended. With regards to lockdown, she felt parents’ feelings were mixed, there were pros and cons. Some parents enjoyed family time during lockdown. Parents felt the 2<sup>nd</sup> lockdown, the school had provided better home learning, teams and the structure was easier for them to follow. The feedback from staff was better and easier to juggle work and school. SC felt the conversation with the parents that the feedback was more positive. SC informed governors that the conversation then moved onto what our current Year R families had missed - virtual induction and were not able to do coffee mornings. New parents were not able to mix like normal and get to know new people, they felt they had missed out. The school needs to be mindful over the next term and in the future to provide space for these events to take place. Whether it is a coffee morning or picnic for these parents to meet with their children and other families. ML – it is being part of the school community and as soon as the school gets the opportunity of doing it the better. SC – also need to be mindful of Year 1’s as these families were in Year R in the first lockdown and missed out as well.</p> <p>See Part B</p> <p>ML was surprised at the high level of children who are Young Carers (24). SC advised young carer is not just about a family with a physical disability but also around mental health and wellbeing and hidden disabilities. The school have siblings with autism, what is the child doing to support the parent, what impact does that have on the child. Could be behaviour, routines, and being mindful of a child coming in unsettled in the morning, tired or late. What are the barriers for that child who staff need to be mindful of and put in provision that will be as effective as possible. Staff look at the list of young carers and look at their progress both academically and emotionally and signpost them to charities like Surrey Young Carers. SC informed governors that when Surrey Young Carers</p>	
---	---	--

	<p>recently visited school, they were encouraged that the school had already identified several children.</p> <p><b>Staff training/CPD</b> SC advised governors that staff are to advise DG of any training they have undertaken which is recorded on SIMs. Governors had a discussion as to how governor training/webinars are recorded e.g. google form/Microsoft teams. Governors agreed to inform DG of training undertaken by email.</p> <p><b><u>ACTION: Governors to email DG of training/webinars they have undertaken</u></b></p> <p>ML asked what SMSC meant from the report. SC – spiritual, moral, social, and cultural development.</p> <p>No further questions from governors.</p> <p>See Part B</p>	GOVs
8	<p><b>POLICES</b> <b>EARLY YEARS POLICY (Appendix H)</b> ML thought the policy was well put together and the EY teacher had done a good job. ML did have concerns regarding point 3.1, line 2 – it mentions targeting children. ML thought the paragraph was not very clear and the target reason should be added.</p> <p>Governors adopted EY policy once small amendment had been made.</p> <p>No further comments from governors</p> <p><b><u>ACTION: EY's teacher to amend point 3.1, line 2</u></b></p> <p><b>ACCESSIBILITY PLAN (Appendix I)</b> ML asked governors if they had any comments regarding the plan – no questions ML liked the format of it, a lot of work had been done and it was realistic. SC confirmed it had achievable aims. Governors adopted Accessibility Plan.</p> <p><b>SUPPORTING CHILDREN'S MEDICAL NEEDS AND 1<sup>ST</sup> AID IN SCHOOLS (Appendix J)</b> SC advised policy is taken from SCC model policy and adapted to the school's practices. SM pointed out appendix C needed updating Governors adopt policy once amendment had been actioned <b><u>ACTION: DG to update Supporting Children's Medical Needs and 1<sup>st</sup> aid in schools</u></b></p> <p><b>EQUALITY PLAN (Appendix K)</b> SC explained the Equality plan has our front cover on but is agreed with the West Surrey Foundation. As the WSF are not meeting in the same way, SC has not used the WSF branding in bold letters but is referred to in the policy. SC confirmed it is the uniform policy that schools adopt.</p> <p>Policy adopted by Governors</p> <p>No questions from governors</p>	<p>DG</p> <p>DG</p>

10	<p><b>FINANCE</b></p> <p><b>Financial Monitoring Report (FMR) Month 14 2021 (Appendix L)</b></p> <p>DG had already advised governors the FMR was in the file section on Microsoft teams to view before meeting. This FMR was the final one for 2020/21 financial year. DG explained the carry forward figure to the next financial year was £154,294. £50k of this was committed expenditure – Year 1, Year 2, and staff toilet refurbishment.</p> <p>No questions from governors</p> <p><b>Final Budget 2021-22 Financial Year (Appendix M)</b></p> <p>DG advised governors that ML had met with SC and DG the previous week to review and agree figures on budget. DG informed governors the final budget had been agreed by ML (chair) and sent to Surrey County Council on 30<sup>th</sup> April 2021. The in-year deficit was showing as £40.016 but with careful spending in the coming year it is hoped it will not be as high as this figure.</p> <p>ML said from his point of view, we had gone through the budget in detail the previous week before he had signed it off, the budget is conservative and there is a little bit of surplus in some areas if needed, particularly buildings in case of any repairs. As it is a 3-year budget the school was aware it reserves would steadily whittle down over that period particularly with the low birth rate coming through.</p> <p>No questions from governors but DG advised new governors if they needed any further explanation regarding the FMR then to let her know.</p> <p>SC reminded governors the school had spent a lot on ICT last year, however this year the budget will be lower. The school does not need as much hardware this year.</p> <p>ML thanked DG on behalf of the governors for her bursar work last financial year.</p>	
11	<p><b>GOVERNORS MANAGEMENT ISSUES</b></p> <p><b>Governor training and Development</b></p> <p>ML officially welcomed ETN to the governing Body. ETN confirmed she had completed the Governance of Assessment training on the 26<sup>th</sup> April and Safeguarding booked for the 5<sup>th</sup> May and Introduction to school governance training on 6<sup>th</sup> May.</p> <p>AF and LA confirmed they had completed Governance of Assessment training on 26<sup>th</sup> April and Introduction to school Governance training to follow.</p> <p>ML, DS, SC, and TH had undertaken School Exclusion Training for HT and Governors.</p> <p>ML advised governors that he had booked a 'hot topic's webinar, which he had found useful and shared with SC – Ofsted to restart Autumn next year, indicators for governors, accelerated learning, support for vulnerable pupils, staff voice and Federations are popular again.</p> <p>ML advised governors that in terms of training and development, they need to think about two areas – subject areas that governors have a particular interest in and can support the school (as mentioned by SC earlier) and the other area, key governor loads e.g.: Safeguarding, SEND, Finance. The governors need to understand what the statutory</p>	







<p>useful. SC asked if SM wanted to add anything to that.</p> <p>SM – Yes, he would agree with SC, thinks it worked well, broadly followed format that ML had just mentioned– he had spent time with SC first and then follow visit was observations through the school and could then report back to governors. He found the format worked well and timed when it was most helpful.</p> <p>SC suggested re-sending the document again, so that governors can sign up for the areas that need monitoring in the summer term and dates can be put in the diary.</p> <p>ML – Agreed with SC and it is good for governors to know that he would welcome visits to school. SC we can socially distance as adults, masks and visors are available. We can minimise visits to classroom, we can observe from the courtyard and there is still value in that.</p> <p>No further questions from governors.</p> <p><b><u>ACTION: SC to resend Monitoring Document for Governors to sign up</u></b></p> <p><b>Staff Wellbeing</b></p> <p>SC - governors had asked him to write a paragraph on his HT's report regarding staff wellbeing. SC informed governors that he found difficult to write as there is a lot going on across the school for staff re: post pandemic/families and didn't feel it was appropriate to write what was happening here or there, staff are working incredibly hard and making sure the children end this academic year with more than they came in, in readiness for next year and not losing sight that we still have 7 weeks to do that effectively. There are pressures for staff e.g. parents evening.</p> <p>SC advised he had done some research and had found a document written by <b>Anna Freud (Appendix N)</b>. There are surveys for staff to complete. He did not think it was appropriate to give it to staff in one go but to send at various times in the year. He asked governors to give their feedback at the next meeting to see if they felt it was appropriate. This would give an indication of staff wellbeing. ML suggested it was sent to staff from governors. SC would be happy to do it that way. It is in 3 parts, one part is personal wellbeing, then work related indicators and the 3<sup>rd</sup> one is how staff support themselves, staff, and children's mental health in school. Over 6 meetings can attach a survey to each meeting which governors can track.</p> <p>ML supports what SC has said and feels the survey would be useful. He also feels the school should not lose sight of the personal touch and not just form filling. SC confirmed SLT are looking at the personal touch for staff wellbeing; ML thought that governors not being able to visit school over the last year had lost touch with staff and that is why they wanted feedback from SLT. SC explained it is difficult to show what the personal touch looks like to governors.</p> <p><b><u>ACTION: Governors to feedback at next FGB meeting their views on Anna Freud document</u></b></p>	<p>SC</p> <p>GOVs</p>
---	-----------------------



	<p>6. DG to put list of statutory areas onto Teams</p> <p>7. SC to resend Monitoring Document for Governors to sign up</p> <p>8. Governors to feedback at next FGB meeting their views on Anna Freud document</p> <p>9. AF to send draft document to DG who would share with governors.</p> <p>10. Governors to give feedback at next meeting regarding AF's Catch-up Plan</p> <p><b>Part B Actions</b></p> <p>11. SC to provide percentages to AF re: Domestic Violence</p> <p>12. DG to send Exclusion training link to LA and ETN</p>	
--	--	--

**Meeting finished at 7.30pm**

**Signed**



**Date 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2021**