

PART ONE

**MINUTES OF THE FULL GOVERNING BODY
OF DORMANSLAND PRIMARY SCHOOL
HELD IN SCHOOL on MONDAY 20TH JANUARY 2025 AT 4PM**

Present:			
Alex Sweetlove AS Vice-Chair	Co-opted	Keith Coleman: KC Chair	Parent
Marie Langer: ML	Co-opted	Efisio Gigliotti: EG	Co-opted
Mark Cook: MC	Co-Headteacher	Faye Davies (FD)	Co-headteacher
Jac Parson: JP	Parent	Jenny Ashley (JA)	Co-opted
In attendance:			
Catriona Sanderson: CS	Clerk	Louisa Blyde (LB)	School Business Mgr

1.	<p>WELCOME & ADMINISTRATION</p> <p>a) Apologies received from Hayley Clark and post meeting from Helen Roe.</p> <p>b) No declarations of interest in specific agenda items.</p>	
2.	<p>FINANCE</p> <p>LB reported that the figures were currently on budget, with a predicted surplus of approx. £33k, not including Amigos which was doing well. The surplus may be more, but there were big IT spending decisions that needed to be made.</p> <p>Surrey had now agreed that draft budgets needed to be approved by 14 February, but no longer needed to be submitted to them. Six weeks later the actual budget needed to be done and the draft would feed into this. Governors noted that schools could no longer submit deficit budgets and were being encouraged to make savings wherever they could, without the possibility of extra funding. Governors agreed that the full impact of NI changes on school (and other) budgets had not been fully realised by the new Government.</p> <p>Action: Draft budget to be circulated to all governors with a deadline for responses.</p> <p>To reduce budget by large amounts, staff consultations would need to be held. School was doing all it could to move support staff around and use where needs arose. JA asked where the school might curtail its spending. It was noted that parents were doing much to help and contributing stationery items to support classes. JP suggested the school produce a wish list of things required and then parents who wanted, could support in this way. Action: FD and MC to create a list.</p> <p>EG asked what had been done to reduce costs. He suggested the school could look at schemes of investment for future savings. For example, to weigh up the cost of investment in a new more efficient boiler compared to annual savings. Noted that the school would need to find money to invest up front and consider how many years before savings would be made. The school considered all its contracts when they came up for renewal.</p> <p>Key Spending Areas: It was likely that the school would need a new Waste Collection Service. Governors discussed various options. EG mentioned the Recycling Partnership, but they may not collect general commercial waste.</p> <p>IT: MC reported that the current server was 5 years old and was discussing the need for the school to move to a virtual serve. In the long run this would be cheaper, but it was likely to cost £14,000 to move across. The school also needed new laptops and desktops to replace those that were not Windows 11 compatible, to be in place by 14 October 2025. Phone lines were also playing</p>	<p>LB</p> <p>FD, MC</p>

	<p>up and BT planned to get rid of cable phone lines and a quote had been received to go digital. Lingfield College had donated some IT equipment which was bringing costs down but still much to be replaced. AS asked if any of this could be done as part of joining Tandridge Learning Trust. LB was due to meet Suresh Shan, Director of Finance & Business Operations on 7 February and would be discussing renewal of contracts. She would ask if they could give notice on any to join the MAT services. He was being very helpful in this transition stage. EG suggested shared ownership options and lease agreements, he offered to help define requirements. It was agreed that conversations should first be held with the MAT to explore what the school could be part of once it joined. There was a possibility that some contracts could be fast-tracked over.</p> <p>SFVS (Schools Financial Value System): Deadline 14th March. It was agreed that LB would start work on this and then KC to complete it.</p>	
3.	<p>CHAIR'S ACTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No emergency actions taken since the last meeting. • Governors discussed if it would be helpful for them and school staff if meetings were to move by 15-30 minutes and start at 4.30pm. Following a short discussion, it was agreed to stick to 4pm start times. • Updated Alternative Participation Protocol. Governors had always agreed that virtual meetings were not the ideal and in particular hybrid meetings did not work well. However, it was noted that occasionally a governor might struggle to attend in person and want to be part of the meeting virtually. There would need to be a viable reason for this to happen. A governor would need to give the clerk and chair at least 72 hours' notice and virtual attendance was at the discretion of the Chair. Only one governor per meeting could attend virtually, they could only request this once per academic year and the meeting would need to be quorate in the room. Governors agreed to the new Protocol and the Code of Conduct also updated to include this. They also mentioned that IT connections meant that virtual attendance was not always ideal. 	
4.	<p>CLERK'S UPDATE:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Code of Conduct: To be updated as noted above and to be amended to refer to KCSiE 2024 (typing error of 2023). Governors had all signed to say they had read and understood KCSiE 2024, and therefore agreed to the amended Code. b) Constitution: Currently no vacancies c) Training updates: Governors reminded to report training done to clerk and attend one session a term: JA had attendee Hot Topics and EF to forward recent training done to the clerk. d) Governors noted the Children's Wellbeing & Schools Bill: Academies would in future need to follow the National Curriculum and would need to follow minimum salary levels set. e) Pupil Attendance: Noted that this should be discussed at every meeting. 	
5.	<p>SAFEGUARDING</p> <p>The autumn term Safeguarding Audit had been submitted to Surrey. ML had been into school earlier in the day and checked the SCR (Single Central Record) with Louisa. She reported that it was up to date and had found no issues. She had done a dip sample on new starters, all requirements fulfilled and a further dip sample on longer term staff, again all checks were up to date.</p> <p>New staff had all received 1-1 training with the head on Safeguarding. Governors noted that one new mid-day supervisor has started in January.</p> <p>Fire and Lock Down Drills: Several parents had queried the last lock down drill saying their children had felt traumatised by it. FD reported to governors that they carried them out in as child friendly way as possible. Children were informed it was about a stray sheep being in the school grounds and they were</p>	

	<p>asked to gather in the library or hall for safety. These were both areas where children could not be seen from outside. The school was therefore sending a letter to parents explaining the requirement to have the drills and to alleviate any fears they might have.</p> <p>AS asked if parents or staff were warned in advance. No warnings given and they were done on different days and at different times .</p> <p>A mid-year safeguarding quiz was handed out to governors and they were asked to complete this at home after the meeting. Answers provided.</p> <p>FD made governors aware of two children in the school who were 'runners' meaning they would try to run out of their class and around the school. Staff were being extra vigilant in keeping corridor and doors closed, to minimise the areas the children could get to.</p>	
6.	<p>ACADEMY UPDATE: See Part Two</p>	
7.	<p>HEADTEACHER REPORT Verbal Update Current Attendance figure: 95.2% which was above National, it had been 97.1% the previous week. Any family with a child's attendance below 90% had been sent an email last term and things were improving with implementation steps in place. Below 90% was classed as persistent absence.</p> <p>One child that the school was particularly concerned about. FD working closely with the family and had carried out a home visit. Family was engaged with the school on a gradual reintegration scheme which seemed to be working.</p> <p>YR: One child that had been part time, had now reached statutory school age and was attending full time. Child where family had requested flexi-schooling had left . They had found another school that said it would offer Flexi schooling. This question had been raised at the Parents' meeting about Academy Conversion. Tandridge learning Trust had said they did not offer flexi schooling and FD noted that the new Schools Bill also stated that children could not be taken out of school in this manner. One more child in YR was still part-time and would not reach statutory school age until Y1. They were missing a lot of the timetable and HC was meeting with the parents to gradually encourage a fuller timetable.</p> <p>School Improvement Maggie Mackie from SaFe had visited in November to conduct the Key Schools Need Analysis (KSNA). It was a tick-list exercise and she looked at data, attendance, curriculum and did a learning walk. She was pleased with what she had seen. No report produced. She would be coming back in two weeks to conduct an in-depth Teaching and Learning Review: report to be produced. Governors agreed it was good to have the same person for consistency. KC asked if she had flagged anything the school had not been aware of. No, but she had gone through some mock Ofsted questions with staff that had been helpful.</p> <p>Staff had carried out a review of the SDP during a staff meeting and updated it live on google drive, it had been a helpful time to collaborate and update on all that had happened the previous term.</p> <p>J Newns had completed her Primary Mental Health Lead accreditation. FD and MC were pleased to have her in this position, she was a strong lead and they noted that for the work submitted each section had a mini action plan that she had linked to the school's SDP. Her assessor had been particularly impressed with this, it was a strength that it was not a bolt on of work for the school but included what it was already doing or working to achieve. Governors congratulated her on the achievement.</p>	

SEND: Survey from the Government on the SEND crisis in schools had been received. Previous week MC and FD had attended the Horley Learning Partnership Heads Meeting. Surrey SEND had attended: It was reported that Surrey had one of the highest number of children with EHCP'S and children in AP's, however one of the lowest percentages for disadvantaged children. Surrey bucked the trend of other counties because parents had the cognitive ability to know how to fight for decisions and the money to do this. There were 14 schools all in the same position with increasing SEND numbers . They planned to pool data to look at the full picture across the region.

Governors noted the wellbeing of staff and the stressful demands on them, particularly support staff, as they worked alongside children with additional needs. **KC asked if the school could ever refuse a place to a child.** If the school felt it could not meet the needs as noted in the EHCP plan this could be said. **AS asked if an EHCP came with the funding to get staff.** It did not always cover funding and it was tricky to recruit the right type of person. **AS asked if other children in classes suffered.** They could do and the school worked hard to ensure it placed any staff it could recruit to best equip the most classes and children. Some staff were on temporary hours that they would lose if a child left which did not provide great stability.

Governors discussed the purpose behind getting private assessments for certain conditions and when this may or may not help. The school prided itself on supporting children well with specific conditions even when a diagnosis had not been made.

Job description and operation of the caretaker was being reviewed with the aim to make the working hours more efficient.

Autumn Term Data Report: Governors discussed what the data could tell them. FD had reported that the November assessments were notorious for teachers being cautious as they had only been with the children less than a term. Children also tended to drop in test results as they tackled NFERs/SATS (National reference tests) that had jumped in difficulty since the previous term.

Y1 Phonics: Noted that 1/3rd of SEND children were predicted to pass the test. School had recently learnt that a child who was a selective mute may be able to take the test at home and be recorded as they spoke at home. MC was confident that the school had carried out early assessments and put things in place to support phonics.

JA asked about the number predicted to reach greater depth and what Ofsted might think of this/could they compare with other schools.

Governors discussed and it was agreed that it was too soon in the year to make major predictions. Ofsted would look at actual outcomes and it would be hard to compare predictions with other schools. In the previous year the number of children reaching greater depth had exceeded predictions. 33% for reading and 27% for maths.

Governors confirmed that for SATS, maths and reading were a standardised score and writing was teacher assessed. **AS asked who made the predictions for Y6.** It was the Y6 teachers based on assessments conducted in the autumn term, not Y5 data.

KC asked how close previous predicted scores were to actuals. They had been pretty close. Governors agreed that they would want to compare end of year results with other schools, rather than midyear predictions. The current Y6 had now done one SATS paper. Governors learnt that secondary schools used SATS scores to set target grades for value added in

	<p>KS4 but would often carry out their own assessments if they wished to put Y7 pupils into sets.</p> <p>AS asked FD and MC if they were happy with the data so far. Overall yes, but they noted that Y2 would need much support. Y4 was a well-rounded year with 100% getting expected – none below and none above.</p>	
8.	HEALTH AND SATETY: No updates	
9.	<p>POLICY REVIEW PROCESS</p> <p>MC reported that in July the DfE had issued a new list of statutory policies. He was in the process of realigning the school’s list with this. Currently the school had 64 policies. They were not all statutory and did not all need approval from governors. Some would be noted by governors and there would be some non-statutory ones where it would be helpful for governors to have oversight.</p> <p>Action: MC to send completed list to AS and KC to check over and ensure statutory policies allocated to suit governor skills and expertise.</p> <p>Governors were given further guidance on how to review policies, noting that they had a strategic role to play rather than an operational one. EG suggested that governors could play a role in the type of policies a school had and specific input into the content of policies. He had contacted Surrey in the past about the complaints policy. It was noted that the school used the recommended Surrey model policy and that when it joined Tandridge Learning Trust some policies would become MAT policies where local governors would not have an input.</p> <p>EG raised the issue of a Separated Parent Policy, which he thought the school should have. Some schools did have such a policy but currently the DfE issued guidance on this rather than a statutory policy. FD and MC would keep this in mind if it were to become statutory.</p>	<p>MC, AS, KC</p>
10.	<p>MONITORING</p> <p>Monitoring since last meeting:</p> <p>Effective Information Systems: KC and EG: 13/12/24 report with papers. They had looked at the new systems of Arbor and Insight which they thought provided good information and had enabled the school to become more efficient when contacting schools about absences. JP asked if the school was going to access the full Arbor package which enabled parents to track children’s absences/attendance. Not now and it may depend on what Tandridge Learning Trust did with its schools. The school did hope in future it could use the system for parents to make payments.</p> <p>Resilience, Wellbeing & Mental Health: JP: 14/01/25 report to follow. She briefly noted her visit and was impressed with provision provided via clubs to support communication needs and that an Educational Psychologist had been in school for the first 6 weeks of the autumn term. She had also discussed the enhanced language and communication initiative with Miss Newns.</p> <p>Inclusive Practice (including SEND/vulnerable learners) JA: 20/01/25 report to follow.</p> <p>Safeguarding: audit of files: ML 20/01/25 report to follow</p> <p>Governors asked to book in dates with school for future monitoring visits.</p>	<p>KC</p> <p>HR</p> <p>JP</p> <p>JA</p>
11.	<p>MEETING DATES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tuesday 25 Feb 2025: 12.15 Governor & Staff Lunch. 1.30-2pm class visits. 2-4pm FGB Action: A list to be circulated for governors to agree what they would bring in for staff. Action: Jenny. EG agreed to bring pizzas, AS to bring cheese and biscuits. Wednesday 7 May 2025 4-6pm Wednesday 2 July 2025 4-6pm 	<p>JA</p>
12.	MINUTES	

	Governors approved the minutes of the meeting held on 19 November 2024 as an accurate record and they were signed by the Chair. Actions: completed or in progress	
13.	WHAT HAVE WE DONE AT THIS MEETING TO BENEFIT OR IMPROVE THE EDUCATION OF THE CHILDREN IN OUR SCHOOL? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considered the autumn term data and asked questions to check on progress and attainment. • Carried out mental health provision monitoring • Discussed safeguarding and learnt that SCR was fully compliant. 	
	Meeting ended at 6pm	

Advice given by Governors at this school is incidental to their professional expertise and is not being given in their professional capacity. Governors must respect the confidence of those items of business which a governing body decides and not disclose what individual governors have said or how they have voted within a meeting.

Signed..... Date.....