

**MINUTES:**

**BOARD:** Full Governing Board

**SCHOOL:** Raysfield Primary School

**DATE:** Thursday 13 July 2023

**TIME:** 13:30 until 15:45 hours

**VENUE:** In person with a virtual clerk

**ATTENDED:**

Holly Magson (HM)	Co-Opted Governor, Chair.
Claire Hill (HT)	Ex-Officio. Headteacher
Kate Ball (KB)	Co-Opted Governor. Health & Safety Link
Sharon Dewfall (SD)	Co-Opted Governor
Pauline Dixon (PD)	LA Governor
Charlotte Gully (CGU)	Co-Opted Governor
Claire Hayward (CH)	Staff Governor Safeguarding Link
Sarah Thomas (ST)	Co-opted Governor Deputy Headteacher

**ATTENDING:**

Teresa Turner (SBM)	Associate Member
Jane Boyce (JB)	Judicium Clerk

**APOLOGIES:**

David Champion (DC)	Parent Governor
Helen Green (HG)	Parent Governor
Colin Gould (CGO)	Co-Opted Governor

**ABSENT:** None

**QUORUM:** 6 Governors

**MEETING FOLDER:**

The Code of Conduct for Governors requires governors to be honest and open with regard to conflicts of interest (either real or perceived). Governors must not use their position for personal gain in business, political or social relationships. Therefore, a governor who has, or may be perceived to have, such a personal interest in a particular matter under consideration should declare that interest, withdraw from all discussions relating to it and take no part in any vote on such matter.

Items marked \* are those in which a majority of Governors may have an interest because of some shared attribute. When considering these items, Governors should aim to achieve a balanced view, paying particular attention to the sources of information and advice, and remind themselves of their duties as governors and to act in the public interest.

Item	
1.	<b>Welcome and Introductions:</b> The Chair welcomed those present
2.	<b>Procedural items:</b>
2.1.	<b>Apologies for absence</b> As recorded.
2.2.	<b>Confirmation of Quorum</b> The meeting was confirmed as quorate.

<b>2.3.</b>	<b>Declarations of interest for this meeting.</b> Governors were reminded of SD's previously declared two pecuniary interests: employment as the Financial Business Partner (Central Team) for Castle School Educational Trust; and their recent appointment as Financial Project lead as part of a team accessing the financial potential for applications to Mosaic Trust. The latter post had been accepted after SD had decided to step-down as a Governor at Raysfield. This would be SD's last meeting.																														
<b>2.4.</b>	<b>Confidentiality Statement:</b> Governors were reminded that all matters discussed during the meeting were confidential until the Minutes had been approved. Any items recorded in the Confidential Part II Minutes would remain confidential after the Part II Minutes had been approved.																														
<b>3.</b>	<b>Any Other Business:</b> It was agreed to discuss additional items as follows: regarding the Mosaic Scoping Financial funds (TEG Payment) in the school's bank account; and 'thanks' for 2022-23																														
<b>4.</b>	<b>Minutes:</b>																														
<b>4.1.</b>	The Minutes of the last Full Governing Board held on 25.05.23 were approved.																														
<b>5.</b>	<b>Matters Arising from the Minutes</b>																														
<b>5.1.</b>	Update on actions agreed at the Full Governing Board held on Thursday 25 May 2023																														
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item</th><th>Action</th><th>Actionee</th><th>Status</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5.1</td><td>Tracked changes to the financial scheme of delegation to be recommended by SBM/HT within this document and then discuss at the July FGB if these should be approved. SBM would check with their SBM group the standard procedures in operation at other schools as part of this process.</td><td>SBM/HT</td><td>On agenda</td></tr> <tr> <td>5.1</td><td>Continue to work on attainment gaps between boys and girls report. Chair to write up their observations of 'if any' of unconscious bias and whether this was a staff perspective or if the children were aware of it. Generically, teachers were not always able recognise over representation of boys. Written report to follow from the Chair, alongside some more investigations. HT requested if this could include the possibility around inequality of praise required by boys and girls.</td><td>Chair</td><td>Ongoing</td></tr> <tr> <td>5.1</td><td>Upload Mosaic slides from the recent information talks attended by Governors</td><td>HT</td><td>Complete</td></tr> <tr> <td>6.3</td><td>Next audit visit from our Health and Safety provider was due to take place next term. Governor Health and Safety Link Visit to be organised.</td><td>KB/SBM</td><td>Complete</td></tr> <tr> <td>8</td><td>A copy of the Safeguarding Audit Report would be shared with Governors.</td><td>ST</td><td>Complete</td></tr> <tr> <td>9.1</td><td>Chair would liaise with HT over GIS scoping questions to be sent to Andrew</td><td>Chair</td><td>Complete</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Item	Action	Actionee	Status	5.1	Tracked changes to the financial scheme of delegation to be recommended by SBM/HT within this document and then discuss at the July FGB if these should be approved. SBM would check with their SBM group the standard procedures in operation at other schools as part of this process.	SBM/HT	On agenda	5.1	Continue to work on attainment gaps between boys and girls report. Chair to write up their observations of 'if any' of unconscious bias and whether this was a staff perspective or if the children were aware of it. Generically, teachers were not always able recognise over representation of boys. Written report to follow from the Chair, alongside some more investigations. HT requested if this could include the possibility around inequality of praise required by boys and girls.	Chair	Ongoing	5.1	Upload Mosaic slides from the recent information talks attended by Governors	HT	Complete	6.3	Next audit visit from our Health and Safety provider was due to take place next term. Governor Health and Safety Link Visit to be organised.	KB/SBM	Complete	8	A copy of the Safeguarding Audit Report would be shared with Governors.	ST	Complete	9.1	Chair would liaise with HT over GIS scoping questions to be sent to Andrew	Chair	Complete		
Item	Action	Actionee	Status																												
5.1	Tracked changes to the financial scheme of delegation to be recommended by SBM/HT within this document and then discuss at the July FGB if these should be approved. SBM would check with their SBM group the standard procedures in operation at other schools as part of this process.	SBM/HT	On agenda																												
5.1	Continue to work on attainment gaps between boys and girls report. Chair to write up their observations of 'if any' of unconscious bias and whether this was a staff perspective or if the children were aware of it. Generically, teachers were not always able recognise over representation of boys. Written report to follow from the Chair, alongside some more investigations. HT requested if this could include the possibility around inequality of praise required by boys and girls.	Chair	Ongoing																												
5.1	Upload Mosaic slides from the recent information talks attended by Governors	HT	Complete																												
6.3	Next audit visit from our Health and Safety provider was due to take place next term. Governor Health and Safety Link Visit to be organised.	KB/SBM	Complete																												
8	A copy of the Safeguarding Audit Report would be shared with Governors.	ST	Complete																												
9.1	Chair would liaise with HT over GIS scoping questions to be sent to Andrew	Chair	Complete																												

		in advance of the meeting on 16th June.		
	9.3.2	Scoping Questions Further questions could be sent through GovernorHub to the Chair.	All	Complete
	9.3.3	Read all Mosaic documentation uploaded to GovernorHub	All	Complete
	10.2	Governor Recruitment – Chair to advertise vacancy.	Chair	Complete
	10.4	Complete self-evaluation form and upload renamed form.	All	September (Also remind about skills audit)
6.	<b>School Business Manager Report</b> The SBM gave a verbal update. There had been no major variances on the 2023-24 budget since the last meeting. A monitoring report would be available for the next meeting. <div style="text-align: right;"><b>Action: SBM</b></div> Highlighted items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Devolved Capital</b>                Further to the discussion on the 2023-24 budget it had been established that the devolved capital for improvements to buildings and other facilities, which meant that there was £15K that could be used for the bathrooms, leaving circa £12K not allocated.</li> <li>• <b>Breakfast Club</b>                24 to 28 children attending Breakfast Club.  <b>Q Gobs:</b> Was it making money? What was the breakeven point? Why had numbers increased? What was the surplus? What were the demographics, and would this go down when current year 6 left? Were the Reception children allowed to attend? Did children need to be full time at school before being able to attend? Was there a maximum number of children with the current staff ration?  <b>A SBM:</b> Breakeven was 24 children, so there was a surplus building up, currently about £1500. Staff were working well together. There had been an increase in numbers with more parents working from home. There were some Year 6 children attending, so this would result in a drop in numbers when they left but there would be an uptake as there were always new parents making enquiries. Reception children were welcome to attend. There were three members of staff, so there was adequate staffing ratios even with the younger children attending.  <b>A HT:</b> Children were discouraged from attending until they were full time. The reception induction was only 2 weeks. Maximum number was currently about 40 children, although this was dependent on how many under 5s were attending.</li> <li>• <b>GDPR – reported in 6.3</b></li> <li>• <b>Health and Safety – reported in 6.2</b></li> </ul>			
6.1.	<b><u>Scheme of Delegation</u></b> SBM requested that the Scheme of Delegation Headteacher authorized purchasing limits be increased from £5k to £9,999. It was noted that this would facilitate necessary purchases being made between Governing Body meetings. <b>Q Gov:</b> Would this be for the purchasing of items that were included in the budget? Would the other condition remain in the Scheme of Delegation? <b>A SBM:</b> Yes the Headteacher would be able to purchase for items up to £9,999 if the item was in the agreed budget. The SBM could also ensure that this condition was stated in the			

	<p>conditions of the Scheme of Delegation. The Resources Committee section required removing from the text stating the conditions.</p> <p><b>PD:</b> Any emergency expenditure (that would be detrimental to the school if left unchecked) required outside the new Scheme of Delegation could be actioned using Chair's Actions. Even if the item of expenditure was not in the budget.</p> <p>The Governors approved the Headteacher's permitted expenditure to £9,999 within the Scheme of Delegation. The references to the Resources Committee would also be removed. It was noted that if the HT were absent that the DHT would be acting HT and they would therefore have the necessary delegated authority.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Approved</b></p>
6.2.	<p><b>Health &amp; Safety</b></p> <p>No live updates. The Link Governor had visited 28 June and the actions from the last Health and Safety report had been checked. The next Health and Safety Fire Risk Assessment would be carried out in term one 2023-24. Risk assessments had been reviewed.</p> <p>It was noted that there had been two staff accidents. One had involved a child on a scooter colliding with a member of staff, resulting in a trip to the Minor Injuries Unit. The second was the caretaker had cut himself with a Stanley knife when opening boxes.</p> <p>There had also been an accident involving a child breaking their arm when playing football.</p> <p>The link Governor suggested that future visits should concentrate on smaller areas, as opposed to looking at the whole site.</p>
6.3.	<p><b>GDPR</b></p> <p>SBM and the HT reported that there had been one incident since the last meeting. This related to children without photographic permission being included in whole class photographs. It had come about because child individual photographs had been taken and then all children, even those without global permission, had been included in the whole class photographs.</p> <p>The mitigating actions were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• class photographs recalled</li> <li>• the School Photography Company, Tulip had retaken the whole class photographs without charge.</li> <li>• the process going forward for checking permissions had been updated and was now more robust.</li> <li>• Tulip were able to offer a separate QR code so that different whole class photographs could be supplied to parents. This meant that the children without permissions could still be included in the process.</li> <li>• the outcome was positive and the system for photograph permissions had been made more robust.</li> <li>• staff in the office had worked during their half term and the senior leaders were grateful for their commitment.</li> <li>• the HT had spoken with the class teachers that had not followed procedure.</li> </ul>
7.	<p><b><u>Headteacher's Report</u></b></p> <p>The HTs summary report had been circulated through GovernorHub.</p> <p>Highlights and Governor Questions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EYFS numbers were at 54. Confident that 53 of these children would be attending in September.</li> </ul> <p><b>Q Gov:</b> Were they new to school or were the reception intake siblings of existing families?  <b>A HT:</b> it was not possible to extrapolate this data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anecdotal evidence was reported on families being attracted by Raysfield's progressive methods, restorative conversations and supportive measures when children's behaviour was challenging</li> <li>• The school's inclusive setting was attracting families who can sometimes felt unwelcome from other maintained settings. This meant the EHCP % was higher than national average.</li> </ul>

	<p>In September 5 children expected with EHCPs and a few of these children were recommended resource base settings but have been issued places at Raysfield. The HT had challenged the LA on providing additional funding in order to support these children. With their current 'band funding' it was not possible to meet the needs as stated on their EHCP. Some of these children had already had their banding increased by one level by the LA when the HT had questioned the LA on their decisions. The HT would, if necessary, ask for the Governors to sign-off a letter to the LA if further funding was required.</p> <p><b>Q Gov:</b> Was it possible to look at the geographical home location of the children and the schools that were in their catchment? Were the challenging children being directed to Raysfield by schools that were in their catchment?</p> <p><b>A HT:</b> This off-rolling was potentially happening. The school had been consulted on two further children with EHCPs, and a family who had been recommended from their current school. This practice was illegal and the HT had reported the school to the LA.</p> <p><b>PD:</b> It was understandable that not all schools could meet the needs of all children in their catchment, however when this was the case additional funding was required to meet the needs of these challenging children.</p> <p><b>A HT:</b> The issue was with SENK children, as these received no funding. Potentially going forward it could be necessary to have two SENDCOs. Additional support within the administrative team was also a way forward.</p> <p><b>SD:</b> Emergency and succession planning was important as well.</p> <p><b>HT:</b> Some funding for training had been accessed through the Cluster Offer for a Teacher of SEND. This had been undertaken by Ella Danter. Rachel Mullins, the Pastoral Lead could potentially be given additional training. It was important to build a team and support network around Karen Tyson, the Inclusion Lead. It was planned to enable Karen to work at home one day a week and to support them with leadership organisation.</p> <p><b>SD:</b> Many schools offered SENDCO supervision outside the school environment.</p> <p><b>HT:</b> Within Mosaic the HT would be inputting into a SEN Group.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was agreed that the EHCP funding and the school's staffing structure would be discussed at the November meeting. It would be an agenda item.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Action: HT/ Clerk</b></p> <p><b>Q Govs:</b> <a href="#">The Headline Data</a> sets were impressive. <a href="#">The Progress Data</a> (Pupil Premium, Year 4 and Year 5, Class Kingfisher and Kestrel in the two-year groups) – what was impacting on the progress in these two classes? Was the teaching provision adequate in Kingfisher?</p> <p><b>A ST:</b> In Kingfisher there was disruptive child in Child Protection which was difficult to manage due to their family dynamic. The handover to the new Kingfisher teacher from the old teacher had been incomplete. A third issue had been lack of moderation on books since the assessment. The new teacher was excellent.</p> <p><b>A HT:</b> Moderation across the school had not been as thorough due to Ofsted. There was no concern about Teaching and Learning quality.</p>
7.1.	<p><b>Ofsted Inspection Outcome</b></p> <p>This had been extremely positive inspection. The associated website check had shown only two minor corrections being required.</p> <p>The Ofsted grading received had been a solid secure good rating. The two next steps outcomes were: improving assessments and continued support of new subject team leaders, Parents had been informed of the outcome and it was also on the school website.</p> <p><b>Q Govs:</b> It would be useful to be able assess the impact of the marketing project funded and the 'good' Ofsted Inspection. Could this be done? Could parents be asked why they had or had not chosen Raysfield?</p> <p><b>A HT:</b> The marketing was a three-year project. Potentially a Google form could be sent to prospective parents that had expressed an interest.</p>

	<p>It was agreed that in September a working party would be set up to assess why parents were choosing Raysfield. This working party could also do some parent conferencing in September as well.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Action: HT</b></p>
8.	<p><b><u>Safeguarding Report</u></b>          The DHT presented the term 6 CPOMs analysis.  <b>Highlights were:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An increase in term 6 incidents. This was traditionally a more challenging term as year 6 children prepared to move into their secondary phase of their education.</li> <li>• Many of the CPOMs entries were related to home issues</li> <li>• Year 4 incidents were high. This was connected to the number of Child Protection (CP) children, Early Help Assessment and Plan (EHAP) and a higher proportion of boys</li> <li>• Check-In had risen and were happening in lunchtime. Previously these had been during lesson time. This had included 8 Check-In for Year R, which was related to the extended absence of Rachel Mullins.</li> </ul> <p>The DHT requested that any further questions be posted on the GovernorHub noticeboard.</p>
8.1.	<p><b>Safeguarding, Prevent and KCSiE 2023</b>          The Chair would upload the key changes to the KCSiE 2023 onto the GovernorHub.  <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Action: Chair</b></p>         It was noted that the KCSiE 2023 would be live from 1 September 2023.          All Governors agreed to read this document by the November meeting. Governors would need to confirm that they had read KCSiE 2023 within their personal profiles.  <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Action: All</b></p>         The Clerk would supply a brief reminder before the next meeting. This briefing note would be considered at the agenda meeting for the November meeting  <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Action: Clerk</b></p> </p>
9.	<b>Governors</b>
9.1.	<p><b>Governor Visits and Training</b>          Governors had received a verbal update from KB on the Health and Safety visit in 6.2.</p>
	<p>SD exited the meeting at 15:00 hours. It was noted that this would be their last meeting and the HT thanked SD for their contribution and extensive support as the Finance Link Governor.</p>
9.2.	<p><b>Self-Evaluation</b>          The requirement for all to complete a 360 self- evaluation form was noted. It was agreed that this would be on the November agenda. There would also be an individual skills audit.  <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Action: Chair/Clerk/HT</b></p> </p>
10.	<p><b>Mosaic Discussions and Vote</b>          It was noted that on the 16th June a Mosaic meeting focussed on finances had been held. Information regarding the detail shared had been uploaded to the GovernorHub.  <b>Highlights of the discussion before the vote was taken were as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback from the staff mosaic meetings had been positive.</li> <li>• If part of an Academy Trust there would be potential for staff finishing a fixed term contract to seek internal vacancies with other schools in the Trust</li> </ul> <p><b>Q Gov:</b> Was there an appeals process for any non-financial element on decision making? Was there an appeals process if there were serious concern with budget allocation (i.e. could one school have some of its funds diverted to help another school)?</p> <p><b>A HT:</b> Raysfield's budget fund would remain within Raysfield 's control. The Heads would have a way in which to request funds for special projects i.e. a sensory den, if there was a rationale to support the request. Raysfield would continue to have a voice to shape their future.</p>



	<p><b>A SBM:</b> There would be central fund, in the same way the Local Authority paid for certain items. For example, if a new roof was required, Raysfield would request funds from the central fund instead of the Local Authority.</p> <p><b>A DHT:</b> It would be equitable for the right reason to provide for the children within the Trust.</p> <p><b>Q Gov:</b> Would the Trust enable for each of the schools to have their own identity or would it be prescribed and generic? What about the stakeholders</p> <p><b>A HT:</b> No this would not be the case. This type of prescriptive 'one size fits all' was not part of the vision and Raysfield had been part of shaping the vision. The vision was based on all the schools retaining their individuality.</p> <p><b>DHT:</b> It was about the vision and the Trustees. 'Every child matters' was at the heart of the values and vision.</p> <p><b>HT:</b> Possible to look at other Trusts in the area, but Raysfield would potentially not have such a strong ability to shape the future. Being part of this vision would enable the Raysfield experts to work alongside other experts and share best practice. For example, the Raysfield specialist music lead could network with other music leads across the Trust.</p> <p><b>PD:</b> The schools in the Trust would be able to replicate best practise. There would be opportunities for economies of scale, which was a benefit when funding was becoming more of a focus. The Trust was a Trust of all primary schools and this was a significant benefit.</p> <p><b>Q Gov:</b> Was there potential for secondary schools to join?</p> <p><b>A HT:</b> No, all primary schools. The aim was to grow to 30 schools, which would replicate the type of support previously given by the Local Authority.</p> <p><b>DHT:</b> By being in the first wave Raysfield would have greater opportunities to shape the Trust.</p> <p><b>HT:</b> The process would have 'hiccups' and there would be issues to overcome so that the future of Raysfield was assured.</p> <p>A vote was taken, which included the absent Governors that had passed their decision to the Chair, on whether to form part of the consultation with stakeholder as to whether to join Mosaic. (The SBM, as an Associate, left the meeting whilst the vote was taken. Helen Green had not provided a vote, so in essence abstained from the vote.) All those who voted approved to go out to consultation with the stakeholders.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Approved</b></p>
<b>11.</b>	<b>Any Other Urgent Business (AOB):</b>
<b>11.1.</b>	<p><b>Mosaic TEG Payments</b></p> <p>It was noted that Mosaic had a grant of £50K that required a school bank account to hold the fund on their behalf. It was agreed that Raysfield would hold this grant in their school budget bank account. The SBM would ensure that the Governors received regular monitoring on the Mosaic bank account. This was approved. The HT would be an accounting officer for this fund.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Approved</b></p>
<b>11.2.</b>	<p><b>Thank You:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Sharon Dewfall – Retiring Co-Opted Governor</b> – had worked hard and contributed extensively.</li> <li>• <b>Pauline Dixon – Retiring Local Authority Governor</b> – their strong commitment to the work of the school and the level of challenge that they had provided during discussions had been appreciated.</li> <li>• <b>PTA Fundraising-</b> this was very much appreciated.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Chair thanked all the Governors for their work across the academic year. In particular, their dedication and commitment, especially for the Governor in School days. The Chair was in awe of the leadership shown by the Headteacher.</li> <li>The HT reported that Ofsted had commented on how strong the Governing Body at Raysfield were.</li> <li>The Chair thanked the Clerk for their contribution to clear and concise Governance advice.</li> </ul>
<b>12.</b>	<b>To identify Items for Confidential Part II Minutes</b>
<b>13.</b>	<b>Meeting Dates 2023-24 - Next meeting on: <a href="#">Report</a></b> Wednesday 6 September 2023
	<b>The Chair closed the meeting at 15:45 hours.</b>

**Actions arising from the Minutes of the Full Governing Board held on Thursday 25 May 2023**

Item	Action	Actionee	Status
5.1	Continue to work on attainment gaps between boys and girls report. Chair to write up their observations of 'if any' of unconscious bias and whether this was a staff perspective or if the children were aware of it. Generically, teachers were not always able recognise over representation of boys. Written report to follow from the Chair, alongside some more investigations. HT requested if this could include the possibility around inequality of praise required by boys and girls.	Chair	Ongoing
10.4	Complete self-evaluation form and upload renamed form.	All	September (Also remind about skills audit)

**Actions arising from the Minutes of the Full Governing Board held on Thursday 13 July 2023**

Item	Action	Actionee	Status
6	Budget monitoring report 2023-24	Chair	On agenda- Sept
7	EHCP funding and the school's staffing structure	HT/Clerk	
7.1	Set up a working party to assess why parents were choosing Raysfield. This working party could also do some parent conferencing in September as well.	HT	
8.1	Upload KCSiE 2023 changes to GovernorHub	Chair	
8.1	Read KCSiE 2023. Confirm read on GovernorHub after 1 September 2023	All	November Agenda
8.1	Brief summary on Governor Actions for those unsure of how to make confirmations on GovernorHub		November Agenda
9.2	Self-Evaluation review (Skills audit also)	Chair/HT/Clerk	November Agenda
11.1	Monitor of Mosaic £50K grant held in school budget account	SBM	Every Agenda