

**MINUTES:** 

BOARD: Full Governing Board

SCHOOL: Raysfield Primary School

DATE: Thursday 30 March 2023

TIME: 17:30 hours

VENUE: Virtual Meeting

ATTENDED:

Holly Magson (HM)	Co-Opted Governor.
-	Chair
Claire Hill (HT)	Ex-Officio
	Headteacher
Kate Ball (KB)	Co-Opted Governor
	Health & Safety Link
David Champion (DC)	Parent Governor.
Sharon Dewfall (SD)	Co-Opted Governor
Pauline Dixon (PD)	LA Governor
Colin Gould (CGO)	Co-Opted Governor
Helen Green (HG)	Parent 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

APOLOGIES: Charlotte Gully (CGU 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.	Welcome and Introductions:
	The Chair welcomed those present.
2.	Procedural items:
2.1.	Apologies for absence



	Accente	d as recorded		
2.2.	Accepted as recorded.  Confirmation of Quorum			
2.2.	The meeting was confirmed as quorate			
2.3.	Declarations of interest for this meeting.			
	No pecuniary or personal interests were advised for any agenda item for this meeting			
2.4.	Confidentiality Statement:			
	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.	Any Other Business:			
	It was agreed to add an item relating to the SEF under <b>AOB</b> for consideration at the end of the			
	meeting.			
4.	Minutes			
4.1.	The Min	utes of the last Full Governing Board held	on 09.02.23 w	ere approved.
4.2.	Matters	Arising from the Minutes:		••
	Februar			
	Item	Action	Actionee	Status
	8	Draft annual governor visits schedule	Chair/HT	Ongoing HT/Chair to discuss outside meeting.
	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	Date to be confirmed with CGu & CGo & HM Ongoing
	9.4	School dinner prices to Sept 2024 agenda	Clerk	Complete
	9.4.1	Newsletter – Inform parents that school dinner prices will increase (£2.40-£2.50) as from Sept 2023. Message from governors.	HT	Complete
	11.2	Check – Annual Safeguarding Report status. Update will be given in Safeguard Agenda Item.	HT	Complete
	12.1	Research website marketing companies	HT	Complete
	12.2	Governor Information on website to be updated – 22-23 part only	SBM	Complete
	13.1.1	'unspecified' category would be added. EQUALITIES INFO & OBJ	SBM	Complete
	13.1.2	sexual preference' was reworded to 'sexual orientation' – EQUALITIES INFO & OBJ	SBM	Complete
	13.1.3	Update the objectives/numbers on the Public Sector Equality Duty. Put on website. The front page needed an annual update, as it was the objectives and information.	SBM	Complete
	13.2	New Behaviour policy & guidance to GH	HT	Complete
5.	School Business Manager (SBM) Report			



The SBM reported that work continued on ensuring that the 2022-23 Accounts were an accurate record for the end of the financial year. A full report would be presented to the next meeting. Highlights of the anticipated year end were:

- A carry forward of circa £300K.
- Breakfast Club profit was circa £1,400.

Q SD: Would there be an accrual for 2021-22 teacher pay award?

A HT: Advice for this had been received from HR today.

**A SBM:** Accruals were only made for specific items over £1000. The Lodge was being improved over Easter. These improvements had been scheduled for later in the year, but had been brought forward. The improvements were within the financial authorization of the HT. This included a new kitchen and making the kitchen area fit for purpose. This was slightly beyond HT's authorisation limit at a cost of £6,800.

**Q SD**: Had Value For Money (VFM) been checked through quotations been compared?

**A SBM**: Yes, VFM had been evidenced.

**Q Chair**: What did the quotation buy?

A HT: A full new kitchen and improved safety features.

All approved the kitchen at £6,800.

Approved.

**Q SBM**: The HTs authorization limit was £5K. How could items that exceeded the HTs authorization be dealt with outside the meetings?

It was noted that items of expenditure exceeding the HTs limit could not be dealt with through voting on the GovernorHub noticeboard. It was agreed that the Scheme of Delegation would be considered at the end of the year.

**Action: Clerk/HT** 

It was agreed that the Chair would meet with the SBM to discuss the areas around finance.

Action: Chair/ SBM

#### Addendum: Chair's Actions

Chair's action is the procedure by which the chair of the board can take unilateral decisions, bypassing usual processes, in specific circumstances of urgency.

To understand the extent, and limit, of the powers afforded by chair's action, it is necessary to consult the School Governance (Roles, Procedures and Allowances) (England) Regulations 2013. The grounds for chair's action are set out in regulation eight.

The regulations define the time at which chair's action can be used as being when the chair believes a "delay... would be likely to be seriously detrimental to the interests" of the school; any pupil at the school, or their parent; or a member of staff. The challenge here is to interpret what is meant by "seriously detrimental." Unfortunately the regulations and accompanying guidance do not provide further clarity, leaving this question at the discretion of those involved and so aware of the context. The key point to draw out is the emphasis on

"seriously detrimental", emphasising that the bar for justifying chair's action is higher than simply any negative consequence of inaction.

In cases where the chair does decide to act, it is important that any actions are limited to those necessary to avoid serious detriment. They should also report back any uses of chair's action to the rest of the board at the next meeting. In cases where a meeting is not for several weeks, it would be sensible to update governing board members in order to maximise transparency.

- 5.1. Health & Safety
- None.
- 5.2. GDPR None.
- 6. Headteacher's Report

The HT's report had been previously circulated through GovernorHub.

**6.1. Q PD**: What was causing the poor attendance and data outcomes, especially in Maths in Kingfisher class?



6.2.	A ST: When year 4 was considered on the behaviour chart and CPOM data this trend continued. In Year 4 there were two children on Child Protection Plans, another was on a Child In Need Plan, and this meant that year 4 had some challenging and vulnerable children. A new teacher had joined in term three, so there had been time required to build relationships with this cohort. The data shown did not reflect the recent progress made by the teacher. The maths data was based on 'book outcomes' which made monitoring harder than for English progress and outcomes.  Q PD: There appeared to be a decline in learning outcomes from Autumn to Spring, as if the children had not embedded their learning?  A ST: This reflected how data was reported. When children moved up a year group children were measured on 'Working Towards' in their new group. It was harder for these children to make the next step in their learning outcomes which was 'Working Towards Plus' or 'Working To 'Expected Standard' was when the skills learnt were applied. Essentially at the start of the
	year most would have learnt the skills necessary but not necessarily applying them required in the next stage. In maths this application became embedded at the end of the year when all the curriculum had been covered. Those children not achieving as anticipated were SEN, but this group were on track as to where they needed to be.
6.3.	Q PD: In all the classes and all the subjects there was a general dropping-back in their learning. Why was Autumn better than Spring?  A ST: This was connected to more children were able to access the 'Working Towards' and then the gap starts to widen because some children can access the application of those skills quicker than other children. It takes some longer to use the application.
6.4.	Q PD: The same thing was happening in Year 6? In Goldcrest: 20% difference in maths, 10% in writing, 10% in reading at a time when this shouldn't be happening?  A ST: The HT had met with the teachers from the classes where the data trends dipped. This data was based on older tests and since then another round of SATs tests had been carried out and these results had been more favourable. The children were on track for 'Expected Standard' in writing. 'Greater Depth' may not be achieved by all. Meetings with the core subject leads and the teachers indicated that all were confident that the children would make the necessary progress.  A HT: The data was a snapshot, as the year progressed the standards would be achieved. Maths was sequenced differently and knowledge was built with each unit. According to the Fischer Family Trust (FFT) targets, children were on target to meet what's expected, if not slightly over.  When the books were reviewed the quality of the work was really good, as were lesson observations and the learning walks. Data was taken immediately after half term. Indicators 4 weeks from half term were showing a more positive picture. Kingfisher had been affected by the change of class teacher, but the new teacher had 10 years' experience and the senior leaders were reassured by the work being carried out by this new teacher  A ST: The data had been 'pinned down' to specific children in every class that hadn't made the expected progress.
6.5.	Q CM: How were the targets set? Were they school or authority targets?  A HT: A software package called the Fischer Family Trust (FFT) that calculated an estimate from the Value-Added score of pupils from KS1 results datasets. Each pupil had a unique set of estimates which were calculated from the results and Value-Added scores of students similar to them. An FFT estimate grade was assigned to each pupil. The school used these grades to benchmark the future performance of pupils. The values were adjusted for SEN pupils. It was possible to use the FFT software to calculate each child's targets if the school aimed to be, say top 20% nationally. Raysfield set ambitious targets from between 50% to 20% nationally. The pupils were on target to meet these. The Expected Standard target would be met, but the Greater Depth for this cohort was unlikely.
6.6.	Q SD/KB: Why was data missing for one class?  A HT: This data had been missing as one teacher had been on long-term sick, however this data had been subsequently added This teacher remained absent.



6.7. Q DC: Due to funding issues would the assessments for Special Educational Ne Educational Health Care Plans (EHCPs) become more vigorous? A HT: Going forward children with suspected autism that had significant function would be offered an assessment. All those that had been added to the waiting li assessment prior to this change would still be assessed, but these would be rob Many of the Raysfield children that had been put forward for assessment had fur and this was evident as they had a reduced timetable which indicated placement.	nal issues st for ustly triaged. nctional issues		
A HT: Going forward children with suspected autism that had significant function would be offered an assessment. All those that had been added to the waiting li assessment prior to this change would still be assessed, but these would be rob Many of the Raysfield children that had been put forward for assessment had fur and this was evident as they had a reduced timetable which indicated placement	st for ustly triaged. nctional issues		
would be offered an assessment. All those that had been added to the waiting li assessment prior to this change would still be assessed, but these would be rob Many of the Raysfield children that had been put forward for assessment had fur and this was evident as they had a reduced timetable which indicated placement	st for ustly triaged. nctional issues		
assessment prior to this change would still be assessed, but these would be rob Many of the Raysfield children that had been put forward for assessment had fur and this was evident as they had a reduced timetable which indicated placement	ustly triaged. nctional issues		
Many of the Raysfield children that had been put forward for assessment had fur and this was evident as they had a reduced timetable which indicated placemen	nctional issues		
and this was evident as they had a reduced timetable which indicated placemen			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	i bieakuowii.		
Those nunils had high complex peods			
<ul> <li>These pupils had high complex needs.</li> <li>Discussion on <u>Data Outcomes</u> of Core Subjects</li> </ul>			
Covered in item 6.			
8. Parent Survey			
The document had been circulated through the GovernorHub.  It was noted that the Red responses were those that agreed and the Blue repres	contad thaca		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	senieu inose		
that strongly agreed.  8.1. Q CM: Was a survey carried out every year?			
	aculd be sent		
A HT: The last questionnaire was 2020. Going forward an annual questionnaire could be sent			
Out.	l		
8.2. Q DC: Was it possible to establish if one individual had strongly disagreed on al	•		
A HT: Yes, this type of analysis was possible. This process had not taken place			
8.3. Q KB: What percentage of responses?			
A HT: 155 responses out of about 200 families. 78 of the 155 had made comme	ents.		
	Q KB: How was it sent out?		
A HT: Paper was available on request (3 had asked for this), or through email or through			
Google forms.			
<b>8.5. Q Chair</b> : Could this be compared to the Ofsted survey?			
A HT: No.			
<b>8.6. Q CM</b> : What was the result of all the parent input?			
A HT: On the website a summary of the results could be viewed. This included a			
what actions the school were taking in response to the results. The common the			
suggestions had been answered: Curriculum, Behaviour, Home Learning, After			
Parent Workshops, Issues at Lunch Times and Increasing Ability for Parental fee			
<b>8.6.1.</b> Curriculum Theme and informing parents about it through a termly learning new			
sharing 'my learning events' and expectations evening to be held in early part of			
<b>8.6.2. Behaviour Theme</b> and concerns that those children without behaviour issues w	•		
'missed' and how children were celebrated. The school had also had a behavior			
had highlighted similar issues. The combination of the parent questionnaire and			
Behaviour Policy had been changed. Going forward there would be more focus			
behaving and 'doing' the right things. The rules had been simplified with three c	lear rules: be		
Kind, Be Brave and Be Responsible.	l' (		
<b>8.6.3.</b> Home Learning and improving clarity around expectations of the three targets:	reading at		
home, number facts and spellings.			
<b>8.6.4.</b> After School Clubs. Teachers were only asked to do an enrichment club for 6			
academic year. Also, the school did not run the after-school club, but encourage	•		
let them know of any complaints so that these could be passed onto the appropr	iate channel.		
<b>8.6.5.</b> Parent Workshops. Maths and Reading lead would be organising sessions.	., .,		
<b>8.6.6.</b> Issues at Lunchtimes. The Lunchtime Supervisors were highly trained but some	netimes the		
pupils did not give them as much respect as they would their teacher.			
<b>8.6.7.</b> Increasing Ability for Parental feedback. This would be happening now that 0			
longer a barrier in this area. Going forward there would be a new Parental Foru	m with clear		
protocols to focus on school priorities.			
8.7. Staffing Update			
<b>8.7.1.</b> There had been a teacher on extended sick absence due to a chronic illness and			
be consulting with HR. In line with school policy there would aslo be a return to	work meeting		
which would establish any further support that the school could provide.			



8.7.2. There was an advert for a year 6 teacher to establish the quality of applicants in the marketplace. This vacancy had arisen because an existing teacher had requested a year's sabbatical. The teacher had made an application for Long Term Unpaid Absence. This application would be shared by email. The HT was in support of the sabbatical being agreed upon subject to certain caveats which included the school being informed by March 2024 if they did not intend to return. The Governors were asked to agree the sabbatical and the HT would check the level of delegation.

9. Safeguarding Report

Update on **CPOMS** 

ST reported that the term had been quiet and that the children were settled. The data demonstrated the positive impact when multi-agencies worked together.

Q DC: Was the pattern that safeguarding incidents tended to be higher after a holiday period?

A ST: Yes there seemed to be more in September.

**Q Chair**: Wasn't an increased incident towards the end of a term part of the national picture? Where children would be worried they would be at home for the holidays and would tell a trusted adult at school just before the end of term.

A ST: Yes, this could often be the case.

**ST:** There had been a decrease in the concerns as the right help from the multi-agencies had been organised.

**Chair**: The figures demonstrated that the school had good relationships and knowledge about the families and that the system to enable changes in behaviour was working effectively.

Q Chair: Why were more boys being sent to 'Check-In'

**A HT**: There needed to be more analysis of this trend.

The Chair offered to explore why there were more boys than girls attending Check-In.

Action: Chair

Acton: HT

### 9.1. Safeguarding Link Update – Clare Hayward

- An action plan would be created out of the Audit 175.
- Safer Recruitment update a new LBS had joined the team
- Safer Recruitment issues surrounding Ukrainian communities
- The Safer Recruitment Training should be undertaken through the National College
- CH, SBM and the Chair would do this training.

#### 9.2. Work on School Site Scheduled for Summer Holidays

It was agreed that the SBM would share this.

10. Scoping Task Update

The HT reported the scoping task was moving forward with Trustees, Members and a clear Scheme of Delegation.

It had been suggested that the Local Governing Boards, at school level, would be called Academy Community Councils. There were some dates for Governor Information sessions based on areas and these would be posted by the Chair on the GovernorHub.

Action: Chair

**Action: SBM** 

It was agreed that CH and CGo would attend on behalf of the Board.

Action: CH/ CGo

**Q KB**: What was the timescale?

**A HT**: There would be a consultation in Autumn 2023.

**Chair**: Currently, no decision had been reached and the work remained a scoping exercise. Schools would retain their individuality and their ethos and values.

It was agreed that the HT would upload relevant information on the Scoping Exercise to a Mosaic Folder in GovernorHub.

**Action: HT** 

#### 11. Draft Policies Folder

Governors had been asked to read the policies and review them.



11.1.	Safer Recruitment
	This version had been substantially improved by the HT. A more up-to-date version would be
	circulated by the HT to Governors for approval. The SBM would upload the most recent
	version from the Teacher Shared Drive
	Action: HT/ SBM
	It was agreed that the Governors would be given a week to review and approve through the
	GovernorHub.
	Action: Governors
11.2.	Whistle Blowing
	This was based on the South Gloucester LA policy.
	It was agreed that the Governors would be given a week to review and approve through the
	GovernorHub.
	Action: Governors
12.	Staffing Update
	Discussed in Item 8.
13.	Any Other Urgent Business (AOB):
13.1.	The South Gloucestershire Headteachers would be writing to Ofsted about their concerns that
	had been tragically highlighted by the death of Ruth Perry. A sympathy Card would also be
	sent to ruth's primary school.
13.2.	It was noted that SLT had recently completed all their school evaluations and these would
	added to the SEF, as well as the impact evaluations would be put into the folder.
	Action: HT
13.3.	A local resident had donated £100 for books, which had been matched funded by the school
14.	No items were identified for Confidential Part II Minutes
15.	Meeting Dates to confirm:
15.1.	Remaining Full Governing Board 2022-2023
	Thursday 25 May 2023.
	Thursday 13 July 2023.
15.2.	Full Governing Board 2023-24
	Dates were noted.
	The meeting closed at 19:35 hours.

## Actions arising from the Minutes of the Full Governing Board held on Thursday 30 March 2023

Item	Action	Actionee	Status
5	Scheme of Delegation to Summer meeting	Clerk/HT	
5	To discuss delegated financial authority.	HT/SBM	
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	
9	The Chair offered to explore why there were more boys than girls attending Check-In.	Chair	
9.2	School site work scheduled for summer holidays	SBM	
10	Put on GH dates Governor Information sessions for scoping tasks	Chair	
10	Attend area scoping task governor information meetings	CHayward/ CGo	
10	Upload into Mosaic Folder useful information on the scoping task	HT	



11.1	Safer Recruitment Policy – latest version to be uploaded to FGB meeting folder 30.03.23	SBM	
11.1	Governors to review safer recruitment policy	Governors	
11.2	Governors to review Whistleblowing Policy	Governors	
13.2	SEF to be updated	HT	

# Actions arising from the Minutes of the Full Governing Board held on Thursday 9 February 2023

Item	Action	Actionee	Status
8	Draft annual governor visits schedule	Chair/HT	Ongoing HT/Chair to discuss outside meeting.
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	Date to be confirmed with CGu & CGo & HM Ongoing