



## Tas Valley Church Schools Federation

Preston CE VC Primary and Saxlingham Nethergate CE VC Primary

### Full Governing Board Meeting

Monday 23 January 2023 at 6.30pm, [via Microsoft Teams](#)

#### Minutes

Diane Perry-Yates DPY (Chair of Governors)  
 Matthew Walker MW (Headteacher)  
 Claire Crawshay CC  
 Fiona Webb FW  
 Claire Smith CS  
 Will Defoe WD  
 Anne Fry AF

**Apologies:**

Katie-Rose Lightfoot KRL  
 Rebecca Orford RO  
 Lesley Allgood LA  
 Daisy Sutcliffe DS

**In Attendance:**

Christopher Perry-Yates CPY (Governance Professional)  
 Laura Knight LK (Assistant Headteacher)  
 Jo Firman JF (Acting Assistant Headteacher)

| Item No. | Item and discussion   | Owner | Target Date |
|----------|---|-------|-------------|
| 1.       | <p><b>Register of attendance and apologies:</b></p> <p>The register of attendance was signed.</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Lesley Allgood, Katie-Rose Lightfoot and Daisy Sutcliffe. All other governors were in attendance and consented to the absence.</p> <p>The Governance Professional advised that the meeting was quorate.</p> |       |             |
| 2.       | <p><b>Declarations of pecuniary interests:</b></p> <p>There were no new pecuniary interests declared.</p>   |       |             |
| 3.       | <p><b>Minutes of the previous meeting on 12 December 2022:</b></p> <p>The minutes of the meeting on 12 December 2022 were reviewed and approved as an accurate reflection. The minutes were digitally signed by the Chair.</p> <p><b>Proposed: CS    Seconded: MW</b></p>   |       |             |

|                  |   |  |   |
|------------------|---|--|---|
| <p><b>4.</b></p> | <p><b>Matters arising:</b></p> <p>The action list from the previous meeting was reviewed.</p> <p>It was agreed to carry forward the following actions:</p> <p>The Executive Headteacher advised that the SCR was being updated and would be reviewed within the next week.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Monitor the Single Central Record.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: Upload EYFS monitoring report to GovernorHub.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: Arrange a working party to discuss a parent survey.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: Add Finance Policy review to the next FGB agenda.</b></p> <p>All other actions were noted as completed.</p>   | <p>DPY, LA</p> <p>LA</p> <p>MW, DPY</p> <p>CPY</p> | <p>31/01/23</p> <p>31/01/23</p> <p>13/03/23</p> <p>13/03/23</p> |
| <p><b>5.</b></p> | <p><b>Items for discussion under Any Other Business:</b></p> <p>There were no items declared.</p>   |  |   |
| <p><b>6.</b></p> | <p><b>Chair's actions:</b></p> <p>There had been no Chair's Actions since the previous meeting.</p>   |  |   |
| <p><b>7.</b></p> | <p><b>Executive Headteacher's report:</b></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 Executive Headteacher advised that there had been 1 child from each school in Alternative Provision on a temporary arrangement. Both children had an EHCP. There had been a great deal of work to complete all paperwork and show that the school had carried out due diligence checks as part of the process. One of the children was likely to gain a permanent place in specialist provision. Both were funded through high needs funding and through the virtual school.</p> <p>The governors reviewed the staff survey results. It was noted that communication and behaviour were the two main concerns coming out of the results.</p> <p><b>Q(DPY): In the staff survey, what percentage of total staffing does the 21 represent?</b></p> <p><b>A: 21 out of 41 = 51%.</b></p> <p><b>Q(DPY): When response shows that someone has disagreed, is there a way of breaking this down to show which school this is or is it across the Federation.</b></p> |  |   |

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
|  | <p>A: Yes, but I do not have the data available at this point in time. Further analysis can be conducted to provide a more specific overview for each school individually, although some staff work across both schools.</p> <p>Q(DPY): Behaviour and Communication show a higher level of disagreement: what can be done to address this? The narrative at the end does highlight particular concerns which might help focus an action plan.</p> <p>A: Initial thoughts from the SLT would be to consider the following: a Governor Monitoring Morning which will enable Governors and Senior Leaders to view the schools in operation and to speak to pupils and staff; Parent Focus Group discussion on behaviour; Review of Behaviour Policy (Easter INSET); Further analysis of responses to draw, if possible, distinction between the two schools; Opportunities to feedback the survey results to staff and discuss strengths and areas of development: specific focus on behaviour and communication; all support staff will have received a 1:1 Appraisal Meeting with one of the SLT before the end of the half term.</p> <p>Q(DPY): The questions relating to the governing board ask more or less the same question. The responses indicate that 4 - 6 staff feel that we are not a supportive presence in the school. How can we work together to resolve this perception?</p> <p>A: Potentially a question for the FGB to discuss.</p> <p>Q(DPY): One staff member feels that the children are not safe, is there any indication of which school? How do we resolve this?</p> <p>A: I can find the answer to this. I agree it is concerning that a staff member states that they feel this way and yet has not raised this with SLT. I feel that all issues that have been raised to me have been followed up.</p> <p>Q(DPY): Is there anything more that can be done to improve work / life balance mindful of the budgetary constraints and recent Covid outbreak?</p> <p>A: Potentially a conversation for Staff Meetings when the results are fed back.</p> <p>It was agreed that governors would attend the school to monitor behaviour and that the results of the survey should be used to further identify the main concerns with behaviour. The Executive Headteacher advised that a survey focused staff meeting would be held to discuss the results further and unpick the general messages. Support staff appraisal meetings would also be used to gather additional information. It was agreed by governors that the staff survey needed to be held at least annually to provide</p> |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|

|    |   |  |  |
|----|---|--|--|
|    | <p>comparative data and evidence of improvements.</p> <p>The Assistant Headteacher advised that governors could increase visibility and involvement through regular links with teaching staff as well as attendance at parent evenings and interacting with staff. Governors discussed ways of being visible and supportive. Attendance at staff meetings, Collective Worship and during break times were also suggested.</p> <p>The Executive Headteacher advised that the Early Reading review had taken place and all aspects of children’s work had been scrutinised. The report was yet to be received; however, the verbal feedback had been very positive. It was agreed that the Phonics leads would attend the next FGB meeting to provide an overview of Little Wandle and the results of the review. Governors agreed that it was positive to receive external validation that the phonics curriculum was having an impact.</p> <p>Governors were advised that the Federation had introduced Times Tables Rock Stars which children were engaging well with.</p> <p>The Executive Headteacher advised that he had attended a meeting with Educate Norfolk and discussed the NEU strike action on 1 February 2023. Governors noted that although the Executive Headteacher could ask staff if they were likely to strike, they were not obliged to answer this. DfE guidance stated that schools should prioritise who they should stay open for, however, this would create a lot of additional work and risk assessments would be required before a decision was made on whether it would be safe to keep the schools open. It was agreed that parents should be given the earliest possible notice of any closure and that a decision should be made on 25 January 2023.</p> <p>Q(WD): Were the repairs to the boiler at Preston of significant concern that there would be any issues through repairs by the caretaker?</p> <p>A: No. We are likely to need to pay for the repairs to be done.</p> <p>Q(WD): Had the prejudice related incidents been resolved?</p> <p>A: This was incorrect information and had been discussed at the last meeting.</p> <p>Q (AF): Will we keep the PAN at Saxlingham at 10?</p> <p>A: Yes. We are conscious that we have always attracted children from outside the village and will continue to strive to do that.</p> |  |  |
| 8. | <p><b>Safeguarding report:</b></p> <p>The governing board reviewed the safeguarding report section of the Executive Headteacher report. A copy had been circulated prior to the meeting and can be found filed with these minutes.</p> <p>There were no questions.</p>  |  |  |

|            |  |  |  |
|------------|--|--|--|
| <p>9.</p>  | <p><b>Finance reports:</b></p> <p><b><i>Current Budget Control report</i></b></p> <p>The governing board reviewed the latest BCR. A copy had been circulated prior to the meeting and can be found filed with these minutes.</p> <p>It was noted that expenditure was in line with the target spend to date.</p> <p><b>Q(WD): Was there any plan for the use of the Energy Efficiency Grant?</b></p> <p><b>A: This would be investigated.</b></p>  |  |  |
| <p>10.</p> | <p><b>Autumn terms assessment and progress data:</b></p> <p>The governing board reviewed the autumn term data reports. Copies had been circulated prior to the meeting and can be found filed with these minutes.</p> <p>The Executive Headteacher advised that the assessments had been undertaken in the latter part of the autumn term. These were based on the NFER (National Federation for Educational Research) tests. Year 1 and 2 assessments were judged against current standards. In Reception the teaching staff looked at the work of the children and made judgements on attainment based on the information available. All data was being input onto Pupil Asset which made it easier to track progress and attainment of pupils.</p> <p>Governors were advised that the majority of children in all year groups were making good progress.</p> <p>The Executive Headteacher advised that the Little Wandle scheme was enabling the schools to put into place targeted interventions for Key Stage 1 children. Children were tracked regularly, and assessments took place every 6 weeks to identify progress. It was noted that there were two year groups of concern at Saxlingham: Year 2 and Year 5. However, these were a low performing cohort and there were signs of improvement in maths and also in reading and writing. Little Wandle interventions were in place to focus on those children in Year 2 who had struggled with the phonics tests. There was a mixed group in Year 5 with some working below key stage and others at Greater Depth (GD). The school had looked at the children on the cusp and interventions were in place to support those children. School-led tutoring was also being implemented.</p> <p>Governors were advised that Pupil Progress meetings were being undertaken with class teachers to ensure that there were individual learning plans (ILP) in place.</p> <p>It was noted that Year 1 and Year 4 at Preston had a high level of SEND. Those children in Year 1 had a low level of GLD (Good Level of Development) when they were in Reception Year. Teaching staff were optimistic that 4 out of the 5 children in Reception at Saxlingham would achieve GLD. 70% of children at Preston were heading for GLD.</p> |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  | <p>Q(DPY): Are you confident in the assessments - do all teachers understand what expected standard looks like?</p> <p>A: Yes. Where anomalies have been spotted, these have been raised with teachers in Pupil Progress meetings. Pupil Progress meetings are taking place with all teachers to discuss pupil attainment and progress. A number of staff are engaging with external moderation to validate their judgements. Writing is also moderated internally.</p> <p>Q(DPY): Are you using question level analysis to identify gaps that need to be filled and/or interventions that need to be put in place.</p> <p>A: Across Reception, KS1 and in Y3, we are using Little Wandle to support our planning of interventions. To some extent, QLA would be useful, however, many of the children who are behind are struggling in all areas.</p> <p>Q(DPY): Is the assessment a point in time or against end of year predictions.</p> <p>A: Point in time</p> <p>Q(DPY): How can we identify that the Pupil Premium gap is being closed? Pupil Premium data is for all Pupil Premium children whereas the whole school data is broken down in year groups or am I misreading this?</p> <p>A: That is how the data has currently been presented.</p> <p><b>Preston Primary Data:</b></p> <p>Q(DPY): Is there any expectation that Pupil Premium children will reach GD in Maths.</p> <p>A: 2 children are likely to achieve this.</p> <p>Q(DPY): What is being done to bring 'below expected' up to expected standard? Are any of these children on the cusp?</p> <p>A: A number of different interventions have been planned in different year groups. Little Wandle provides specific phonic interventions for children in the bottom 20% of each year group. We are also using these materials to implement interventions for those children in Y3 who are falling behind. We have started the process of applying to use the school-led tuition through the NTP to target individuals and groups of children.</p> <p>Q(DPY): The 'better than expected' is excellent news are they the same children achieving in reading and writing?</p> <p>A: Sometimes yes but not always</p> |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|

Q(DPY):Yr3 has children working below 'expected' standard is this anything to do with Covid and how do we bring these up to 'working towards and expected"? Are any of these children working below key stage?

A: This year group was heavily affected by COVID, although we must be cautious about using this as an explanation, as all schools could claim likewise. At the point of the KS1 assessment, 3 were PKS in Reading; 3 were PKS in writing (one of the children is a different child to the Reading); 1 child was PKS in maths.

Q(DPY):Yr4 has 5 children working below 'expected standard' are these the 5 SEND children? Is there any expectation that they can improve to 'working towards'?

A: There are 3 pupils with EHCP in this year group.

**Saxlingham Primary Data:**

Q(DPY):In Yr6 there are a high number of 'working towards' are they on the cusp? Is there any expectation of GD in Maths and writing?

A: 2 pupils in Y6 have EHCP. A number of children are on cusp and are being targeted for intervention. 4 pupils are on track for GDS in Reading, Writing and Maths

Q(DPY):Yr5 show that maths is strong however reading and writing are much weaker what is in place to address this or are children on the cusp?

A: 3 children are on cusp (2 are SEND); 1 child EHCP; 1 child Persistently Absent (PA).

Q(DPY):Yr4 reading shows 67% at GD which is excellent is there any expectation of GD in writing? Are the teachers in Yr4 confident in their writing assessment as there is no correlation between reading and writing?

A: 4 children are high expected in writing. Teachers are confident in their judgements.

The Assistant Headteacher advised that she had been cautious with the Year 6 assessments following the use of NFER tests. This was a much more educationally diverse year group than the previous Year 6.

Q (AF): Were there any surprises for the staff in the data?

A: Staff know their children very well and are very honest about the data.

Governors commended the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) and staff for the provision of the data.

|                   |   |            |                |
|-------------------|---|------------|----------------|
| <p><b>11.</b></p> | <p><b>Published Admission Number (PAN):</b></p> <p>The governing board noted the MI sheet and letters from the LA and Diocese regarding the suggested reduction in PAN for both schools. Copies had been circulated prior to the meeting and can be found filed with these minutes.</p> <p><b>Q(WD): What is the rationale for reducing the PAN so significantly?</b></p> <p><b>A:</b> There has been no indication that our buoyant intake is about to change. We have reported that we are happy to leave the PAN as it is. The LA responded by advising that admitting pupils out of catchment may impact on the viability of other schools.</p> <p>Governors agreed that the situation would continue to be monitored and that the PAN for both schools should remain as agreed at the previous FGB meeting.</p>  |            |                |
| <p><b>12.</b></p> | <p><b>Parent Focus Group feedback:</b></p> <p>The governing board reviewed the minutes from the parent focus group meeting. A copy had been circulated prior to the meeting and can be found filed with these minutes. It was noted that the focus of the meeting had been the Federation vision.</p> <p>The Chair of Governors advised that parents at the meeting had advised that they struggled to understand and articulate the John 10:10 vision. It was agreed that the ethos of the Federation was not the issue but there was a need to capture this within a biblical foundation that was easier to articulate.</p> <p>After discussion and debate, the governing board agreed that there was a need to revisit the vision and biblical foundation involving all stakeholders within the process. Development of a Federation logo was also discussed.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Federation vision should remain as a regular FGB agenda item.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Governance Professional to add Federation Vision as a regular agenda item.</b></p> | <p>CPY</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> |
| <p><b>13.</b></p> | <p><b>Governor CPD:</b></p> <p>CC advised that she had undertaken training in General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR).</p>   |            |                |
| <p><b>14.</b></p> | <p><b>Governor monitoring:</b></p> <p><b>RE</b></p> <p>The governing board reviewed the RE monitoring report submitted by the link governor. A copy had been circulated prior to the meeting and can be found filed with these minutes.</p>   |            |                |



|     |   |  |  |
|-----|---|--|--|
|     | <p>There were no questions.</p> <p><b>SEND</b><br/>The governing board reviewed the SEND monitoring report submitted by the link governor. A copy had been circulated prior to the meeting and can be found filed with these minutes.</p> <p>There were no questions.</p> <p><b>Pupil Premium</b><br/>The Chair of Governors advised that she had met with the Executive Headteacher to discuss Pupil Premium, and a further monitoring meeting would be held following the production of the autumn term data.</p>   |  |  |
| 15. | <p><b>Governing board correspondence:</b></p> <p>The Chair of Governors advised that a letter had been received from the NEU regarding the industrial action.</p>   |  |  |
| 16. | <p><b>Policy review:</b></p> <p>The following policies were reviewed and approved:</p> <p><b>a) Anti-bullying Policy</b><br/>There were no changes.</p> <p><b>b) Attendance Policy</b><br/>There were no changes.</p> <p><b>c) Capability Procedure – Teaching Staff</b><br/>There were no changes.</p> <p><b>d) Capability Procedure – Support Staff</b><br/>There were no changes.</p> <p><b>e) Drug Education Policy</b><br/>There were no changes.</p> <p><b>f) Safeguarding Policy</b><br/>The Executive Headteacher advised that there had been only minor changes to include name changes, particularly the Safeguarding Policy.</p> <p>The above policies were proposed for adoption.<br/><b>Proposed: CS    Seconded: CC</b><br/><b>All voted in favour with no abstentions.</b></p> |  |  |
| 17. | <p><b>Any other business:</b></p> <p>There was no other business.</p>   |  |  |

|            |  |  |  |
|------------|--|--|--|
| <b>18.</b> | <b>Items deemed confidential:</b><br><br>There were no items discussed that were deemed as confidential.   |  |  |
| <b>19.</b> | <b>Reflection: how have discussions today helped the children and school:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reviewed the current progress and attainment of all children.</li> <li>• Seen the interventions put into place to ensure that children are making good progress.</li> <li>• Looked at reviewing the visions and values of the school.</li> <li>• Analysed staff survey results to identify areas for improvement and areas that were positive.</li> <li>• Discussed ways that governors can support staff.</li> </ul> |  |  |
| <b>20.</b> | <b>Date of next meeting:</b><br><br>20 March 2023 at 6.30pm.   |  |  |

Meeting closed at 8.14pm

**Actions:**

| <b>Item No.</b> | <b>Action Description</b>                           | <b>Owner</b> | <b>Target Date</b> |
|-----------------|---|--------------|--------------------|
| 4               | Monitor the Single Central Record.                  | LA, DPY      | 31/01/23           |
| 4               | Upload EYFS monitoring report to GovernorHub.       | LA           | 31/01/22           |
| 4               | Arrange a working party to discuss a parent survey. | MW, DPY      | 13/03/23           |
| 4               | Add Finance Policy review to the next FGB agenda.   | CPY          | 13/03/23           |
| 12              | Add Federation Vision as a regular agenda item.     | CPY          | 13/02/23           |