

**KINGSKERSWELL C of E PRIMARY SCHOOL  
AGENDA OF THE FULL GOVERNING BOARD  
TUESDAY 25 April 2023 at 5.30 PM**

**In person meeting**

Name		Attended	Apologies received	Apologies sanctioned
Jenny Benney	JB	YES		
Revd. Michael Wilkie	MW	NO	YES	YES
Rachel Miller	RM	YES		
Laura Twamley	LT	YES		
Amy Vine	AV	YES		
Sarah McDonald /Chair	SM	YES		
Sam Vine	SV	YES		
Matthew Loosemore	ML	NO	YES	YES
Susan Robinson	SR	YES		
Giles Watson	GW	YES		
Adam Devine	AD	YES		
Jackie Staines	JS	YES		
<b>In Attendance</b>				
Louise Lloyd/Clerk	LL	YES		
Karen Strachen	KS	YES		

	<p><b>Minutes:</b></p> <p>For completeness these minutes should be read in conjunction with the following supporting papers:</p> <p>Head teacher report SBM report/budget monitor Lead Governor reports – English and Phonics</p>
1.	<p><b>Welcome, apologies and sanction of apologies.</b></p> <p>Apologies were received and sanctioned.</p>
2.	<p><b>Minutes of the Last Meeting</b></p> <p>Subject to minor amendment the minutes of the FGB on 28 February 2023 were approved.</p>
3.	<p><b>Matters Arising from previous meeting</b></p> <p>Review Behaviour and Relationship Policy ( SEE AGENDA ITEM 14)</p> <p>Review Health and Safety Policy ( SEE AGENDA ITEM 14)</p> <p>KS to draft up Lead Governor Terms of Reference for Science and Physical Education <b>(CARRIED)</b></p>

	FORWARD TO NEXT MEETING)
4.	<b>Declarations of Interest for Items on the Agenda</b>  None received.
5.	<b>Inspection Feedback</b>  Governors discussed the feedback from the Ofsted inspection.
6.	<p>Monitor Governor visits to school.</p> <p>Lead Governor reports were submitted – English &amp; Phonics , the following Governor questions were received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions relating to the phonics governor visit report in Year 2, 43% are in the group below where they need to be.</li> <li>• Is there a common theme why the others are not moving through the books to enable them to be "on track"?</li> <li>• This group receives extra support what monitoring on their progress is done to show progress to "be where they need to be"?</li> </ul> <p>KS response:</p> <p>Looking at Yr. 2 children, going back in time some of those children may not have got the early learning goals, there was also Covid. Also when children were in Yr. 1 they got a lot of 1:1 which makes sure they get their phonics screening . When children go into Yr 2 the focus was then back on Yr 1 again . So whilst some of the yr 2's would get 1:1, particularly those who did not pass the phonics screening in Yr 1 hey will still get 1:1 to make sure they get it in yr 2. For example last year 100% got it in Yr 2 and they would do that again this year.</p> <p>Some of the children had SEND or specific needs which may be around concentration levels. Once children got onto the books , yellow &amp; blue &amp; higher up into the scheme , they have to read all the books in that section. They could have 15 books to go through which slows the process down.</p> <p>The next lot of tracking data should show that these children will have moved on.</p> <p>This year Yr1's, already 88% of them are where they need to be now, progress was cumulative and got better and better.</p> <p>In Phonics screening children were always above national , 32 was the pass mark , the aim was to get children to 37/38/39, which meant they were secure then going forward.</p> <p>Governor comment: There was a lot in the press/magazines/nationwide articles talking about Yr 2 and how Yr' 2s nationwide across all schools were further back than they usually were. The statistics usually referred to were 2019 which was pre Covid. Nationwide yr 2's were 10% down .</p> <p>The 43% included SEND children , but also included the children who were close to getting there / very closely not hitting the on track level.</p> <p>If the children were rushed through the books, they would have gaps in their learning later on .</p> <p>KS: Also at this point, the children knew their sounds really well it was about their reading fluency, so were they reading fluently with understanding when they were reading the book. Reading at home also made a big difference , if some of the children were not been encouraged to read at home or being read with or too, this also had an impact.</p>

	<p>Governor comment: Regarding assessments , the children were assessed daily, it was very small groups all TA's ,teachers or whoever was taking the class were all trained up, they were all able to teach, or able to spot gaps and where extra was needed.</p> <p>RM: The Inspector had all of that data and it had come out as a strength.</p> <p>Governor comment: Even though Yr 1 had been impacted by Covid as well , their figures were 88% which was such a big difference.</p> <p>KS: Yr 1 were pre school, they were more impacted by their speech and language. Vocabulary was also a speech and language issue.</p> <p>Governor comment: Did fluency impact on their speech and language, they could do the phonics sounds but when they were trying to join it together , that was proper talking.</p> <p>KS: Vocabulary was also a speech and language issue. Further on up the scheme it was more about grammar and punctuation , so there was all that mix into it</p> <p>Governor comment: After Covid noticed that several children who returned to school had acquired American accents.</p>
7.	<p>Headteacher's Report/Safeguarding update</p> <p>The HT report was emailed to Governors prior to the meeting, no questions were received.</p> <p>RM provided a verbal update:</p> <p>The school now had 354 pupils on roll.</p> <p>During the inspection the only mention of SATs came from RM, when attempting to explain the school response to COVID and prioritising mental health which was at the expense of Yr 6 outcomes . Last year only 39% of Yr 6 children got age related . It was testament to the teachers having come out of a 2 day inspection with Quality of Education 'good', given that was the starting point the inspectors would have seen. In regard to data KKPS was in line with other schools who prioritised mental health and well being</p> <p>Governor comment: The inspector mentioned that the school has not had a safeguarding audit for a while.</p> <p>RM: We have not had an internal inspector in from the Local Authority to do an audit, because it costs about £800. RM did an annual audit , which ML saw and this got sent off to the Local Authority. The inspector asked about this and what the action points were. RM said there weren't any, which was corroborated by the findings in inspection .</p>
8.	<p>Discuss Key School Improvement Priorities – monitor and evaluate progress to include Action Plans and Curriculum Recovery Action Plan</p> <p>KS: All the Action Plans were ready to go now near enough, just needed to tweak them a bit before they got sent out to individual governors. KS aimed to do this next week.</p> <p>Governor question: Has anything happened to the improvement plan because of the inspection.</p> <p>KS: The only thing that may need to be tweaked was around assessment in some areas.</p>

	<p>RM: SLT met at lunchtime today , one of our parents worked at a school in Plympton who had been judged outstanding across the board . RM planned to talk to her and find out what that school did specifically/share best practice.</p> <p>Governor comment: Being outstanding all across the board was not necessarily a positive outcome, some parents might think if a school was outstanding it was not motivated to achieve/strive for anymore.</p>
9.	<p>Ethos Group SIAMS/SEF</p> <p>Verbal report from LT:</p> <p>LT: had nothing to report from the Ethos group A - meeting had been arranged for 4<sup>th</sup> May .</p> <p>On the 10<sup>th</sup> May there was a staff meeting where we would be using the Ofsted report and personal development and outstanding elements to feed into our SIAMS/SEF. A lot of the content we were outstanding was in our SIAMS/SEF as well.</p> <p>KS: surprised how much Ofsted picked up on Christian distinctiveness as they are not judging a church school, they talked very much about the children and the worship and welcome team, which was surprising and had never happened before.</p> <p>RM: The children were able to articulate impact of those values on their lives. Having a judgement that personal development was good, put the school in a positive place going into a SIAMS inspection.</p>
10	<p>Receive School Business Manager's report .</p> <p>The SMB report was emailed to Governors prior to the meeting.</p> <p>AV provided a brief summary of her report to Governors.</p> <p>Governor question: Had the Caretaker leaving left a significant gap?</p> <p>AV: not at the moment , a staff member was opening up in the morning and AV was doing the end of day lockdown. AV worked with the cleaners on a daily basis and anything that got reported to AV as an incident, AV tried to get sorted . AV hoped that someone would be recruited to the post soon</p>
11	<p>Approve Budget</p> <p>AV provided a copy of the budget to Governors.</p> <p>AV noted that she met with RM and KS last week and went through the budget and finalised conversations at a SLT meeting which was held that afternoon. We are still rolling with 330k deficit in year 3, this would be submitted to Devon Finance (subject to Governor approval).</p> <p>If the school needed to put a recovery plan in place this would not be until the Autumn term. AV had spoken with Devon Education and learning and they said pretty much all schools were in the same situation. The main significant factor to our budget shortfall was because we had capacity for 420 children and only had 354, this was something we were working on and may invest in some marketing this year to try and get some new admissions. Pay had gone up again this year, the same as last year. The school had been very tight with subject lead budgets which KS had worked on and AV had gone through with KS, so they were as trimmed back as far as possible.</p>

	<p>We were expecting and have worked the budget on an intake of 60 children in reception 2023, at the moment we were showing 49 . We were now on the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase of applications . In total the school had received 63 applications, 45 were first choice.</p> <p>Governors approved the budget which would be submitted to DCC.</p> <p>Meeting moved in Part 11</p>
12	<p>Review current years expenditure and project likely year end situation including capital and grant funds.</p> <p>Please refer to BM report.</p>
13	<p>Review pupil premium funding</p> <p>RM: PP funding was spent appropriately as designated by HMI last week, he said the school provision for disadvantaged children was a strength.</p>
14	<p>Review progress of identified building/maintenance works – (Part 2 if quotes discussed – end of meeting)</p> <p>AV: The only building works coming up was a Booster room</p>
15	<p>Policies:</p> <p>Complaints Policy (annual)</p> <p>Teaching, Learning and Assessment Policy (annual)</p> <p>Health, Safety and Well-being Policy</p> <p>Children with Health Needs who cannot attend school (annual)</p> <p>Behaviour and Relationship Policy</p> <p>Carried forward to next meeting.</p>
16	<p>Health &amp; Safety Update to include Fire alarm tests and fire drills.</p> <p>AV: nothing to report, would have a test/drill in the summer term.</p>
17	<p>Chairs Other Business and Date of Next Meeting 13.06.22 - virtual.</p>