

**MINUTES:**

**BOARD:** Full Governing Board

**SCHOOL:** Raysfield Primary School

**DATE:** Thursday 25 May 2023

**TIME:** 14:30 -16:30 hours

**VENUE:** In-Person and Virtual

**ATTENDED:**

Holly Magson (HM)	Co-Opted Governor. Chair
Claire Hill (HT)	Ex-Officio Headteacher (Exited at 15:10 hours.)
Kate Ball (KB)	Co-Opted Governor Health & Safety Link
David Champion (DC)	Parent Governor (Virtual)
Sharon Dewfall (SD)	Co-Opted Governor
Pauline Dixon (PD)	LA Governor
Colin Gould (CGO)	Co-Opted Governor
Helen Green (HG)	Parent Governor (Exited at 16:15 hours.)
Charlotte Gully (CGU)	Co-Opted Governor
Claire Hayward (CH)	Staff Governor Safeguarding Link
Sarah Thomas (ST)	Co-opted Governor Deputy Headteacher
Teresa Turner (SBM)	Associate Member
Jane Boyce (JB)	Judicium Clerk (Virtual)

**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>

	None.																				
2.2.	<b>Confirmation of Quorum</b> The meeting was confirmed as quorate.																				
2.3.	<b>Declarations of interest for this meeting.</b> SD declared two pecuniary interests for item 9, the Scoping Item Mosaic Trust which were: 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. Detailed emails had been circulated on these and it had been agreed through GovernorHub that SD should be able to answer any generic questions on the process of joining a Trust and what happened when a maintained schools became an Academy. Although it was noted that SD would not participate in more generalised discussions or decisions about agreeing the next steps in the scoping exercise. SD had updated their pecuniary interest within GovernorHub. There were no other personal or pecuniary interest declared. There would be a celebration of SD’s work at the end of the academic year.																				
2.4.	<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.																				
3.	<b>Any Other Business:</b> None.																				
4.	<b>Minutes:</b>																				
4.1.	The Minutes of the last Full Governing Board held on 30.03.23 were approved. <a href="#">Minutes of the Full Governing Body 30.03.23</a>																				
5.	<b>Matters Arising from the Minutes:</b>																				
5.1.	<b>Actions arising from the Minutes of the Full Governing Board held on Thursday 30 March 2023</b> <table><tr><th>Item</th><th>Action</th><th>Actionee</th><th>Status</th></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>Raysfield Financial Scheme of Delegation for new academic year. Please read, in GovernorHub for Governors to read for July meeting.</td><td>Clerk/HT</td><td>Complete</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>To discuss delegated financial authority. Purchasing limits. This will require above Scheme of Delegation to be altered.</td><td>HT/SBM</td><td>July Meeting</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td colspan="3">Tracked changes to the 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></tr><tr><td>8.7.2</td><td>To consider the request by a teacher to have a sabbatical and the HT would check the level of delegation</td><td>Governors/ HT</td><td>Complete Agreed and finalised through GovernorHub.</td></tr></table>	Item	Action	Actionee	Status	5	Raysfield Financial Scheme of Delegation for new academic year. Please read, in GovernorHub for Governors to read for July meeting.	Clerk/HT	Complete	5	To discuss delegated financial authority. Purchasing limits. This will require above Scheme of Delegation to be altered.	HT/SBM	July Meeting	5	Tracked changes to the 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.			8.7.2	To consider the request by a teacher to have a sabbatical and the HT would check the level of delegation	Governors/ HT	Complete Agreed and finalised through GovernorHub.
Item	Action	Actionee	Status																		
5	Raysfield Financial Scheme of Delegation for new academic year. Please read, in GovernorHub for Governors to read for July meeting.	Clerk/HT	Complete																		
5	To discuss delegated financial authority. Purchasing limits. This will require above Scheme of Delegation to be altered.	HT/SBM	July Meeting																		
5	Tracked changes to the 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.																				
8.7.2	To consider the request by a teacher to have a sabbatical and the HT would check the level of delegation	Governors/ HT	Complete Agreed and finalised through GovernorHub.																		

	9	The Chair offered to explore why there were more boys than girls attending Check-In.	Chair	Ongoing
	9	Chair & SD had met with Yr 4 pupils. They had tried to establish if there were differences in teaching styles between boys and girls. 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.		
	9.2	School site work scheduled for summer holidays	SBM	Complete
	10	Put on GH dates Governor Information sessions for scoping tasks	Chair	Complete
	10	Attend area scoping task governor information meetings	CHayward/ CGo	Complete
	10	Upload into Mosaic Folder useful information on the scoping task	HT	Complete
	11.1	Safer Recruitment Policy – latest version to be uploaded to FGB meeting folder 30.03.23	SBM	Complete
	11.1	Governors to review safer recruitment policy	Governors	Complete
	11.2	Governors to review Whistleblowing Policy	Governors	Complete
	13.2	SEF to be updated	HT	Complete
	HT to upload Mosaic slides from the recent information talks attended by Governors.			
	<b>Action: HT</b>			
	<b>Actions arising from the Minutes of the Full Governing Board held on Thursday 9 February 2023</b>			
	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Actionee</b>	<b>Status</b>
	8	Draft annual governor visits schedule	Chair/HT	Complete
	9.1.1	Add more readable headings to monitoring report.	SBM	Complete
	9.1.2	Bespoke training on budget reports – how to read & interpret them	SBM	Complete
<b>6.</b>	<b>School Business Manager Report</b>			
<b>6.1.</b>	<b>General Overview Report</b>			
	<a href="#">End of Year Report 2022-23</a>			
	This had been previously circulated through GovernorHub. The report summarized the outturn against the revised budget figures. <b>The 2022-23 end of year budget outturn report was approved.</b>			
	<b>Approved.</b>			
	<b>It was noted that the end of year surplus was £296,096. The use of this surplus had been discussed at the GIS day and the use of the surplus was approved.</b>			
	<b>Approved.</b>			
<b>6.2.</b>	<b>Proposed Three Year Budget 2023-</b>			
	<a href="#">Traci Langford Budget Visit Notes 4 May 2023– Three-Year Budget</a>			

	<p><a href="#"><u>Traci Langford Budget Email Go Ahead to Submit Budget with no Recovery</u></a></p> <p><a href="#"><u>Detailed Income and Expenditure Excel Report – Three-Year Budget 2023-26</u></a></p> <p>The 2023-24 budget setting process had been carried out with the School Finance Officer, Traci Langford, the SBM and the HT. There had been a need to revisit the budget setting process due to year 2 and 3 of the three-year budget potential deficits. The correspondence with Traci on this process had been shared and uploaded to GovernorHub,</p> <p>The GIS Day had discussed the new scenario which would avoid year 2 and 3 going into deficit.</p>
6.2.1.	<p><a href="#"><u>Governor in School Financial Morning Session 25 May 2023</u></a></p> <p><b>Detailed questions about the budget had been posted on GovernorHub Notice Board and answered in GIS morning session. This information was available <a href="#"><u>Governor in School Day held on 25 May 2023 Finance Discussion Notes</u></a>.</b></p>
6.2.2.	<p><b>Q:</b> Capital? what is the position re this "pot of money" could we move some potential revenue spend to capital thereby freeing up some revenue?</p> <p><b>A:</b> The SBM would consider the position on this. It was important to be mindful that not all monies should be allocated as future unplanned expenditure required consideration.</p>
6.2.3.	<p><b>The actions and bullet points from GIS were as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff review of Teaching Assistants to be implemented September 2024</li> <li>• Review any Teaching Assistant over 25 hours</li> <li>• Income from EHCP - it was anticipated that Raysfield would be eligible for additional funding from September 2023, when we would have 5% with SEN E. Potential for £18K 2023-24, then £12.5K ongoing.</li> <li>• Currently there are 18 FTE teachers for 14 classes. This does include HT, DHT and Inclusion Lead. We re lucky to have a part time Teaching and Learning Lead to support ECTs currently but this has been changed for the future budget. Supply costs would be lower, as the plan was to use HLTAs after academic year 2023/24.</li> <li>• Upper Spine Point Teacher leaving this financial year, to be replaced with a Main Pay Scale</li> <li>• Traci had been happy with the assumptions that demonstrated 2 years without a deficit</li> <li>• Income streams would be required to maintain current staffing structure</li> <li>• There were contingencies in many lines of the budget</li> <li>• A good OFSTED would help improve pupil numbers which we are keen to have.</li> </ul>
6.2.4.	<p><b>The three-year budget for 2023-26 was approved.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Approved</b></p>
6.3.	<p><b>Health &amp; Safety</b></p> <p><b>The SBM report was as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There have been no major reported health and safety incidents since the last meeting.</li> <li>• Zurich had conducted a check of our outside areas and play equipment and there are a number of advisories on the two trim trails. Potential for repair would be assessed. The areas may have to be removed should the items become unsafe. There was currently no money in the budget to replace these.</li> <li>• A number of windows around the school were unable to be opened due to their age. This had been reported to South Gloucester who are coming out to assess them.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The leaking roof in KS1 had been repaired through South Gloucester with a school contribution of £500 out of capital towards this.</li> <li>Refresher training had been carried with the majority of staff on Health and Safety around the school.</li> <li>Noted 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.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Action: KB/SBM</b></p> <p>(HT exited the meeting at 15:10 hours)</p>
<b>6.4.</b>	<p><b>GDPR</b></p> <p>There have been no incidents recorded since the last meeting. Refresher training had been carried with the majority of staff on GDPR around the school and everyone's responsibility. The annual audit was due next term</p>
<b>7.</b>	<p><a href="#"><u>Headteacher's Report</u></a></p> <p>The written report had been circulated in advance of the meeting. The Deputy Head Teacher answered questions on the report.</p> <p><b>Governor Questions:</b></p>
<b>7.1.</b>	<p><b>Q:</b> With reference to the multiplication check for year 4, when would this take place?</p> <p><b>A:</b> After half-term. There had been a variety of initiatives, including competition between classes and year groups. It look likely to be an 80% pass rate, improve on last year's results. Some children had found the method of delivery through an iPad a barrier.</p>
<b>7.2.</b>	<p><b>Q:</b> Positive trend in CPOMs, with all categories reducing? How could this be captured in terms of evidencing how the school had been responsible for these improvements?</p> <p><b>A:</b> The new behaviour policy (Brave, Kind ,Responsible) had made a positive impact and the impact of this would be reviewed by CSP and Peers from Venture hub on 12<sup>th</sup> June. This new policy had reduced the number of children attending Check-In. Safeguarding Welfare Attendance Group (SWAG) evidenced the work of the Lodge and the support work accrued out. ST planned to track all children that had been supported by SWAG and follow the journey of a pupil to show the steps undertaken. The CPOM bar charts were also good evidence. ST also looking to refine the category of CPOM 'home' to be able to track root cause.</p>
<b>7.3.</b>	<p><b>Q:</b> Year 4 had some children with complex needs. Was the behaviour associated with these children with the high needs?</p> <p><b>A:</b> This year group had a Child Protection plan, two children with Child In Need plans, some others on Early Help plans. This resulted in more entries on the safeguarding records, as these groups were tracked more closely. Three children in this year group with challenging behaviours and there was tendency for behaviour issues to escalate as the children moved into the higher year cohorts. One on a Child Protection plan had left the school but was still on roll and the school remained responsible for their safeguarding. The Educational Welfare Officer (EWO) had been supporting with this child.</p>
<b>7.4.</b>	<p><b>Q:</b> What was the whole school attendance percentage target?</p> <p><b>A:</b> 95% and currently whole school attendance was above this at 95.4%</p>
<b>7.5.</b>	<p><b>Q:</b> Recruitment update on advertised KS1 post? The candidates had shown promise in their application forms.</p> <p><b>A:</b> The candidates were not suitable, and none had delivered for the KS1 gaps in the teaching structure. It would be re-advertised. The new marketing strategy would hopefully encourage better quality applicants.</p>

8.	<p><b>Safeguarding Report</b></p> <p>The Annual Safeguarding Audit had been positive and there had been some small changes required. ST gave a verbal update on the required improvements. The area of most significance was the improvements required in Online Safety Curriculum and that ST would lead on this. KB reported back on their findings from the GIS Day.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KB conducted thorough look the SCR and recruitment process, which was very positive.</li> <li>• DBS copies to be destroyed after 6 months</li> <li>• The children showed good evidence of online safety in Years 1 and 2.</li> </ul> <p>A list of the actions related to Safeguarding Audit Report would be shared with Governors.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Action: ST</b></p>
9.	<p><b>Scoping Task Update</b></p>
9.1.	<p><u><a href="#">Governor in School Day Discussion on Mosaic</a></u></p> <p>The questions and answers and the surrounding discussion during the GIS Day were available in the meeting folder.</p> <p>Chair would liaise with HT over GIS scoping questions to be sent to Andrew in advance of the meeting on 16th June.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Action: Chair</b></p>
9.2.	<p><b>Further Questions Raised to be answered by HT:</b></p>
9.2.1.	<p><b>Q:</b> Have other Academy Trusts been explored, such as Leaf?</p> <p><b>A ST:</b> The difference was that Raysfield would become a part of shaping this academy. The group of schools considering joining Mosaic included schools that Raysfield already ran initiatives with. It would be a partnership of like-minded schools. The offer from the LA was shrinking, with less services being included in the package offered.</p>
9.2.2.	<p><b>Q:</b> What was Andrew's five-year plan? What would happen to Mosaic if he moved on? Would the Trust change it's offer: What would happen if Raysfield were not in the first wave, by the time Raysfield were joining Andrew could be moving on? What was the long term vision</p> <p><b>A Clerk:</b> A Trust was bound by its Articles of Association, and the Scheme of Delegation. The members were the guardians of the governance of the trust. The board of trustees were the accountable body and determined which functions it delegated. Under the board of trustees there were board committees and the executive leaders. Accountable mechanism were in place and the Academy Councils would feed into this process.</p> <p><b>SD:</b> There was no guarantee that an individual would remain in post. For example, Claire might not continue to be HT at Raysfield. Any good organisations were structured and set up to build resilience that was no reliant on one individual. Did the vision and ethos being outlined by the Mosaic present an opportunity that Raysfield would like to be part of and agreed with. This vision and ethos would be embedded in the legal documentation.</p>
9.2.3.	<p><b>Q:</b> Have you seen a change in the LA since Andrew left?</p> <p><b>A ST:</b> Yes, the services on offer from the LA were declining.</p> <p><b>PD:</b> There was a risk that Academy Trusts did not know what was going on in schools and that decisions would be made that were not appropriate. Decisions could be made that were not taken in the absence of the schools' experiences.</p> <p><b>CGU:</b> It was business.</p>



<b>9.3.</b>	<p><b>Chair:</b> There would be the 16 June meeting where further questions could be asked. At the next FGB on 13 July the Governors would be asked to make a decision and to vote as to whether Raysfield would like to be included in the decision to go out to consultation. There were 10 Governors to vote.</p> <p><b>SD:</b> This was not a decision to become an academy. This decision did not need to be made until the application had been approved by the Regional Directorate and an Academy Order had been issued. This was unlikely to be done before December 2023.</p> <p>It was agreed that to enable Governors to be able to make a decision on 13 July the answers detailed in item 9.1 and 9.2. A briefing paper would be useful.</p>
<b>9.3.1.</b>	<p><b>Q Gov:</b> Please can you clarify what going out to consultation meant?</p> <p><b>A SD:</b> This was consultation with the community, the staff and with Trade Unions.</p> <p><b>Addendum:</b> Governors were informed that that staff would be meeting with Andrew for a face-to-face on 06.06.2023 16:00 to 17:00 hours or virtually on 12.06.2023 17:00 to 18:00 hours. Governors that expressed an interest were advised that they could do so. The questions from the morning GIS Day would be sent to Andrew and responses would be shared with Governors at the next Governing Body meeting. After the next meeting a decision would be required as to whether Raysfield would like to be included in the next stage of the scoping task.</p>
<b>9.3.2.</b>	<p>Further questions could be sent through GovernorHub to the Chair.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Action: All</b></p>
<b>9.3.3.</b>	<p>All to read the information on GovernorHub.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Action: All</b></p>
<b>9.3.4.</b>	<p><a href="#">Mosaic Slides from Presentation 12.02.2023</a>. It was noted that all information available was on GovernorHub in documents in a folder called 'Mosaic Information'.</p>
<b>10.</b>	<b>Governors</b>
<b>10.1.</b>	<p><b>Governor Visits and Training</b></p> <p>CGU and CGO had attended Governor Induction Training, which had been informative.</p>
<b>10.2.</b>	<p><b>Governor Recruitment – Finance Link</b></p> <p>It was noted that a new Finance Link Governor would need to be appointed when SD resigned at the end of the academic year and KB would take on this role. The Recruitment of Governors to the Governing Body would take into account the need for potential Governors to have a background in finance.</p> <p>Chair to start this recruitment process.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Action: Chair</b></p>
<b>10.3.</b>	<p><b>Governor Visits – <a href="#">Draft Annual Schedule 2023-24</a></b></p> <p>The 2023-24 dates were agreed and the GIS Days would continue.        (HG exited the meeting at 16:15 hours.)</p>
<b>10.4.</b>	<p><b>Self-Evaluation – Pre-Read <a href="#">Self-Evaluation Form</a></b></p> <p>Governors were asked download a copy, complete and reupload with a new file name. The information would be collated into a matrix for consideration at the next meeting.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Action: All</b></p>
<b>11.</b>	<p><b>Any Other Urgent Business (AOB):</b></p> <p>None.</p>
<b>12.</b>	<b>No items were identified for Confidential Part II Minutes</b>

<b>13.</b>	<b>Meeting Dates to confirm:</b>
<b>13.1.</b>	<b>Remaining Full Governing Board 2022-2023</b> Thursday 13 July 2023 at 13:30 hours.
<b>13.2.</b>	<b>Full Governing Board 2023-24</b> To note dates. <a href="#">2023-24 Dates</a>
	The Chair closed the meeting at 16:30

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

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	
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	
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	
8	A copy of the Safeguarding Audit Report would be shared with Governors.	ST	
9.1	Chair would liaise with HT over GIS scoping questions to be sent to Andrew in advance of the meeting on 16th June.	Chair	
9.3.2	Scoping Questions Further questions could be sent through GovernorHub to the Chair.	All	



9.3.3	Read all Mosaic documentation uploaded to GovernorHub	All	
10.2	Governor Recruitment – Chair to advertise vacancy.	Chair	
10.4	Complete self-evaluation form and upload re0named form.	All	