



HORRBRIDGE PRIMARY AND NURSERY SCHOOL

Full Governing Board

Meeting 162 Minutes				Part I
20 th November 2023, 18:00			Location: Year 6 classroom	
Attendees	Initials	Governor type	Term	Responsibilities
Emiko Adjene	EA	Co-opted	18/11/20 - 17/11/24	Curriculum Lead School Imp. Deputy
Nicola Beeching	NB	Co-opted	17/04/23 – 16/04/27	Community, Staff, Wellbeing Personnel Nursery
John Clarke	JC	Headteacher	01/01/09 – ongoing	Headteacher
Tom Cooper	TC	Partnership	20/09/23 - 19/09/27	Safeguarding Deputy
Caroline Daniel	CD	Parent	18/11/20 – 17/11/24	Chair of Governors Behaviour & Attendance Lead Premises, H&S, Maintenance
Hannah Downing	HD	Associate	20/09/23 - 19/09/27	SENDCo @ HPNS
Christine James	CJ	Parent	06/02/22 – 05/02/26	Children in Care Safeguarding Lead
Tracy Lear	TL	Co-opted	20/11/23 – 19/11/27	SEND Deputy Pupil Premium
Alison Smith	AS	Staff	08/09/23 - 07/09/27	
Sam Sykes	SS	Parent	13/11/23 - 12/11/27	
Claire Treliving	CT	Parent	03/02/20 – 02/02/24	Vice Chair of Governors P&P Committee Chair SEND Lead

Absent	Apology/ non-apology	Governor Type	Term	Responsibilities
Carol Waterman-Smith	CW	Partnership	20/11/23 – 19/11/27	School Improvement
Sophie Bailey	SBP	Co-opted	05/01/22 – 04/01/26	Curriculum Deputy

In Attendance	Initials	
Sam Brown	SB	Clerk
Pam Law	PL	Observer
Caroline Morgan	CM	Observer

Minutes to:
Attendees and Apologies
School Website
-

Ref, time 162. #	Action or Decision	Owner/ Decision	Date Due	Progress /Date actioned
	<p>was appointed on to the Performance and Pay Committee. TL was appointed the Pupil Premium Lead Terms of Reference and Deputy SEND Terms of Reference.</p> <p>18:20 TL rejoined the meeting.</p> <p>d) CT was appointed the governor mentor for SS. CD the mentor for CW and TL.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>		
7	<p><u>Headteacher's report</u> See docs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - HT report Nov 2023 - External advisor report 171023 - Sport Premium impact report, reviewed Nov 23 <p>a) <u>External advisor report</u>: Governors received the external advisor's report.</p> <p>QUESTION: A recommendation was for the Key Stage (KS) 2 lead to spend time with, and support, the teacher's planning. How could that be implemented? This had been implemented with the KS2 lead working alongside the teacher during their Planning, Preparation and Assessment (PPA) time, or after school at a mutually convenient time, and/or at key stage meetings.</p> <p>QUESTION: Was the implementation plan realistic? Yes. Some sessions had already taken place and future sessions had been diarised. Leadership time was in place for the Key Stage lead to conduct the work.</p> <p>b) <u>Ofsted visit</u>: The final Ofsted report had been received and shared with the school community. The first draft report had been challenged by JC, with support from Devon's K.Powell, to ensure that it was reflective of the Ofsted feedback meeting that Governors had attended. Since issuing to parents, JC had offered open sessions to families that might want to discuss their resulting queries. The sessions had been attended by just a few families who hadn't been concerned by the Ofsted report. In general, the school community had been positive and supportive about the Ofsted outcome. Some elements from the Ofsted feedback meeting to governors hadn't been in the final report e.g. developing cultural diversity and developing the Nursery provision.</p> <p>QUESTION: How did HPNS now compare with other local school Ofsted outcomes? Favourably.</p> <p>c) <u>Personnel & staffing update</u>: A Teaching Assistant (TA) had offered their resignation as of the end of the Autumn Term. HD & JC were considering options for continued TA provision but were not currently considering advertising to replace the TA. The Finance Officer had recently advised, due to budget constraints, that the school should consider not replacing departing staff where possible.</p> <p>QUESTION: if the school did not replace the TA, would it still be able to meet the needs of the children? By re-deploying existing staff, the affected class would continue to have a TA. JC and HD were considering ratios in school and</p>			

Ref, time 162. #	Action or Decision	Owner/ Decision	Date Due	Progress /Date actioned
	<p>confirmed the school would remain compliant. Due to budget constraints, the school was moving towards an “essentials” only staffing structure rather than being able to employ the “nice to haves”.</p> <p>QUESTION: Had the school identified a solution for the upcoming Maternity Cover needs? Yes.</p> <p>d) <u>P.E. Premium Strategy</u>: governors received the updated review report</p> <p>QUESTION: The report stated that all children partake in an after-school club for 1 hour of activity, how did the school know that every child did this? If some didn't do a club what did the school do to try and encourage them to join in? Records of uptake were kept and monitored by the Administration Office. Identified children were then targeted and individually invited to attend a club. Whilst every effort was made to encourage children, not all children did attend a club, therefore the target in the report was aspirational. The classes offered were diverse to cater for all interests and had been developed after taking into consideration parental feedback.</p> <p>e) <u>Headteacher (HT) termly written report</u>: Governors received the HT report.</p> <p>QUESTION: Noting that no internal exclusions had been reported, what did the school categorise it when a pupil was taught out of class? This was planned provision to support an individual's needs rather than an exclusion. Internal exclusions would be used as a form or reprimand for behavioural reminders. Ofsted had been content with the process in place at HPNS.</p>			
8 1845	<p><u>School Development Plan (SDP) review</u> See docs: - <i>SDP 2023-2024</i></p> <p>a) Governors received the revised SDP</p> <p>QUESTION: had the SDP been changed/developed because of Ofsted? No, but some areas had been enhanced (e.g. developing the Nursery provision). Most of the areas identified by Ofsted had already been in the SDP.</p> <p>QUESTION: were Nursery age children negatively impacted because of COVID? Some communication and interaction needs had been identified.</p> <p>b) Review against SDP #2: There were no further questions from governors who completed their review of progress against SDP #2.</p>	Agreed		

Ref, time 162. #	Action or Decision	Owner/ Decision	Date Due	Progress /Date actioned
9 1855	<p><u>School Improvement ToR</u> See docs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Primary School On A Page letter and guidance October 2023 - SOAP - 2023 Devon Quintiles (Primary Provisional).pdf <p>JC presented the data reports to governors, key points were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Quintiles report was based on attainment rather than progress. - Some of the cohorts were very small so the results were statistically not significant. - The school had been in the top 20% (Q1), in 2023, for achieving an EYFS (Early Years Foundation Stage) GLD (Good level of development. - There was a cause for concern in the Q4 result for 2023 KS1 (yr 1) phonics which had been a cohort of 29 children. This wasn't a contextually weak cohort, and the school had since identified some children who should have passed but that hadn't. These children were being "picked up" in yr2 for additional support and the new Year 1 teacher was receiving support from the KS1 lead. - KS1 (yr2) results for 2023 were strong: Reading Q1; Writing Q1; Math Q2. The disadvantaged cohort of 12 children in this class was significant for HPNS. <p>QUESTION: noting that the results for KS1 had been less strong in 2022, what had changed? That had been a cohort of particularly high need which would continue to impact HPNS results as it moved through the school. Raw attainment for that class would always be a challenge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - KS2 results were Q3 Reading; Q3 Writing, Q2 Math; Q3 all combined. Some of the cohort had joined the class over the years and/or had additional needs. 33% of the cohort had been Disadvantaged. <p>QUESTION: 2019 data had generally been Q1 and Q2. Was HPNS now seeing the impact of COVID? Partially yes, but each year's results were cohort dependent. For example, the cohort which had just left HPNS had been one with many academic challenges but it had still attained well in Maths but its Reading results had been disappointing. It was noted that disadvantaged rates had been increasing at HPNS over the more recent years.</p> <p>QUESTION: would the data reports be consulted by potential Academy partners? JC thought this unlikely, and that academies would refer more to an Ofsted report.</p>			
10	<p><u>Governor Portfolio or ToR reports</u> See docs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pupil Premium Monitoring Form Sept 29th 23 - Pupil Premium Strategy 2022-2025 - HPNS proposed term dates 24.25 			

Ref, time 162. #	Action or Decision	Owner/ Decision	Date Due	Progress /Date actioned
	<p>a) Partnership Working Party: This group needed to arrange a date for its next meeting where it would start to consider which of the 6 or 7 potential academy partners it wanted to investigate further. The government target was for all schools to be part of an academy, or on that journey, by 2030. SS and TC nominated themselves to join this working party.</p> <p>b) Wellbeing Working Party: Three staff members had volunteered to become wellbeing representatives and a go-between for staff to feedback, anonymously, to the SLT about wellbeing in school. Results had been mixed, some staff were anxious about using this mechanism. The feedback received had given JC and HD some possible areas to consider and develop e.g. a “you said, we did” feedback scenario.</p> <p>QUESTION: Had any “Quick wins” been identified? Yes.</p> <p>QUESTION: did the volunteer staff members represent a variance of different types of school staff? Not particularly, HD had hoped that a teacher would volunteer too, but HD was confident that all staff have a good relationship with at least one of the representatives.</p>	<p>Party members Agreed</p>	<p>FGB163</p>	<p>complete</p>
<p>12 1942</p>	<p><u>Finance Committee</u></p> <p>The committee had met on 20/11/23. They had:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Completed budget monitoring, there was £30k surplus forecast for the 23/24 main school budget. - Identified a catering deficit which the school was investigating. - Understood that the forecast budget was strong until April 24 but declined thereafter. This was a typical trend at HPNS. - Understood that the TA resignation had already been incorporated into the surplus. - Considered pupil numbers and their effect on the budget. - Considered the compliance of spending for Pupil Premium, CiC, Tutoring and Sports Premium. <p>Draft minutes would be circulated by the Clerk at the next FGB.</p>	<p>SB</p>	<p>Jan FGB</p>	<p>complete</p>
<p>13</p>	<p><u>Policies & Procedures</u></p> <p>a) Policies approved by ToR holders, committees, individuals in line with delegations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CD: Health and Safety Policy Nov 23 <p>b) Policies reviewed and approved by the Full Governing Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pay Policy Nov 23 - Staff – Maternity and Adoption Support Leave Policy Nov 23 - Staff – Managing Sickness Policy Nov 23 - CCTV Policy Nov 23 - The Equality Statement was reaffirmed 	<p>Agreed</p>		

Ref, time 162. #	Action or Decision	Owner/ Decision	Date Due	Progress /Date actioned
	<p>QUESTION: Would equality objectives be updated regarding diversity following Ofsted visit? This was under consideration by HD.</p> <p>QUESTION: Staff Absence policy, did the Chair of Governors run absence meetings? Only in relation to the Headteacher's absence.</p>			
14 1947	<p><u>Premises, H&S & Maintenance</u></p> <p>Brought forward from previous FGB: item 161.12 - JC would monitor, and report back, regarding protruding drains on the school footpath. Response covered, in part, during agenda item 7 - HT report. Quotes were being sought to improve the path.</p> <p>The wall to the rear of the school continued to be monitored and there were some recent signs of movement. The school was seeking quotes to repair with buttresses being considered as a solution.</p> <p>The school would consult the Finance Policy to identify the number of quotes needed and approval limits etc.</p>			
20 1951	<p><u>Safeguarding</u></p> <p>The annual S175 check had been received by the school and would be complete by the submission deadline of 31st January.</p> <p>TC and CJ would arrange a handover of the Safeguarding role with a written monitoring report anticipated for FGB 162.</p>	<p>JC/CD/TC</p> <p>TC/CJ</p>	<p>FGB163</p> <p>FGB 163</p>	
21	<p><u>Training</u></p> <p>a) Confirmation of training attended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Governor Induction (NB, TC, CW, TL) - Primary School Curriculum (NB) <p>b) Identified training needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NB HT Appraisal training – NB would complete the NGA course - A governor volunteer was sought for DES' Spring Term Governance briefing: 30th Jan, virtual, 17:30 – 19:00 31st Jan, virtual, 13:30 – 15:00 	<p>NB</p>	<p>w/c 27th Nov</p>	<p>Complete</p>

Ref, time 162. #	Action or Decision	Owner/ Decision	Date Due	Progress /Date actioned
	Volunteers to contact SB to make the booking.	All	30/01/24	TC to attend
23	<p>What have we done today that has positively impacted the quality of our children's education?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appointed new governors onto the board - Received an overview of the budget and actions being taken - Considered nursery provision - Received the Ofsted report and ensured the school is using it to develop provision - Set actions for the Partnership Working Party to continue their work <p>1957: The meeting ended.</p>			
Next Meetings: FGB: 15/01/24, 6pm FC: tbc approx. late Jan P&P: 11/12/23, 6pm,		Location: FGB: Year 6 Classroom FC: tbc Pay & Performance Committee: virtual		

Signed as a true and accurate record:

Signed	Date