



Tas Valley Church Schools Federation

Preston CE VC Primary and Saxlingham Nethergate CE VC Primary

Full Governing Board Meeting

Monday 18 July 2022 at 5pm, [Preston CEVC Primary School](#)

Minutes

Present:

Diane Perry-Yates DPY (Chair of Governors)
 Matt Walker MWa (Executive Headteacher)
 Claire Crawshay CC
 Rebecca Orford RO
 Lesley Allgood LA
 Fiona Webb FW
 Claire Smith CS
 Will Defoe WD

Apologies:

Julie Bennett JB (Vice-Chair of Governors)
 Will Clements WC
 Daisy Sutcliffe DS
 Alan Gall AG

In Attendance:

Christopher Perry-Yates CPY (Governance Professional)
 Laura Knight LK (Assistant Headteacher, Saxlingham)
 Matt Williams MWi (Associate Member)
 Anne Fry AF (Associate Member)

Item No.	Item and discussion	Owner	Target Date
1.	<p>Register of attendance and apologies:</p> <p>The register of attendance was signed.</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Julie Bennett, Will Clements, Alan Gall and Daisy Sutcliffe.</p> <p>The Governance Professional advised that the meeting was quorate.</p>		
2.	<p>Declarations of pecuniary interests:</p> <p>There were no pecuniary interests declared for items on the agenda.</p>		
3.	<p>Minutes of the previous meeting on 20 June 2022:</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting on 20 June 2022 were reviewed and approved as an accurate reflection. The minutes were digitally signed by the Chair.</p> <p>Proposed: DPY Seconded: WD</p>		
4.	<p>Matters arising:</p> <p>The action list from the previous meeting was reviewed.</p>		

	<p>It was agreed to carry forward the following action:</p> <p>ACTION: Upload curriculum monitoring reports.</p> <p>All other actions were agreed as completed.</p> <p>AF advised that she had arranged a monitoring visit for autumn term.</p> <p>The Chair of Governors advised that she had made contact with Governor services for whole group training in governor monitoring and the cost had been quoted at £600. It was noted that governors would book onto the diocese governor monitoring training in November 2022.</p>	RO	12/09/22
5.	<p>Items for Any Other Business:</p> <p>Resignation of governor.</p>		
6.	<p>Chair's actions:</p> <p>The Chair of Governors advised that she had approved the expenditure to upgrade the gate entry system from wireless to wired at Preston Primary which would enable the school office to be able to see visitors. The cost was £1,798. It was agreed to check whether the system could be compatible with hearing aids.</p> <p>ACTION: Headteacher to check accessibility features of the new gate upgrade at Preston Primary.</p> <p>IT WAS RESOLVED that the decision to upgrade the entry access at Preston Primary should be ratified. Proposed: LA Seconded: WD All voted in favour with no abstentions.</p>	MWa	19/09/22
7.	<p>Headteacher's report:</p> <p>The governing board reviewed the headteacher's report. A copy had been circulated prior to the meeting and can be found filed with these minutes.</p> <p>The headteacher highlighted that pupil numbers were changing quickly which was positive.</p> <p>Q (AF): The number for Reception at Saxlingham is estimated at 5 - do we expect any increase and how can we address this?</p> <p>A: It is difficult to know as we have had a number of pupils join us throughout the year. It is more likely that we can slowly build on this number, but it will become more of an issue if we are not nearer to capacity in September 2023. We will continue to promote the school via our website and social media, by planning open days and working closely with the wider community.</p> <p>Q (AF): The KS1 Reading, Maths and Writing scores are well below National</p>		

	<p>data, from 2019 which may be part of the explanation- for both schools. However, Science is recorded at 100% at Saxlingham and is 70.6% at Preston. Please can you explain reasons for lower scores in Reading, Maths and Writing but not in science?</p> <p>A: Assessment criteria for science is narrower than for Reading, Writing and Maths; 3 children at Preston are working well below expected standards in all areas.</p> <p>Q (AF): Would it be helpful to compare data with similar schools in Norfolk if this is available?</p> <p>A: We will do this once the data is available in October 2022</p> <p>Q (AF): The data on KS2 children's attainment is generally positive. Could you explain the difference between KS2 children achieving EXS+ in Reading, Writing and Maths: 87.5% at Saxlingham but 58% at Preston?</p> <p>A: It is the peculiarity of small cohorts. At Saxlingham (8 children), all pupils achieved EXS+ in all areas with the exception of 1 child who achieved WTS (working towards expected standard) for Maths. At Preston, most of the children in this category were working at EXS in all areas.</p> <p>Q(DPY): Preston KS2 - Were there any particular needs for the SEND pupils that would account for the result. Were they given any additional time? Did they make any progress?</p> <p>A: Yes, there were some particular needs that we can detail within case studies, however, as this is such a small number of children, I am mindful of providing too much information that could lead to identification. No children qualified for additional time.</p> <p>Q(DPY): Preston KS1 - Pupil Premium children did they make progress? and did the SEND children have any particular needs?</p> <p>A: Pupil Premium children are making expected progress. 2 or 3 SEND children are working well below EXS in some areas.</p> <p>Q(DPY): Preston Attendance - Grasshoppers class for girls is lower than any other, is there a reason for this and what is being done to address it. The boys are also lower but not significantly.</p> <p>A: Grasshoppers girls' data could be skewed by 1 pupil attending P/T in agreement with other agencies and parents/carers.</p> <p>Q(DPY): Can you confirm that SEND/ EHCP pupils showing 100 EXS is for 6 pupils and the same for GDS at Saxlingham.</p> <p>A: In Year 6, 4 out of 8 pupils are on SEND register (this includes 2 EHCP).</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>Q(DPY): Saxlingham Attendance - looks to have increased 'term to date' which is excellent news - is it just that the children are bedding in from the long delay of Covid or are we doing anything particular across the Federation?</p> <p>A: As I have stated throughout the year, it is that there have been far steadier patterns of attendance since Easter 2022, and this is more reflective of normal expectations.</p> <p>Q(DPY): The admission numbers for Reception at Saxlingham are down, will this effect class structure? Since the last report, the numbers in each school have gone up by an additional YR1 in Saxlingham and YR5 in Preston.</p> <p>A: Class structure will be Squirrels (Reception, Year 1, Year 2 = 26 pupils); Hedgehogs (Year 3, Year 4 = 16 pupils); Owls (Year 5, Year 6 = 24 pupils).</p> <p>Governors noted that the Saxlingham KS2 showed excellent outcomes far above national average of 59% for combined and excellent GDS outcomes.</p> <p>Q(DPY): Preston KS2 - each child is worth 5% so if the child who was Ill had taken the test, were they projected to make EXS? If so, we would have made national average. The same question goes for the child taken out of school for a holiday. If the child taken on holiday had achieved expected standard, then reading and GPS would have only been 1% below national average.</p> <p>A: I have uploaded some information to support this.</p> <p>It was highlights that the Writing results were excellent being 11% above national. The school also had 30% GDS which was better than the trend in other schools.</p> <p>Q(DPY): Is the recent spike in Covid issues causing any staffing or absence issues?</p> <p>A: Two staff have been positive. Small numbers of children have been positive.</p> <p>Q (RO): EYFS - are there specific areas of the assessment framework where the pupils scored poorly?</p> <p>A: I have attached a breakdown of the assessments so Governors can see performance in each of the areas (pupils are anonymised)</p> <p>Q (RO): KS1 results are compared against 2019 National Data - when will the 2022 National and County-level data be available for an equitable comparison?</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>A: This data has not yet been released. Other headteachers advise me that this will be October 2022.</p> <p>Q (RO): Would it be better to include the 2022 figures in the SIDP?</p> <p>A: I will do when the new SIDP is created for September.</p> <p>Q (RO): The Preston KS1 reading scores are considerably lower than the National average in 2019 and at Saxlingham none are at GDS - are there any additional 'incentives' that can be put in place to encourage better engagement with reading e.g., links with local library or book clubs?</p> <p>A: This is something that we will be looking into. Our new Little Wandle Scheme will necessitate adjustments to the teaching of Early Reading both at home and school; support will be planned for parents/carers to support at home.</p> <p>Q (RO): Is the number kit still used in both schools and could this be developed for Multiplication reinforcement?</p> <p>A: Yes. The subject lead has also suggested exploring TT Rockstars as a tool to support Multiplication reinforcement and we are looking into this for next year.</p> <p>Q (RO): There is a difference between the two schools for the Science scores - is this influenced by a different approach to curriculum design in each school?</p> <p>A: No – a small number of children at Preston are working well below age expectations.</p> <p>Q (RO): Are the KS2 National % figures quoted also for 2019 or are these 2022 percentages?</p> <p>A: These are for 2022. The only national data I currently have is for KS2.</p> <p>Q (RO): Preston KS2 data - how many children were on the borderline (within 1 or 2 points) of 100 for EXS or 110+ for GDS?</p> <p>A: See attached table.</p> <p>Q (RO): Have KS2 SEND children at Preston made progress since their KS1 assessment? Are there any reasons why SEND pupils at Saxlingham appear to have performed better than SEND at Preston or is it very dependent on specific SEND need of individuals?</p> <p>A: Maths – all 6 pupils achieved expected progress. Reading – all 6 pupils achieved expected progress. Writing – 5/6 pupils achieved expected progress (including 1 pupil who exceeded expected progress). More dependent on specific individuals.</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>Q (RO): How will a subject lead for Phonics be assigned to ensure effective oversight of the roll-out of Little Wandle across the Federation?</p> <p>A: This is still under discussion, particularly with the recruitment of new staff. There will likely be a nominated person at both schools working in close collaboration. An Early Reading Audit is planned through VNET in Autumn 2.</p> <p>Q (RO): Has money been put aside in a budget line for clearing of the wildlife area? Could this project be carried out with support of Trustees of Burfield Park (Tasburgh Nature area)?</p> <p>A: £2000 has been budgeted so far. I know nothing about the Trustees of Burfield Park but would welcome more information.</p> <p>Q (RO): Saxlingham appears to offer more creative enrichment activities for the pupils than Preston - are there more opportunities for linking up across the Federation to ensure a balance with creative, physical and environmental activities?</p> <p>A: I agree and this is something that we are seeking to redress. Jo Firman and Laura Knight have already met together to discuss some ideas for the next academic year.</p> <p>The Executive Headteacher advised that an email had been received from the diocese to advised that 21 schools in the diocese were likely to be inspected and neither Federation school was on the list. It was agreed that this allowed the school to take further time to embed all the activities from the SIAMS action plan.</p> <p>Governors were advised that there had been further contractual changes for staff for the next academic year. Governors reviewed the list of increased hours. It was highlighted that much of this was to assist leadership release time and increase support time.</p> <p>Q(DPY): Was this already included in the budget?</p> <p>A: Yes.</p> <p>Q (FW): Were the 5 children at Saxlingham on the SEND register?</p> <p>A: None were known to be on the SEND register at this point in time. There were some with siblings already in the school and some outside catchment.</p> <p>Q (FW): Is there any way that the school could make parents of children in the nursery think of Saxlingham first?</p> <p>A: For two years before lockdowns, we had invited parents into the school for tours and to participate. There was no particular concern at this stage as there had been a number of in-year admissions.</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p style="color: red;">Number only Roll (NoR) would be monitored and opportunities to market the school would be undertaken.</p> <p>Governors discussed the need for a marketing action plan. It was noted that there were some year groups that were full and there was a risk that some children would be turned away if they wanted spaces in those year groups. It was agreed that the overall number on roll across the Federation was strong. It was agreed to have an objective to look at marketing of the school in the School Improvement and Development Plan (SIDP).</p>		
8.	<p>Safeguarding report:</p> <p>The governing board reviewed the safeguarding section of the headteacher's report.</p>		
9.	<p>Cybersecurity action plan:</p> <p>The governing board reviewed the cybersecurity themed audit results and subsequent action plan. Copies had been circulated prior to the meeting and can be found filed with these minutes.</p> <p style="color: red;">Q(DPY): As this is a red RAG rating, I feel that we should be ensuring that staff passwords are more complex in line with recommendations. In the new password policy, it should stipulate the type of password that is acceptable?</p> <p style="color: red;">A: I agree but this is something I will need to action in September.</p> <p style="color: red;">Q(DPY): Supply - if generic accounts are to be available, then a facility needs to be in place to ensure that the passwords are regularly changed. Otherwise supply teachers will have access beyond their time at the Federation.</p> <p style="color: red;">A: Also agreed but note that we only have technical support in school once weekly.</p> <p style="color: red;">Q(DPY): I still feel that the procedure that JC Comtech uses needs to be documented otherwise we will not comply.</p> <p style="color: red;">A: I am happy to ask for more information/written confirmation.</p> <p style="color: red;">Q(DPY): USB drives - are we already using Google Drive, OneDrive, and/or Sharepoint? If so, access to USB drives should be disabled. If not, the Cloud system will eliminate this, however, USB drives should still be disabled to meet GDPR requirements.</p> <p style="color: red;">A: USB/portable hard drives should not be used on a daily basis. Such devices should be encrypted.</p> <p>The governing Board noted that consideration of moving to a cloud-based system in Autumn term was within the draft SIDP for 2022-23. The headteacher advised that an initial discussion had been held with JC</p>		

	<p>Comtech regarding a cloud server with a view to getting this in place as soon as possible. JC Comtech had offered support for staff in using the new system.</p> <p>Governors agreed that a cloud based system should be in place as soon as possible and that any associated cost would be circulated.</p> <p>IT WAS RESOLVED to move to a cloud based system in the autumn term. Proposed: DPY Seconded: CC All voted in favour with no abstentions.</p> <p>Q (AF): Is there anyone in the school with a IT background who can support the technical side of the systems.</p> <p>A: No. There is only a curriculum lead.</p> <p>IT WAS RESOLVED that the themed audit action plan should be adopted. Proposed: DPY Seconded: WD All voted in favour with no abstentions.</p>		
10.	<p>School Improvement and Development Plan (SIDP) progress:</p> <p>The governing board reviewed the SIDP progress report. A copy had been circulated prior to the meeting and can be found filed with these minutes.</p> <p>The headteacher advised that he had been in conversation with VNET for support in Reading and Phonics. Monitoring of the curriculum and subject lead areas would continue to be developed within next years SIDP. There would also be some level of Ofsted readiness preparation for subject leaders to be able articulate their subject.</p> <p>Governors agreed that it would be useful to have subject leaders attend the governing board meetings to provide an overview of their subjects.</p> <p>It was agreed that the SIDP would be RAG rated and reviewed on a termly basis.</p> <p>ACTION: Headteacher to update the SIDP and present to governors on a termly basis.</p>	MWa	Ongoing
11.	<p>Resources reports:</p> <p>Finance Audit response</p> <p>The governing board reviewed the finance audit report. A copy had been circulated prior to the meeting and can be found filed with these minutes.</p> <p>It was noted that the report was very positive with very few urgent recommendations with the exception of the need to ensure that 3 quotes were received for expenditure of above £5k.</p> <p>IT WAS RESOLVED that the proposed response and action plan should be submitted to the Local Authority.</p>		

	<p>Proposed: WD Seconded: CC All voted in favour with no abstentions.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Finance policy would be reviewed in full in the autumn term with consideration to increase the headteacher spending limit to £1k from £500.</p> <p>The headteacher advised that there was the need to ensure that the asset registers were up to date and were monitored regularly including by governors.</p> <p>Q(WD): Had the 9 staff who were seen as being self-employed had their work reviewed to ensure that they should not be employed?</p> <p>A: A check would be carried out on each individual. We are in the process of deciding on whether the school should undertake this or whether the individuals should be asked to do it.</p> <p>Governors commended the results of the audit and minuted thanks to the School Secretary.</p> <p>Review quotes for playing equipment</p> <p>The governing board reviewed the quotes for playing equipment. A copy had been circulated prior to the meeting and can be found filed with these minutes.</p> <p>The headteacher advised that Friends of Saxlingham School (FOSS) had raised some funds. Governors noted that £2k had been allocated from Sports Premium and ring-fenced for the purchase with the balance paid by FOSS. £2k had also been ring-fenced for the wildlife area at Preston Primary. Quotes were being sought for this.</p> <p>It was agreed to circulate the quotes via GovernorHub for a decision.</p> <p>Governors also noted that £20k of Sports Premium had also been allocated for the purchase of a mini bus.</p>		
<p>12.</p>	<p>School effectiveness report:</p> <p>The governing board reviewed the datasets for the EYFS, KS1, Year 4 Multiplication tests and KS2 SATs. Copies of the data had been circulated prior to the meeting and can be found filed with these minutes.</p> <p>Governors commended the EYFS results.</p> <p>Q (AF): Do you have a Gifted and Talented Policy in place?</p> <p>A: This was being developed ready for the autumn term.</p> <p>Governors agreed that until national data was available to compare it was not possible to gauge how well the schools had done overall.</p>		

	<p>Q (RO): Are all the new phonics systems going to be aligned to the current assessments system?</p> <p>A: Yes.</p> <p>The headteacher advised that two children who had not taken their KS2 SATs would have been at the Expected Standard (EXS). Case studies has been prepared to show this.</p> <p>Overall, the governing board commended the children and staff for the results which showed that the school had performed well in very difficult circumstances.</p> <p>It was agreed that each cohort needed to be viewed based on its own challenges.</p>		
<p>13.</p>	<p>Ethos reports:</p> <p><i>SIAMS Strand 5: Dignity and Respect</i></p> <p>The governing board discussed the question of how the school was meeting the expectations and the DfE’s statutory guidance on relationships education and RSHE.</p> <p>The headteacher advised that the same scheme of work for RSHE was used across the Federation - Discovery RSHE. The schools responded to even try as they happened as well including areas such as prejudice related events. The September Inset would be focused on Little Wandle phonics, safeguarding based on Keeping Children Safe in Education 2022 which included a focus on LGBTQ+.</p> <p>The governing board reviewed the summary SEF. A copy had been circulated prior to the meeting. Governors commended the document.</p> <p>The RE link governor advised that she had attended the school to monitor religious literacy and how children could talk about RE. Work on theology, philosophy and social sciences was also discussed. A further visit was being arranged to sit in on a lesson in autumn term.</p> <p>The Saxlingham Assistant Headteacher advised that ten grants of £1k were available for bids for projects and it was proposed that a bid should be submitted based on increasing the children’s understanding of multicultural environments such as visiting mosques and synagogues etc.</p> <p>Q (RO): Would this be across the Federation?</p> <p>A: This could be looked into.</p>		
<p>14.</p>	<p>Staff wellbeing:</p> <p>The headteacher advised that staff had rallied over the last term, supporting each other where there was absence. There had been staff staying after hours and supporting Year 6 leaver productions. Everyone was</p>		

	<p>tired and needed the summer break to ready themselves for another term. Preston staff had held their end of year get together and Saxlingham was due to hold its own event in the coming week.</p> <p>Governors commended the commitment of all staff throughout a difficult year and requested that this was passed back to all staff.</p> <p>Staff and governors commended the headteacher for his work under difficult circumstances. Governors also recorded thanks to the Chair of Governors for taking on the role and moving governance forward.</p>		
15.	<p>Headteachers Performance Management:</p> <p>The Chair of Governors advised that the headteachers mid-year review had been carried out.</p>		
16.	<p>Governor CPD:</p> <p>The Chair of Governors advised that she viewed a podcast on Modern Governor which focused on the curriculum. Governors were encouraged to listen to the podcast.</p> <p>The headteacher advised that he had written an intent document which would be uploaded to the new website in September and would be placed on the review cycle along with the school policies.</p> <p>The Governance Professional advised that Keeping Children Safe in Education (KCSiE) 2022 made it mandatory for governors to undertake annual safeguarding training.</p>		
17.	<p>Governor monitoring:</p> <p>The governing board reviewed the monitoring reports by the Chair of Governors and the RE link governor. It was noted that the children had been very engaged in their learning and happy to discuss their learning with visitors.</p>		
18.	<p>Governing board correspondence:</p> <p>There had been no correspondence received.</p>		
19.	<p>Policy review:</p> <p>The following policies were reviewed:</p> <p>a) Allergies policy There were no questions.</p> <p>b) Behaviour policy The headteacher advised that the behaviour policy was not yet ready and consultation with staff at both schools was still underway to ensure that the policy was right and fitted in with the schools' Christian Ethos.</p>		

	<p>c) Grievance procedures There were no questions.</p> <p>d) Homework policy There were no questions.</p> <p>e) Safeguarding policy There were no questions.</p> <p>IT WAS RESOLVED that the policies above except the behaviour policy should be ratified and adopted by the governing board. Proposed: RO Secoded: CS All voted in favour with no abstentions.</p>		
20.	<p>Any other business:</p> <p>The headteacher advised that a meeting was being held to finalise the Federation websites. The new websites would be ready for September. MWi agreed to audit the websites when they had been completed.</p> <p>Governors were advised that Will Clements had advised that he would be resigning as a governor at the end of the academic year.</p> <p>Governors commended the schools for their Year 6 productions.</p>		
21.	<p>Items deemed confidential:</p> <p>There were no items deemed confidential.</p>		
22.	<p>Reflection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledged the children’s hard work across the board with the positive assessment results. • Acknowledged the hard work and dedication of the staff at both schools. • Agreed a way forward for the cybersecurity of the school. • Acknowledged the achievements of the SIDP. 		
23.	<p>Date of next meeting:</p> <p>19 September 2022 at 5pm, Saxlingham Nethergate Primary</p>		

Meeting closed at 7pm

Actions:

Item No.	Action Description	Owner	Target Date
4	Upload curriculum monitoring reports.	RO	12/09/22
6	Check accessibility features of the new gate upgrade at Preston.	WMa	19/09/22
10	Update the SIDP and present to governors on a termly basis.	MWa	Ongoing