

**Minutes of Full Governors Meeting**

Held at Swavesey Primary School on 05/05/2021 at 6.30pm

**Governors present:** Anna Norden (AN) - Headteacher  
Colin Oakman (CO) - Chair  
Tina Carminati (TC)  
Steve Byfield (SB)  
Hannah Parish (HP)  
Catherine Cannon (CC)  
Alison Fox (AF)  
Laura McAuley (LM)  
Rachel Hallam (RH)  
Diane Herrington (DH)  
Lucy Parsons (LP)  
Lynsey Fulcher (LF)

**Apologies:** Andrew Baker (AB)

The Meeting was quorate.

**Also Present:** Associate Members: Lucy Poskitt (LP) –Deputy Head  
Wendy Whistler (WW) – Business Manager

**Clerk:** Katie Tween (KT)

	Action
<p><b>1. Welcome and Apologies for absence</b> Apologies received and accepted from Andrew Baker.</p>	
<p><b>2. Declaration of interests</b> None declared.</p>	
<p><b>3. Minutes &amp; Matters Arising from Meeting held on 24/03/2021.</b> The minutes of the Full Governing Body meeting held on 24/03/21 had been uploaded to the Every system for all to read in advance. It was <b>agreed</b> that they were a true record of the meeting and should therefore be <b>approved</b> and signed.</p> <p><b><u>Matters Arising &amp; Action Points</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>RH to link with new DPO.</i> DPO only just in post. It was agreed that RH should be listed as the link governor, but that there may not be further action needed at this stage.</li> <li>- <i>Resources Committee to appoint a new safeguarding governor at the next meeting.</i> Two governors (HP and LP) had agreed to take this on, on an interim basis, taking a term each.</li> <li>- <i>CO to circulate report from governor conference. KT to circulate details of available training.</i> The two presentations from the governor conference were now available on Every; one on Ofsted and one on Disadvantaged Pupils. The Chair noted several key points from the Disadvantaged Pupils presentation</li> </ul>	<b>CO</b>

	Action
<p>including that the school closures may have reversed progress that had been made to narrow the gap in the last decade. It was noted that disadvantaged pupils did not refer solely to pupil premium but included any pupils who had been disadvantaged as a result of covid. LP noted that pupil premium reporting was also changing. The Chair suggested that, based on this, the governing body would need to be clear on priorities and realistic on expectations. The Chair also noted that from the Ofsted presentation, Ofsted would be looking at the three core functions. SB <b>agreed</b> to summarise the presentations and circulate to all governors. The clerk <b>agreed</b> to provide any further training updates that she received.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>All to read the correspondence that had been circulated.</i> There was a discussion about the use of e-mail for governor correspondence. It was noted that governors should not forward e-mails to other accounts because of the need for confidentiality. When using Every, governors also needed to ensure that any temporary downloads were deleted. WW <b>agreed</b> to check all staff governor e-mail addresses and update where necessary.</li> <li>- <i>Committees to prepare Governors' Reports to Parents for approval at the next meeting.</i> The CLA draft report was done; the Resources committee still needed to be done. Action to remain open.</li> </ul> <p>All other actions were confirmed to be closed.</p>	<p><b>SB</b> <b>KT</b></p> <p><b>WW</b></p> <p><b>CO/LF</b></p>
<p><b>4. Head Teacher's Report</b></p> <p>A written report had been uploaded to Every in advance of the meeting. The Head noted some of the key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The number of children at the school had increased.</li> <li>- The additional EHCP had now been confirmed, which meant a total of 11 across the school.</li> <li>- They had had their first child covid case, but the child had already been self-isolating before diagnosis, so no class bubbles had to be closed.</li> <li>- The LA had provided a spreadsheet on attendance showing comparative data.</li> </ul> <p>The Head then gave a safeguarding update, informing governors of the government's inquiry into historical sex abuse in schools. She explained that Ofsted would be undertaking specific safeguarding visits into schools. It was essential to ensure that the school had robust systems in place. The LA had sent out a set of questions that Ofsted would be using and the Head had turned these into a staff survey to gather staff's thoughts, to consider what views there were of the school's processes and to identify any gaps. Once the survey had been carried out, the Designated Safeguarding Leads (DSLs) would meet to discuss the processes. The Head had also developed a survey specifically for the governors and it was important to have honest answers so that they could identify any gaps. It was <b>agreed</b> that all governors would complete the survey by 13<sup>th</sup> May. Staff governors should complete both the staff survey and the governor survey as the questions were slightly different and it was important for staff governors to look at it from an accountability perspective as well as based on their own understanding.</p> <p>The Head confirmed that she would gather the information and report back to the Safeguarding governors who would then report back to the next FGB.</p>	<p><b>All</b></p>

	Action
<p>Governors asked the following questions:</p> <p><i>Q./ How was the catch-up funding being used?</i></p> <p>A./ Schools were given catch-up funds by the government; the purpose was to support children who had been disadvantaged in some way because of Covid. The government had also put aside money for “tutoring” which enabled schools to sign up for a tutoring provider that was 75% cheaper than normal (schools paid 25% of the total cost). Swavesley had linked up with SP Tutors which was a bespoke training group created especially for this by an East Anglian teaching school. There were lots of rules but they were allowed to use their own staff, so Mrs Kellam and Mrs Stevenson had signed up. This had been a complicated process, with a lot of paperwork involved, but it had now started. They had used the catch-up money to pay for the 25% tutoring costs, as this meant that this catch-up money went a lot further than if they had had to pay full price. Initially they had prioritised Year 2 and Year 4 but when more money was provided by the government they would move on to other year groups.</p> <p>Governors also noted that the new Reception teacher had accepted the job offer.</p> <p>There were no further questions. The Chair thanked AN.</p>	
<p><b>5. Budget</b></p> <p>WW presented a summary of the budget, which had already been shared via e-mail with all governors. The budget had also been presented to the Resources committee at its meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> April 2021.</p> <p>WW made the following points as she talked governors through the document:</p> <p><u>Budget Process</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The budget was not a fixed document: they were budgeting throughout the year and changes would be made, partly because of the split between the financial year and the academic year.</li> <li>- Once it had been ratified, there would still be changes: they needed to ensure that these changes were acknowledged in governing body meetings going forward.</li> </ul> <p>The Chair noted that the main driver was always staff costs and that the very detailed, early conversations that were held on staff and staff structures were a huge part of the end budget and drove the SDP.</p> <p><u>Funding</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The school had benefited from the minimum per pupil funding that the government had brought in. This had illustrated how poorly funded they had been in the past: an £87K subsidy had been needed to bring them up to the minimum.</li> <li>- The uplift in funding helped to offset the drop in roll, though the additional new pupils had also closed that gap.</li> <li>- They were now in year 2 of a three year uplift. They were still expecting the additional funding: they had not budgeted for an increase but in all likelihood it would go up. However, teachers’ pay may also increase as well.</li> </ul> <p><i>Q./ Were there any caps that would prevent them from getting the increase per pupil?</i></p>	

	Action
<p>A./ No, because they were on the minimum.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- For High Needs funding, there was an expectation that schools would meet the first £6K of a child's EHCP. That may change to £7K but that hadn't been formally agreed yet. They had budgeted for this potential increase in case, because it would affect them substantially.</li></ul> <p>There was further discussion on the impact of lack of funding for SEND. The Head had, along with other teachers, spoken to the local MP because the disparity was huge. If there was a child with an EHCP who needed a FT 1:1 adult the total cost was around £21K. Based on the formula that the LA used, the school only got £10K so in affect are contributing £11K. They only received funding of £4K per child which meant that the funding shortfall had to be made up by another child's funding aswell. Cambridgeshire County Council did not have the money to subsidise further and the formula they used was an historic formula, because the formula used by the government to fund the county was also an historic formula. Cambridgeshire was now the LA with the highest proportion of ASD diagnosed children in the county, but the funding system did not recognise that. Other areas had greater deprivation, but the Head felt that higher SEND should also be funded as it was also a higher need. WW added that the EHCP process had changed 6 or 7 years ago but the value had stayed the same, despite TA pay having risen approx. 30% in the same timeframe. There had been a recent SEND review at government level with the results due in July but unknown yet whether there will be any changes.</p> <p><u>Pupil Numbers</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Pupil numbers were a key driver and they had been facing a considerable drop off in pupil numbers but had managed to acquire some new pupils (this year +33 since September).</li><li>- The figures were based on October numbers which had been 291, but they were now at 301.</li><li>- They still needed to be mindful of large year groups leaving and the potential drop off in numbers.</li></ul> <p><i>Q./ Were demographics available?</i></p> <p>A./ Yes, from the LA but they were not that helpful. They were more reliant on the numbers coming up from pre-school. They would expect an increase generally due to the new houses in the village but there didn't seem to be any forecast for those available anywhere. It was noted that that the recent census data would help inform the LA forecasts and that also covid had affected the normal housing monitoring activities.</p> <p><u>Staffing Structure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- They had worked hard to ensure that the SEND provision was beneficial to the school.</li><li>- The main change was to be able to return to the 10.5 class structure which creates more space in most year groups (except Years 5 and 6) so have the potential to increase numbers.</li><li>- They had budgeted for 10.5 for two years as it was not good for curriculum planning to keep going up and down, but if they did end up with more pupils then could increase to 11.</li></ul>	



**SWAVESEY PRIMARY SCHOOL GOVERNING BODY**

Full Governing Body Meeting Minutes, 05/05/2021

	Action
<p>It was confirmed that the Resources Committee had been happy to recommend the budget for approval.</p> <p><b>The full governing body agreed to approve the budget for 2021-2022. It was therefore ratified.</b></p>	
<p><b>6. Safeguarding Update</b></p> <p>This had already been covered in the HT report. It was confirmed that the next Safeguarding governors' meeting would be after half-term.</p>	
<p><b>7. Staff Well-being</b></p> <p>Governors were thanked for making contact with staff: their emails and notes of thanks had been well-received. LM, as staff governor, reported that the mood appeared to be shifting in school now; lots of staff had had their first vaccination and it felt as though the atmosphere was slowly returning to normal.</p> <p>The Head added that the local vaccination centre had rung the school when they had spare vaccines, so several staff members had been able to take advantage of that.</p>	
<p><b>8. Governor Visits</b></p> <p>Nothing to report.</p>	
<p><b>9. Governor Training</b></p> <p>Governors briefly discussed training needs: the Clerk <b>agreed</b> to send details of the induction training that was available for the new governors. Several governors were waiting for spaces on courses that were currently fully booked. The Clerk would provide an update on availability.</p> <p>The Head also noted that lots of governors were due an update on their SEND and Child Protection training and that she would invite them to a morning training slot.</p>	KT
<p><b>10. Correspondence</b></p> <p>No correspondence received.</p> <p>Governors noted that the Head had been involved in a presentation to other teachers on research, which had been well-received. AN reported that this had been enjoyable.</p>	
<p><b>11. Items for Information and Next Meeting Agenda</b></p> <p><b>The next FGB will be held on 14<sup>th</sup> July 2021 at 6.30pm.</b></p>	

**The Chair thanked the Governing Body and closed the meeting at 8.05pm**

**Actions**

Item	Action	Responsible
3	Minutes to be signed and given to the school office	CO

**SWAVESEY PRIMARY SCHOOL GOVERNING BODY**

Full Governing Body Meeting Minutes, 05/05/2021

3	SB to summarise the presentations from the annual conference. KT to provide him with any additional updates.	SB/KT
3	WW to check staff governor email addresses are up to date on Every	WW
3	Resources Committee to prepare draft Governors' Reports to Parents for approval at the next meeting.	LF/CO
4	All governors to complete the Safeguarding questionnaire	All
5	CO to write to EY&P team thanking them on behalf of governing body	CO
9	KT to send details of induction training to new governors	KT