



## Pilton Infants' School Full Governing Body Meeting 10<sup>th</sup> January 2023

### Minutes

**Date/Time:** 10<sup>th</sup> January 2023, 5.30pm      **Location:** School Hall

Governor Attendees	Initials	Governor Category
Brian Holme	BH	Foundation - Chair
Jess Holme (until 7.10pm)	JH	Co-Opted
John Mortimer	JM	Acting HT
Kate Nolan	KN (Vice-Chair)	Parent
Lindsay Tranter-Sharpe	LTS	Foundation
James Crighton	JC	Parent

Other Attendees	Initials	Capacity
Verity Goss	VG	Clerk
Sue Featherstone (until 6.06pm)	SF	Business Manager

Apologies	Initials	Governor Category	Absent w/o apology

Procedural Items		
<b>1</b>	<p><b>Welcome and apologies for absence</b></p> <p>BH welcomed all to the meeting. There was possibly a potential governor coming to view the meeting. No apologies.</p> <p>Ebon Daunton had stepped down from his role of governor – as LTS had taken on a paid role at the school, this had taken the board over the 1/3 allowed for governors who were also staff members. ED had been a governor for 15 years – governors expressed their thanks for his time on the board.</p>	
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Declarations of pecuniary/non-pecuniary interest and confidentiality</b></p> <p>None declared.</p>	

3	<p><b>Agree minutes of meeting of 8<sup>th</sup> November, and actions arising</b></p> <p>Minutes agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.</p> <p>Action point – new behaviour policy was being worked on – would be in development during the spring term to be put in place during the summer term.</p> <p>Part II minutes agreed as accurate.</p> <p><u>Budget Update</u></p> <p>SF explained the budget sheets that had been distributed. Some extra spends and commitments – as the project was connected to the new build some items such as the heater could be a capital amount. Some expenditure from builds could be capital. SF had advice from the financial advisor on what was possible. £13,000 was being received as capital money for energy efficiencies – this could be used for something like converting to LED lighting which had been discussed previously.</p> <p>Governors agreed it was better to use capital budget when possible. SLT and SF would discuss what would be beneficial to the school in terms of energy efficiencies. New buildings were being built to be energy efficient.</p> <p>All lines of spending were as expected – supply had seen an increase as there had been a lot of illness. Insurance covered only when five days absence was reached. May be worth considering changing this to be three days – there would be a higher premium. £3,000 was expected to be received for supply to cover when JH was out of the classroom for the Jurassic maths hub.</p> <p>Nothing new in budget presented. SF explained that the school did not yet know how many would be starting in Reception in September.</p> <p>Teachers union had not yet decided whether to accept the pay offer or strike – there may be an increase in costs due to the pay rise, or incidents where the school would need to be closed due to the strike.</p> <p>Overall the school budget was comparatively healthy. Governors thanked SF.</p> <p>SF left 6.06pm.</p>	
<b>Strategic Items</b>		
4	<p><b>HT Report</b></p> <p>All had received. JM reminded governors that this was the report from the postponed December meeting. There were now two more EHCPs in draft form. Some were now being granted which was positive.</p> <p>Attendance – pupil premium attendance was lower than non pupil premium attendance. This continued to be worked on by the school – letters had gone out before Christmas, attendance was being monitored and more letters</p>	

	<p>would go out in a few weeks.</p> <p>Staff sickness report showed the numbers of days lost – it could be seen when there had been Covid issues in the school.</p> <p>Staffing – Sophie would be going on maternity leave at Easter, with Janine returning after May half term – currently looking at how to cover between this. A teaching assistant had requested reducing to three days a week – JM was considering how this could be facilitated.</p> <p>Safeguarding – JM explained the problems with changes of social workers – there was no continuity, and also locum social workers coming from out of area. The school had had a safeguarding review with Caroline Pincet which had gone well, with a few small areas to work on. The report stated that children were safe and happy in the school.</p> <p>Household support fund – the school had put in some referrals, and also for the Christmas toy bank. The school had received a good number of donations for the Christmas toy exchange, but not so many taking toys – it would be considered how to encourage families to take advantage of the offer for next time. Toys that were left over had been donated to Cancer Research/Children's Hospice.</p> <p>The Christmas performance had gone really well – this had been in the church this year.</p> <p><b>Was an evacuation plan needed with the building work going on?</b> JM explained there was already an emergency evacuation plan in place. Lockdown could be used in case of chemical spill or similar meaning the children should not go outside. The fire alarms had been linked – both the school and building site would be evacuated in case of fire. The demolition phase had gone well, with groundwork starting the next week.</p> <p>The application to join TEAM had been submitted – a date was now needed for the stakeholder consultation. BH explained the consultation process.</p> <p>There had been a TEAM review of the school with an EYFS focus – this had gone really well. There had also been a successful deep dive in phonics with Devon literacy. JM was finalising the dates for the deep dives this term, which would be sent out to governors. JM requested that when governors came in to school they completed a visit note – KN had put a template on the shared drive in Google form format, which should be easy to fill in. JM stated that he had seen visit notes which had a tick box for governors to indicate if they were met with the correct safeguarding protocols – this would be a good idea to bear in mind for governor visits.</p>	
5	<p><b>School Development Plan Update</b></p> <p>All had received. JM explained the colour coding – green was for completed</p>	

	<p>items, red where there was concerns or not started, and amber if the item was in progress. The majority of items had been started and were on track. Governors felt it would be clearer to have items that were on track as green, with another colour to indicate completed, as this would show more progress. A governor stated they had felt concerned at the number of amber coloured items, but looking at it in more detail they could see that most items were on track.</p> <p><b>How did children's progress compare to pre Covid years in terms of where children were expected to be?</b> JM stated that high 70s/low 80s was good for the school. Before Covid maths would be in the 70s, with writing often a bit lower than reading. Progress was shown from EYFS to Y2. JM reminded governors that data would vary between different areas and cohorts – it was important to see progress in each cohort.</p> <p>JH explained that this year's Y2 cohort were looking to be at a higher level in maths than the previous year's cohort. Currently there was a focus on reading comprehension, developing children's understanding of what they were reading. This was done in a way that allowed interventions for children who were struggling, which was making a difference.</p>	
<b>6</b>	<p><b>Budget and Finance</b></p> <p>Budget update discussed in item 3.</p> <p>Financial benchmarking – governors had received the benchmarking information, which showed the school was performing about average. Supply was shown as an outlier, and high compared to other schools. JM stated he had found it useful to compare to Cove Infants School, as it was a school of a similar size with similar levels of SEND and pupil premium. Most areas were broadly in line, with the in year balance significantly different to other schools, and supply staff also high.</p> <p>JM would ask SF to look at the benchmarking and identify reasons for the outliers. Supply cost had been high during an increase of Covid in the school, and there had also been a staff member hospitalised who needed cover. Governors discussed whether it was better to employ a cover supervisor than to have a supply teacher/agency staff. Governors also considered whether CPD costs had increased as more courses were now running after Covid – this would link to supply costs as cover was needed for staff attending training.</p>	
<b>7</b>	<p><b>Update on Management Partnership with TEAM MAT</b></p> <p>Covered in HT report.</p>	
<b>Monitoring and Accountability / Issues to Decide</b>		
<b>8</b>	<p><b>Safeguarding</b></p> <p>Covered in HT report.</p>	

<p><b>9</b></p>	<p><b>Admissions Arrangement</b></p> <p>Governors queried change to catchment area – was not clear where new line was in one area. JM to check.</p> <p>Admissions arrangement agreed pending response from admissions team.</p>	<p>JM to check with admissions team.</p>
<p><b>10</b></p>	<p><b>Policies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Acceptable use of IT (staff) – Renewal of current policy, no changes. ‘Amend here’ indicators to be removed on final copy. Agreed.</li> <li>b) Attendance – based on new Devon model. Agreed.</li> <li>c) Behaviour (including behaviour principles) – New policy, JM explained that relational approaches would be included later. Agreed.</li> <li>d) Charging and remissions – New model policy – change from previous policy an update to the year the guidance was published. Agree.</li> <li>e) Code of conduct for staff – Renewal of current policy, no changes proposed. Governors discussed whether it needed to be published on the website, whether it was actually useful/needed by parents. DSO needed to be changed to DSL. Discussed how to change social media section to allow staff to comment appropriately on PTFA page. Policy agreed, did not need to be published on the website. Document referred to (guidance for safer working practise) needed to be shared with staff along with a reminder of the code of conduct.</li> </ul> <p>Were trigger points for absence in place? LTS stated she had raised this and the school were looking in to it to ensure trigger points were noted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>f) Collective worship – New policy. Agreed.</li> <li>g) Computing – carried forward to next meeting.</li> <li>h) Data protection – New policy from Data Protection Officer. Date at end of policy to be changed due to change in meeting date. Agreed.</li> <li>i) Education of children in care – Renewal of existing policy. Updates required to staff information. Agreed.</li> <li>j) Emergency management and business continuity plan – Governors questioned who would take the lead if JM was not in school – JM explained this would be a member of SLT. During JM’s recent absence staff had received an e-mail each morning stating who was the lead for the day. Governors discussed how the plan was checked to be fit for purpose – JM explained that it was used in incidents such as the gas leak. Agreed.</li> <li>k) Finance – Update to cardholder names. Agreed.</li> <li>l) Outdoor education, visits and off site activities – New policy. Agreed.</li> </ul> <p>Governors discussed how policies were currently formatted on the website – dates in policy names could be misleading to parents. Agreed policy dates should be removed from the website.</p>	<p>VG to arrange publication of policies with admin team.</p>
<p><b>Governing Body Management</b></p>		

<b>11</b>	<b>Governor Visits: Feedback and Planning</b> BH had been in for safeguarding review – CP pointed out that when governors came in to school they needed to make notes of their visit to prove that challenge had been provided.  JH left the meeting 7.10pm. Meeting moved to Part II.	
<b>Part II Discussion</b>		
<b>12</b>	<b>Policies regarding staff issues</b>	
<b>13</b>	<b>Chair's Business</b>  Meeting ended 7.38pm.	