

**PATCHAM INFANT SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY MEETING
MINUTES**

Meeting Type	Full Governing Body
Date/Time:	6 th December 2017 4.30 pm
Location:	Patcham Infant School
For:	Full Governing Body
Quorum:	6 Governors required to be present for decisions to be binding
Apologies:	Claire Wickham (CW) Andy Ahmed Walsh (AAW) Helen Emerson (HE) Margaret Maslin (MM)
Present:	Governors (voting) Irene Evans (IE) Andy Flowerday (AF) Ron Guilford (RG) Chair of Governors Helen Hawkins (HH) Graham Kane (GK) Thomas Rhodes (TR) Chris Taylor (CT) Nina Taylor (NT) Chaired this meeting Other (non-voting) Michelle Langstead (ML) (associate member) Amanda Breeds (AB) School Business Manager Janet Johnson (clerk)

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	ACTION
1	<p>INTRODUCTION The meeting was opened, introductions made and apologies noted. No declarations were made when requested and all governors and associate member could contribute throughout.</p>	
2	<p>BUDGET OUTTURN/UPDATE The outturn forecast, with notes on anomalies, was tabled. It was requested information be provided 7 days beforehand to enable governors to prepare in future. Meetings would be scheduled later than the first week in the month where possible to enable provision of more up-to-date information. AB was requested to talk to the report. Further information was provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school was working to budget. • The budget for 'teachers' had been exceeded to fully allow for pension payments. • Teaching assistant budget was over due to provision of additional support. • The local authority did not approve of a 'contingency' budget heading and so this had not been considered. <p>What is the reason for the good position on the supply staff head? Whilst generally speaking we have good attendance, it is sickness dependent and the spring term is longer than usual term and starting after a shorter Christmas break so we are expecting the position to change.</p>	

**PATCHAM INFANT SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY MEETING
MINUTES**

CT informed he had spoken with the Chair and Vice Chairs of governors regarding the school partnership and working with other schools, including the Junior school, about a 3 year project with the Education Endowment Fund which they had considered seemed money well spent.

Is it the first time the nursery has been full for a long time? We have been consistently full. There will not be a clawback.

Governors congratulated the school.

- Primary sports funding – the funding from the government had doubled and the local authority reviewed the use of the funding. It would continue to be monitored by governors.
- The breakfast club was doing well, achieved a 5* food hygiene standard rating and a Jamie Oliver award. It ran a variety of activities and was full. A discounted rate was offered for pupil premium pupils, financed by 'Ride the Wave'. A flexible approach for the more vulnerable families was supported by governors.
- The hall and the quiet room were now let every night.

Why is any profit not shown on that heading? Debits are on the other budget heads, e.g. staff. We can provide a specific breakdown if required.

What is the cost of the breakfast club? £3.50, with breakfast, activities and they are taken to class. Governors were keen to ensure the club was self-financing and costs to users within local norms.

Governors appreciated all the work involved in contributing to income for the school.

Advice was sought from governors on works to the hall and the purchase of a heavy duty machine to enable prompt and hygienic floor cleaning.

Is it not part of the cleaning contract? No

Do you have to get it especially cleaned? A deep clean takes place in the summer but because of building works this is sometimes not fully effective. Governors were aware of difficulties encountered previously with other cleaning contracting options. They recommended giving feedback to the local authority and undertaking a trial with the machine.

How much are the costs for the hall? Possibly around £5k.

Can it come from the sports fund? That is allocated elsewhere for this year. We will consider if it can spread over part of next.

The current projected outturn stood at 6.3% of the total budget share for 2017/18. Governors were determined to ensure the current pupils had sufficient assistance to achieve the best outcomes. **Knowing the difficulties with the current year 2, are there any options funds could be used to help them?** CT informed the school has done so and it was recalled an additional member of staff had been employed for interventions, invested in FFT training re Every Child a Writer and upskilling for two members of staff. HH added there came a point with intervention that they needed to be in with their class for other things and we need to champion the whole child.

In discussion it was noted the current projected outturn was within the acceptable range and that its planned use was for sustainability of outcomes. In future outturn would be expressed on the minutes as a

NT JJ

**PATCHAM INFANT SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY MEETING
MINUTES**

	<p>percentage of budget share. An addendum to two sets of minutes from the previous year would be considered.</p> <p>The reports were accepted and signed by NT. Discussion turned to item 10</p> <p>School/Voluntary funds CT read out a letter from the Office Manager at Stanford Infant School “I can confirm that the income and expenditure reports prepared by AB accurately represent the transactions of the period....”and the monetary balance reconciled. AB explained the general use of the school fund. AB would send the letter to JJ for circulation.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">RG NT</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">3</p>	<p>MINUTES FROM LAST MEETING, REVIEW OF MINUTES ON WEBSITE AND MATTERS ARISING</p> <p>Subject to removing the words “pupil premium” from the last question in item 5 and amending the closure of the meeting to 18.37, the minutes were agreed to be an accurate record and signed accordingly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parent questionnaire. Governor input was required; they would consider any questions the response to which would assist them in their work. This would be discussed in greater depth at the next meeting but comments that the inclusion of a n/a box would assist were noted. • Induction of the new members was proceeding well. A joint tour with mentors and CT of the school and discussion of the strategic issues involved was in planned. <p>Discussion turned to item 6.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A governor could confirm the letter with clarification on attendance had been received positively with parents, especially as it aligned with the Junior school. • Equalities would be discussed at the next ELA focus meeting • All other due actions had been completed or were discussed elsewhere 	<p style="text-align: right;">IE</p> <p style="text-align: right;">IE</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">4</p>	<p>TRAINING</p> <p>Verbal reports were received from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AF who had attended a safeguarding governors’ network meeting. A serious case review had been discussed with learning points for the local authority. There was likely to be an additional category of ‘exploitation’ and training had been received on areas for priority by Ofsted. • GK had completed the second of two induction sessions. He informed that from discussion the size of this governing body was effective. <p>No recommendations for change were put forward for consideration.</p> <p>The list of upcoming training was considered. A governor from the school would attend</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial management and budget development • Analyse school performance • Visits <p>Attention was drawn to the series of Charing training sessions. It was felt that at 5 hours apiece this might be difficult to manage. JJ would feed back to governor training but recommended all consider and noted the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">NT IE GK</p> <p style="text-align: right;">JJ</p>

**PATCHAM INFANT SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY MEETING
MINUTES**

	sessions could be spread over more than one year.	
5	<p>HEADTEACHER REPORT</p> <p>It was noted in future it was likely the reports to finance focussed meetings would be verbal.</p> <p>a. Pay Policy 2017/18. CT informed the local authority had indicated for one year there may be funding for payments in excess over that agreed nationally and that he recommended acceptance of the policy in line with other schools in Brighton and Hove. The budget forecast included the projected pay rises.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">❖ The pay policy 2017/18 was agreed</p> <p>b. Accessibility report. CT informed the accessibility plan was still fit for purpose and up-to-date.</p> <p>c. Whistleblowing. No concerns had been raised. CT would check the current policy had the correct contact details</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">❖ The school would continue to use the local authority model policy and this was renewed for a further 3 years. Amendments other than contact details to be made if recommended by the local authority.</p> <p>d. Freedom of Information. Brief details of the 2 requests this year were given. There was no cause for concern and a governor gave advice regarding email requests. All were reminded of the need to remain vigilant to continue to maintain digital security.</p> <p>e. Capability. The policy had not had to be used.</p> <p>f. Buildings/groundworks update. Garden work of cutting back, tree surgery, bulb and sapling planting was proceeding to plan. The hall had been painted and urinals replaced. Governors were pleased to learn the dilapidated flat roofs that had caused many issues in the past were to be replaced and paid for by the local authority. The work would be in two phases, Easter and Summer. Some scaffolding may still be present after Easter. Asbestos was to be removed from ceilings and the lighting changed.</p> <p style="color: red;">Do you have any input on the specification for the roofs/ceilings as there are several possibilities with differing benefits, including acoustically? It was going out to tender and it was not certain how much flexibility there was. TR would meet with CT to discuss further.</p> <p>g. Staffing structure – update and considerations. The staffing structure diagram was tabled and noted. CT informed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were no longer any C grade teaching assistants or a learning mentor. • Those with increased hours have not changed contracts, they were being, done on a claims basis. • We spend less per pupil than any other Infant school in Brighton and Hove. • Currently our teachers and teaching assistants are relatively cheap and bearing in mind the excellent outcomes, we give good value for money. Over time costs will increase as staff move up the pay grades. • No changes were proposed. 	

**PATCHAM INFANT SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY MEETING
MINUTES**

	<p>You have quite a few teachers on the upper pay spine 3? Yes, some are part time and we also have some on grade M1,2 and 3.</p> <p>Governors' advice was sought regarding becoming strategic partners with the Sussex Coast Teaching Alliance, based at Benfield School. It was likely the Brighton City Partnership for Education payments would be reducing and this new alliance would cost £500 per annum. It was recalled teaching alliances were able to bid for DfE funds and staff could put themselves forward to tender out and generate income for the school. An example was given.</p> <p>Who would pay? The school if not covered from elsewhere.</p> <p>What is the downside? For your own development it sounds like the thing to do but you will be out of school. It would need to be covered. Yes, we would need to think of capacity.</p> <p>If we sign up what is involved? An audit of skills in the schools would be taken.</p> <p>How much can you pick and choose? If we aren't available, we cannot commit.</p> <p>How does the other project align with this? They will dovetail. All the Portslade schools are in it. It is still all very new for the teaching school alliance.</p> <p>Governors commented that success generates success and it should be beneficial but they were concerned to ensure CTs time away would still benefit the children here. They recommended proceeding with caution.</p>	
6	<p>DATA OUTCOMES, INCLUDING PUPIL PREMIUM VALUE FOR MONEY</p> <p>Governors had already received the report following two governors' visit to the school to scrutinise performance data, along with CTs summary. During the visit they had, with CT, examined all the Analyse School Performance information and received printed documents. They now had access to the online system.</p> <p>Outcomes. These had been very positive, above both national average (NA) and local average (BHA). The main issue was those working at greater depth in reading and writing was below NA yet under the previous assessment system the school had been above NA. Governors recalled this was based on teacher assessment with which there were consistency issues across the country and lamented year on year results were not comparable this year nor would they be next, as the marking framework was changing yet again. CT was confident with the accuracy of assessment at the school and was meeting with colleagues in Infant Schools that had high levels of greater development to examine work examples to effect change in practice where necessary.</p> <p>Groups English as an additional language. There were anomalies which CT would investigate further and discuss at the next meeting of the data group. Gender. Results did not differ significantly by gender. Pupil Premium. Attainment was at expected or above expected standard and indicated that funding was well spent to support their learning. For phonics, the average mark was 17 (pass mark 32) and strategies were in place to get the overall results up to expected levels in Year 2. Case studies were available. The report noted confidence in pupil premium being used to target pupil</p>	

**PATCHAM INFANT SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY MEETING
MINUTES**

	<p>progress.</p> <p>Provision for current year 2 was the main focus of discussion. Issues with the cohort were well known and the importance of measuring progress reiterated. The group expected progress to be of at least expected and ideally accelerated rates and would meet to monitor this at the spring meeting. The report noted they had been impressed with the range of provision and satisfied a great deal of effort is being made to raise the achievement of the cohort.</p> <p>Other predicted outcomes for progress and attainment were very good and in line with Patcham's usual positive results.</p> <p>Governors wished to record thanks for IE and AAH and acknowledged the usefulness of having access to online data. The pupil premium report would be reviewed by AAH prior to posting on the website.</p> <p>Discussion turned to item 9a</p>	AAH
7	<p>GDPR update</p> <p>The heightened regulations would take force in May 18. Have you been on training? CT and AB had attended an information session run by Paul Platts, from Schools ICT, who had attended training with others from outside the school sector. Since schools were already complying with the existing data protection laws it was felt schools were probably well positioned. An audit would be sent by Paul to the school and model policies would be forthcoming by the end of February 18.</p> <p>Do we have a risk register for data issues? No.</p> <p>Should we appoint a data protection officer? In discussion it was agreed there were difficulties in allotting this but that it should not, preferably, sit with governors whose role was more suited to strategic overview. NT and GK would maintain a watching brief and governors decided to proceed with adopting school email address. AB and JJ would liaise and JJ set up a governor group and filing system.</p>	GK NT AB JJ
8	<p>HEALTH & SAFETY</p> <p>TR provided an up-date</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Business Continuity Plan. This had progressed and TR was working on updates. A meeting CT AB TR was required. a. Premises Management Documents. The position would be confirmed at the next meeting. b. Evaluation of the effectiveness of the policy would be reviewed at the next meeting. 	CT AB TR
9	<p>GOVERNOR REPORTS</p> <p>9a. Safeguarding. The comprehensive report from AF had already been circulated and considered.</p> <p>He drew attention to some loose ends that needed tidying up and it was confirmed these were in hand:</p> <p>E safety – policy review would be undertaken by CT</p> <p>The Health and Safety policy review.</p> <p>Whistleblowing (Raising concerns in public life) was to be put on the website.</p> <p>The single central record had been checked and a query regarding recording of qualifications raised.</p> <p>Thanks were extended to AF.</p>	

**PATCHAM INFANT SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY MEETING
MINUTES**

	<p>b Appraisal - this was for the next meeting c Grounds Visit –for next meeting d Data Protection – NT would undertake a data protection visit.</p>	<p>CW TR NT</p>
10	<p>SFVS – update on actions Governors had received the completed SFVS document from March 2017. RG had attended some training earlier this year and the local authority had confirmed the reports were checked. He had also reviewed some audit questions from other schools in the local authority and now enquired how governors wished to check financial management in future. In discussion it was felt it was required to be confident all the statements were occurring in practice and that whilst some of the questions might be appropriate for other governors to complete it should be co-ordinated by RG and that at the next meeting it would be gone through question by question. It was noted the plan from last year included that this year voluntary funds would be audited. A governor could confirm BCP actions were on track.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a. Consistent Financial Reporting report b. Local Financial Procedures</p> <p>These items would be addressed as part of the SFVS.</p>	
11	<p>NT Ransomware statement <i>discussion and to note</i> The Brighton and Hove statement informing how ransomware and malware was being protected had been circulated and was now accepted. AB was thanked and left 17.45. Discussion turned to item 3</p>	
	<p>There being no further business, the meeting closed at 18.52.</p>	