

**Emersons Green Primary School**  
**Meeting of the Full Governing Body**



**Tuesday 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2022 at 6:00pm**

Ref	Item	Comment/Action						
	<p><b><u>Present</u></b> Neil Smith (NS) Co-Chair, Jo Bishop (JB), Vice-Chair, Simon Botten (SB) Executive Head, Soraya Young (SY) Headteacher, Laura Morson (LM), Rachael Richards (RR), Neil McLaren (NM), Mark Broadbent (MB), Lucy Parker (LP), Matt Chubb (MC), Gemma Leach (GL), Caroline Mountford (CM) and Gemma Goodman (GG – Clerk)</p>							
1	<p><b><u>Welcome and Apologies</u></b></p> <p><u>Welcome</u></p> <p>Neil Smith (NS) as chair welcomed everyone. Gemma Leach (GL) – English lead/reception teacher attending to go through Phonics Impact Report and Caroline Mountford (CM) – Math’s lead/year 6 teacher to go through Math’s Impact Report.</p> <p><u>Apologies</u></p> <p>James Dowling (Co-Chair)</p> <p><b><i>Apologies accepted</i></b></p> <p><u>Declaration of Pecuniary Interests</u></p> <p>RR (parent/staff) NM (parent) MC (parent) SY (staff) LM (staff) SB (staff)</p> <p><u>Minutes of Previous Meeting</u></p> <p>Held on 27<sup>th</sup> September 2022.</p> <p>No comments. RR proposes acceptance. JB, seconds this. Minutes agreed.</p> <p>NM on the minutes the behavior policy is agreed but not severely agreed.</p> <p><u>Review Action Log/Outstanding Actions/Matters Arising</u></p> <table><tr><th>Who</th><th>Action</th></tr><tr><td>NM</td><td>To Carry out English deep dive JD has been in contact with GL to arrange dates and these have been booked in.</td></tr><tr><td>All</td><td>To read &amp; acknowledge training undertaken by staff GG has created a new training document and this has been updated to reflect all training actioned. This has been uploaded to Google Drive. Members to update GG as and when training has been actioned.</td></tr></table>	Who	Action	NM	To Carry out English deep dive JD has been in contact with GL to arrange dates and these have been booked in.	All	To read & acknowledge training undertaken by staff GG has created a new training document and this has been updated to reflect all training actioned. This has been uploaded to Google Drive. Members to update GG as and when training has been actioned.	
Who	Action							
NM	To Carry out English deep dive JD has been in contact with GL to arrange dates and these have been booked in.							
All	To read & acknowledge training undertaken by staff GG has created a new training document and this has been updated to reflect all training actioned. This has been uploaded to Google Drive. Members to update GG as and when training has been actioned.							

	<table><tr><td>JB</td><td>Governor Roles &amp; Responsibilities <i>This has been actioned.</i></td></tr><tr><td>All</td><td>Governors to sign to say they have received the safeguarding training on 17<sup>th</sup> October and confirm with JB. <i>NS and JB have carried out theirs but anyone who hasn't needs to. Leave action open until next meeting and Gemma to indicate anyone who hasn't actioned this.</i></td></tr><tr><td>SY</td><td>Meeting room on 18<sup>th</sup> October <i>SY this has been actioned.</i></td></tr><tr><td>SY</td><td>Set up LA review meeting with Geraldine <i>This has been actioned.</i></td></tr><tr><td>NS</td><td>Moving January's FGB Meeting to tie in with decision timescale for Leaf Trust proposal <i>We will cover this in the Chair's report.</i></td></tr></table>	JB	Governor Roles & Responsibilities <i>This has been actioned.</i>	All	Governors to sign to say they have received the safeguarding training on 17 <sup>th</sup> October and confirm with JB. <i>NS and JB have carried out theirs but anyone who hasn't needs to. Leave action open until next meeting and Gemma to indicate anyone who hasn't actioned this.</i>	SY	Meeting room on 18 <sup>th</sup> October <i>SY this has been actioned.</i>	SY	Set up LA review meeting with Geraldine <i>This has been actioned.</i>	NS	Moving January's FGB Meeting to tie in with decision timescale for Leaf Trust proposal <i>We will cover this in the Chair's report.</i>	
JB	Governor Roles & Responsibilities <i>This has been actioned.</i>											
All	Governors to sign to say they have received the safeguarding training on 17 <sup>th</sup> October and confirm with JB. <i>NS and JB have carried out theirs but anyone who hasn't needs to. Leave action open until next meeting and Gemma to indicate anyone who hasn't actioned this.</i>											
SY	Meeting room on 18 <sup>th</sup> October <i>SY this has been actioned.</i>											
SY	Set up LA review meeting with Geraldine <i>This has been actioned.</i>											
NS	Moving January's FGB Meeting to tie in with decision timescale for Leaf Trust proposal <i>We will cover this in the Chair's report.</i>											
	<p><b><u>Requests for AOB items</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Email re LA review. This is to be picked up with SB after budget item.</li><li>• JB: Website update.</li><li>• RR: Terms of Reference to be formally agreed.</li></ul>											
	<p><b><u>Impact Report</u></b></p> <p><b><u>ENGLISH:</u></b></p> <p>GL went through the Governor Impact Report but to summarise below:</p> <p>English no. 1 priority - phonics. Using a DFE approved phonic scheme, which was purchased last year is being rolled out this year. The first couple of terms we have focused on training and coaching staff and fidelity across the whole school.</p> <p>Alongside reception and year 1 workshops we have reading rangers. 5 parent volunteers work with children who are reading below level. The aim is for them to catch up with peers ASAP. Phonic drop ins are being held where we are working together to promote togetherness and phonics are not being forced upon them.</p> <p>Data: Children are assessed week 5 of every term and this is where we are able to pick up children who are having issues.</p> <p>EYFS: 1<sup>st</sup> half term 73% of children on track. Half the class are blending sounds into words which is much quicker than what the scheme promotes.</p> <p>Year 1: 63% on track. Further review weeks for these sounds are planned in and interventions are currently focusing on children who need support with Phase 3 sounds.</p> <p>The scheme has been rolled out to year 2. Figures were lower than expected last term. This term ¾ have moved on to the next book level. There were 7 children who didn't pass last term, 4 have now passed this term.</p> <p>Moving forward: monitoring and interventions. Team will have teaching dialogue.</p> <p>The school is secure in phonics and the LA Review (29/9/22) commented positively on our use of new phonic scheme. They noted fidelity to the scheme in lessons observed, some responsive teaching, and good use of additional adults and saw the impact of purchase and organisation of new decodable books.</p> <p>NM asked what GPC stands for? GL 'Grapheme-Phoneme Correspondence'.</p>											

	<p><b><u>MATH'S:</u></b></p> <p>CM went through the Governor Impact Report but to summarise below: Math's no. 2 priority (math's fluency).</p> <p>Arithmetic's weren't as high as they should be and we need to develop arithmetic skills.</p> <p>Two things to focus on: TTRS and Numbots. Action plan:</p> <p>1<sup>st</sup> we wanted to ensure every child has log in to TTRS/Numbots. There were log in blips but we are now sure that all children are able to log in.</p> <p>Set number of minutes per night per week for the children to 'play'. We are still at early stages but the children are improving their log in figures. Year 5-6 70-80% are logging in. Younger years is lower at 40-50%.</p> <p>We would like to set target of 90% logging on and we have a long way off of that, so the aim is to make progress as not a single class is at 90%.</p> <p>Our biggest battle is engaging parents and children. SY, weekly reminders are in newsletter to remind parents of the importance of their children logging on as well as fact sheets and parents guides created and put on website.</p> <p>CM, some children are not logging at all. We are not sure why but need to figure this out so we can tackle this issue. We have gone down the incentive route such as certificates, setting battles against the houses, which is starting next week. Teachers have been asked to prompt, congratulate those that are taking part/not taking part in TTRS/Numbots.</p> <p>NM, is there a link in attendance? CM, not that we can see.</p> <p>Timetables year 4: we have asked for volunteers (begged for help) and one grandparent has volunteered to help the class with timetables. This is the beginning of a journey with a long way to go.</p> <p>Fluency: Boolean Math's Hub met with SY and CM to discuss how fluency could improve? The scheme does work, the structure works and the booklets work. Are we missing opportunities? In terms 3 &amp; 4 we will look into exactly what we should be doing and fixing problems there and then.</p> <p>Question remains on how to engage/improve opportunities in school for those not doing their sessions. JB, is the IT issues that the school has causing difficulties? SY has an exciting update on this to follow later.</p>	
2	<p><b><u>Budget/Finances/Resources</u></b></p> <p>RR, on whole we are doing really well. We are not overspending but supply and overtime seems to catch us out and has gone up. This month support staff cost us £38,000. Teachers pay rises cost us £18,000.</p> <p>End of this year we will make a surplus of £5,000 (this includes all pay raises). This brings. Debt now down to £35,000 and if we didn't have support staff costs/pay rises, we would be out of debt.</p> <p>LA made an error where we were £60,000 worse off (the income provided to the RB by the LA not matching the provision which the school was expected to put in place) but now this has been sorted we are in a better situation. MB, the budget has been a problem since he started as Governor, which hasn't been our fault due to the LA's error, we are now in a much better position which is something to be very proud of.</p> <p>NM, does the budget allow for laptops and building needs? SB, yes and Wi-Fi is being done on Friday. LA have sorted windows and agreed to roof. SB, we are</p>	<p><b>All approved purchasing</b></p>

<p>proposing spreading the cost of the computers with the LA under a lease agreement, this includes 15 new laptops for the children and all staff to have new laptops, which will bring us up to minimum standard. Are all in agreement with this proposal – all approved.</p> <p>Wi-Fi will come out of next year's budget. All of which will be in place before Christmas.</p> <p><b><u>LA Resource Base report and initial summary report</u></b></p> <p>SB went through the report:</p> <p><b>Background:</b></p> <p>Emersons Green Primary school has a 10 place LA-commissioned Resource Base (RB) for children with Visual Impairment and Physical Disability. This has been a long-standing feature of the school and was part of the initial design when the school was built in 2000.</p> <p>For the past 5 years the school has run a deficit budget of between £40,000 and £70,000. This overspend is the result of the income provided to the RB by the LA not matching the provision which the school was expected to put in place.</p> <p>As a result, the shortfall had to be covered by the main school budget, resulting in resourcing, staffing and building maintenance cuts which are unsustainable. There are now £100,000 worth of urgent building repairs needed, including several serious leaks in the roof and 14 windows which could not be locked – resulting in a recent break-in. The school has only 7 working computers for children and staff are forced to use the free (very low spec) DfE provided Covid laptops as the school cannot afford to pay for staff PCs. The funding situation is now seriously impacting on the school's ability to provide a good standard of education.</p> <p>The school can clearly show that it was unable to meet the needs of the children in the RB using the historic funding model without drawing on the main school budget. However, the LA have recently created a new banding (finance) model and has begun applying this to schools. This will cut the RB funding by 30% over three year (starting this academic year). This will cause a funding crisis within the school which will lead to a rapidly increasing deficit budget, worsening an already untenable situation.</p> <p>The LA written Service Level Agreement provided is vague and was never completed by LA Officers (it still reads as 'Draft' and refers to a different RB at a different school in places). The LA had to ask the school for a copy as they didn't hold a copy centrally.</p> <p>The LA tried to close the Emersons Green Resource Base in 2018, but reversed its decision when faced with public opposition from local parent's groups.</p> <p><b>Actions already taken</b></p> <p>The school was forced to lose two RB teachers in July as their costs could not be carried by the main school budget.</p> <p>The school requested that the LA complete a full review of the Resource Base in October 2022 to ascertain whether the school was correct in its assertion that funding was too low. The report (Appendix A) claims that the overspend is the result of the school being overly generous with support for children. This is disputed by the school which has followed LA guidance throughout.</p> <p><b>What the school is requesting from the LA.</b></p> <p>1. The new banding arrangements being halted until an impact assessment has been carried out on all Resource Bases in S Glos.</p>	<p><b>computers through LA lease agreement</b></p>
---	--

	<p>2. The historic deficit being wiped by the LA in acknowledgement that this purely the result of LA under-funding (the school is currently responsible for repaying the overspend).</p> <p>3. A new funding arrangement agreed which allows the school to operate the Resource Base without it being subsidised by the main school budget.</p> <p><b>Specific points in relation to the LA report:</b></p> <p><b>Point 1: The LA acknowledges that the RB is unable to deliver the provision which it commissions but makes no recommendations as to how this can be achieved.</b></p> <p>The LA report states <i>"The current resource base staffing, structure, application and delivery of funding and provision is not able to deliver an effective offer"</i>. In a meeting on 26<sup>th</sup> October Hilary Smith (S Glos Head of Service) stated that she believed that the school should be able to provide the service for the funding provided. When asked for a funded provision model to justify this statement she conceded that she didn't have one.</p> <p>The report is contradictory. It suggests that the RB should be able to meet the Service Level Agreement with the existing (and future reduced funding) but also concedes that it is not able to do so at present and needs to increase staffing to achieve this.</p> <p><b>Point 2: The LA suggests that the school has more money for the Resource Base than the school accounts show.</b></p> <p>The LA asserts that the school has been provided with approximately £326,000 of funding for the Academic year 2022-23. The school's initial April budget showed that the total income for the financial year would be £300,267 and that the total expenditure would be £338,986. The school is currently awaiting updated figures from the revised mid-year budget, but the LA has conceded that it may have 'lost' £60,000 of funding which should have been allocated to the Resource Base in April 2022.</p> <p><b>Point 3: The funding provided for each child in the Resource Base is less than the basic cost of providing them with the support required.</b></p> <p>Appendix B (EG Figures – RB staff vs Income) shows that the RB will cost £42,218 more to run than the LA funding provides. The LA accepts in the report that the Hay 8 TA pay grade is correct for the complexity of the work, yet does not provide funding that matches this grade.</p> <p><b>Point 4: The LA reports states that the school is providing too many hours of support to the children within the Resource Base.</b></p> <p>The report states that: <i>'Even allowing for planning, transfer and meeting times this far exceeds what is necessary or required for every child, especially those on bands 3 and below.'</i> This refers to 1:1 provisions for children with complex needs throughout the school day (including lunchtimes), and specialist teaching.</p> <p>The previous banding document which was in place 2017 - July 2022 (Appendix 3) made statements such as <i>'...children should have 100% support for the week, alongside specialist teacher input of up to 3.5 hrs per week'</i>. When the school raised this as the reason for support being provided at this historic level, the LA replied that the 2017-2022 banding document was 'advisory' and therefore not the basis of organising support. However, at previous reviews of the Resource Base, the banding document was used by the LA to assess provision and to dispute resource provision when it indicated that the school should provide a specific item. It therefore appears that the LA's historic use of this document has been selective.</p>	
--	---	--

<p>Section F of the children's EHCPs are generally poorly written providing only a vague statements for children's provision and are therefore in breach of statutory guidance as a legal document. It was common practice across the LA for LA SEND Officers and SENDCOs to historically refer to the 2017-22 Banding document. The school should therefore not be financially disadvantaged because of this.</p> <p><b>Point 5: The LA suggests that higher banded children should attend the Resource Base but they alone decide which children are offered places.</b></p> <p>The LA correctly attributes children with low banding being offered places at RB as one reason for the funding model not working. However, the LA alone determines which children are allocated to their Resource Bases, frequently ignoring their own SLA (where one is in place) despite objections from the individual Resource Bases.</p> <p><b>Point 5: The LA report makes no recommendations as to how the RB could have functioned within the historic funding model.</b></p> <p>The report does not suggest how the Resource Base could have operated within the 2017-22 funding model. It ignores the pressures that this has historically put on the school budget despite the school requesting that the report addresses this point.</p> <p><b>Point 6: The LA have not completed an impact assessment on the new banding model and its impact on Resource Bases.</b></p> <p>The LA conceded that they had not completed an impact assessment on Special Schools and halted the banding funding changes once the Special Schools complained (see Appendix D page 8 onwards of Schools Forum Agenda and Papers 3 November 2022). However, despite complaints from Resource Bases, the funding changes for RBs have gone ahead. This means that a Band 5 child at a Resource Base receives £13,967 whilst a Band 5 child at a Special School will receive £19,197 despite having needs which are the same.</p> <p>As the Emersons Green Resource Base is unable to operate with the historic funding model, it is impossible to see how it will be able to operate with a further 30% cut to funding.</p> <p>The LA's only recommendation in this regard is '<i>Remapping the provision for individuals to match it to the needs and allocated funding for pupils</i>'. This appears to suggest the Section F should be written around the funding available, not the child's needs.</p> <p>Furthermore, the LA Finance Officer told the school at the revised budget setting meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> November the a 3-year projection of the impact of the cuts on schools with Resource Bases had been created but he had been instructed not to share these with the schools.</p> <p>Finally, it has come to light that one Resource Base (Lyde Green) has secured partial protection for its funding despite providing the same service as Resource Bases such as Blackhorse Primary, which did not have their funding protected in the same way. This suggests that the LA is not behaving in a fair or transparent manner.</p> <p>SB, we have appointed Gary Freedman to look at what the LA provision and what we have to provide children by law.</p> <p>Section F's are non-compliant in law and doesn't reflect what the children require. LA think the school is overproviding. Section F states the LA have to rewrite to say what they want and legally the LA cant set funding before provision.</p> <p>Stone King solicitors are the next stage and the £750 cost is being covered by Blackhorse. This is for the Letter Before Action, stating the things the LA are doing which aren't legal and threatening to report to DFE for breaching statutory duty.</p>	
--	--

	<p>We have the option to let the parents know what is happening and they can take the LA to LA tribunal which will be expensive for the LA.</p> <p>SB has spoken to all resource basis. We are still trying to track down £40,000 which they say we have but no one is able to tell SB where this is or where it came from.</p> <p>Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-</li> <li>- 1<sup>st</sup> Letter Before Action</li> <li>- 2<sup>nd</sup> inform parents what is going on, where there is a possibility of 200 tribunals</li> <li>- 3<sup>rd</sup> Report to DFE</li> </ul> <p>SB asked the Governors if they are happy for him to pursue this with the LA – all in agreement.</p> <p>NM, does the school have a figure in mind what they would like to receive from the LA? SB, £40,000 minimum and to stop banding for now.</p> <p>MB, can we ask the LA to clarify what they want and also confirm what we actually agree on, then go down this route? NS, the letter before action would do that and will set out all the information. NS proposes that we give thought that the letter covers this but that SB moves forward with the LA. All of the Governors in agreement.</p>	<p><b>ACTION: SB to move forward with LA.</b></p>
3	<p><b><u>GDPR</u></b></p> <p>No update.</p>	
4	<p><b><u>Safeguarding update</u></b></p> <p>JB: SY and SB put this together. JB nothing to put forward, report seems comprehensive, no safeguarding issues. JB to do report and action plan.</p> <p>We have LA in last week to see if we were overspending on the budget and to see if there was a way for us to spend less. The LA confirmed there isn't a way that we can spend less and in fact they don't think we as a school are spending enough. SB's ambition to get £40k back from the Government.</p> <p>JD thanked SB for getting the report done.</p> <p>Revised budget next month.</p> <p>SB, we will need a strategy in place and if the LA ignores our request, we will need to make the parents aware.</p>	<p><b>ACTION: JB to do safeguarding report and action plan</b></p>
5	<p><b><u>Heads Report/Update</u></b></p> <p>SB does anyone have any highlights or questions?</p> <p>NM sent through various questions before the meeting which have been answered. NM is content with the responses. Q &amp; A are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Following an assessment in the SEND provision for the reception class - how has the budget been affected? "There is a high level of need in the reception class – 2 pre verbal pupils, 1 pupil with selective mutism, 1 pupil with complex medical needs as well as PD needs"</li> </ul>	

	<p><i>There is no impact of these children as their needs are being managed within the EYFS team. However, children with EHCPs in EYFS do not have protected funding (unlike children in other years).</i></p> <p><i>I will report on the budget at the meeting as there are a number of issues arising from the Revised Budget last week which need to be discussed.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The impact on the children quantifies the level which children are working (e.g. 73% went up a reading class) what was the target impact</li> </ul> <p><i>"Y2: 73% of children have moved to the next phonic level / book band level as their knowledge of GPCs and their fluency has improved."</i></p> <p><i>This gives an indication of the amount of progress children have made in early ready (phonics) by the end of T1 in Y2. This suggests a good level of improvement considering weak Phonics scores at the end of Y1 last year in terms of progress. However, it also suggests that children are still working behind the level which should be expected for the start of Y2 when compared to children nationally. The children, as a cohort, are a term behind where we would expect. The children will be reassessed before FGB so Soraya will provide an update at the meeting.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the targets for next term in terms of the priorities.</li> </ul> <p><i>These are listed as milestones on the SDP (End of T4) both as implementation actions (what we expect teachers to be doing) and Impact outcomes (how we expect learning to improve as a result).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IT equipment was identified as being required - have we got any further forward</li> </ul> <p><i>Subject to governor approval, new Wi-Fi will be installed on 25<sup>th</sup> November. New teacher and admin laptops will be delivered before Christmas. 15 new pupil laptops will also be delivered before Christmas. I will explain at the meeting how this has been financed within the current budget.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LA review - have we had a report on this.</li> </ul> <p><i>Apologies – I have sent this to Gemma for circulation, along with my summary response. I have asked for this to be a separate agenda item.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is there plans to get more teachers on the NPQ's</li> </ul> <p><i>Not this year, there isn't capacity for more staff to do this in the current academic year.</i></p> <p>SB, key strengths – children know a lot about computers even though we don't have many/high quality computers.</p> <p>SY and SB think the school could do better than what they currently are. At the moment the school is performing "fine" but not setting the world on fire. The results the school are getting aren't what they think the school should be getting and SY and SB will be carrying out work on this.</p> <p>JB asked as Governors what we could be doing to help facilitate this. SB, Governors should expect more and challenge more. Level of ambition of the school needs to be higher.</p> <p>NM, is the attendance challenge working? SY, yes the text to parents seems to be working and when they receive this the school receives a flurry of calls, which has</p>	
--	--	--



	made an improvement. Letters are being sent out for those children where there isn't an improvement to meet with SY.	
6	<b><u>LA Resource Base report and initial summary report</u></b>  This has been covered above.	
7	<b><u>Policies to be agreed as per schedule</u></b>  Review and approve Pay Policy: Committee are content and this has been accepted.  GDPR has been adapted to reflect EGPS. An email has been sent, around 25% tweaked. All approved.  Charging and remissions: Approved Premises Management Docs: Approved	
8	<b><u>Pay Committee Update ref pay awards</u></b>  NS updated. The committee held a meeting last Monday. One teacher is moving up UPS grade. Recommended by SY and approved/supported by the Pay Committee panel.	
9	<b><u>LED Proposal</u></b>  RR there are issues with the lighting at the school and it is expensive to replace the bulbs. Not all of the lights work in the school hall. RR has looked into an LED grant but this has closed.  RR has found a company who provides grants. If we do nothing with the lighting and keep the bulbs that we have, based on our usage our electricity bill will be £17,000. If we do something i.e. replace the current bulbs with LED ones we will pay £6,000 for electricity and £7,000 to the company, saving us £4,000. This is a lease agreement over 7 years and this includes a maintenance agreement. RR has asked the LA if this is a legit scheme who have confirmed it is. They are covered by DFE Framework and RR is waiting for that report.  RR requires Governors approval. JB has read through the proposal and it all makes sense and can't see a reason why this shouldn't go ahead.  NM, what happens if the company say we are going to save but we don't, in that will they drop their fee/give balance back due to miss selling product? RR, this is a question that I will need to go to them with. RR did say that the company did confirm that if the price of electricity was to go down.	<b>ACTION: RR to speak to LED lease company re miss selling product and money back</b>
10	<b><u>Agree plan for Staff Survey ref Wellbeing &amp; Workload to inform SDP</u></b>  We have a lot of questions we need to review re staff survey. RR we haven't followed up on the past two surveys and nothing has come of them.  It is because of this that we are reviewing the survey. Staff have found the questions very corporate. SY to email LP with dates for her to meet with staff re wellbeing.	<b>ACTION: SY to email LP with dates for her to meet with staff re wellbeing.</b>
11	<b><u>Safeguarding Audit &amp; Action Plan</u></b>  This has been covered above.	
12	<b><u>H&amp;S Update</u></b>  H&S has been covered through the budget and work being carried out.	

	RR, H&S Governor needs to carry out H&S audit/walk around ASAP as per the RAP. As MB is away, NM has offered to come in on 7 <sup>th</sup> December to action the H&S audit/walk around. All agreed.	<b>ACTION: NM to come in on 7.12 to carry out H&amp;S audit.</b>
<b>13</b>	<p><b><u>Chairs Items/Report</u></b></p> <p>Please see confidential minutes re staff disciplinary.</p> <p>Moving January's FGB meeting to tie in with decision timescale for Leaf Trust proposal: The parent survey around LEAF proposal has been largely negative but hardly anyone responded, so this isn't accurate. JB as Governing body we will need to review what has been said. JB suggested an extraordinary meeting on Teams. 10th January 2023 at 6pm has been agreed. GG will confirm if she is able to make this due to her operation, if she isn't able to, this can be recorded through Teams and then typed up.</p>	<b>ACTION: Extraordinary LEAF meeting on 10.01.23. GG to let Governors know if she is unable to make this.</b>
<b>14</b>	<p><b><u>Confidential Items</u></b></p> <p>Confidential minutes re this agenda item have been actioned.</p>	
<b>15</b>	<p><b><u>Clerks Report</u></b></p> <p>GG has asked that the Governors keep her up to date with any training they have been on so that she can update the training schedule.</p>	
<b>16</b>	<p><b><u>AOB and Meeting Reflection</u></b></p> <p>JB has gone through the Governors section on the school website and has a list of what needs to be changed.</p> <p>FGB minutes are not on there. JB had a look at Blackhorse school's website and they have their minutes on there. SB, these do need to be uploaded, at least last years (just minutes). SB, the Headteachers report should also be on there.</p> <p>Confidential items from this meeting need to go on a separate paper. GG to action.</p> <p>MC to look through all of last year's minutes. JB has these and will send this to MC. MC to make sure all confidential information is redacted before sending SY who will send to Claire to upload on the website. MC has said he will action this by the end of next week. SY to send GG Claire's email address so that going forward, when minutes have been agreed, she can send these direct to Claire to upload.</p> <p>Terms of Reference. RR has run this past internal audit and they are happy. As they have been updated, JB to progress with this.</p>	<p><b>ACTION: GG to add confidential items to separate paper.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: JB to progress with Terms of Reference.</b></p>
<b>17</b>	<p><b><u>Date and time of next meeting</u></b></p> <p>Tuesday 24<sup>th</sup> January 2023 – JD to chair.</p>	<b>JD to chair January's meeting.</b>

**Action Log:**

Who	Action	Update
GG	Governors to sign to say they have received the safeguarding training on 17 <sup>th</sup> October and confirm with JB. NS and JB have carried out theirs but anyone who hasn't needs to. Leave action open until next meeting and Gemma to indicate anyone who hasn't actioned this.	
SB	SB to move forward with LA.	
JB	JB to do safeguarding report and action plan.	
RR	RR to speak to LED lease company re miss selling product and money back.	
SY/LP	SY to email LP with dates for her to meet with staff re wellbeing.	
NM	NM to come in on 7.12 to carry out H&S audit.	
All	Extraordinary LEAF meeting on 10.01.23. GG to let Governors know if she is unable to make this.	
GG	GG to add confidential items to separate paper.	This has been actioned.
JB	JB to send last year's minutes to MC	
MC	MC to make sure all confidential information is redacted before sending SY	
SY	SY to send minutes to Claire to upload on website and send Claire's email address to GG.	
GG	When minutes have been agreed send to Claire to upload onto website.	Ongoing
JB	JB to progress with Terms of Reference.	

**Emersons Green Primary School  
Meeting of the Full Governing Body**



**Tuesday 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2022 at 6:00pm**

**CONFIDENTIAL AGENDA ITEMS**

<b>13</b>	<p><b><u>Chairs Report:</u></b></p> <p>NS updated that a member of staff had a disciplinary hearing. He won't go into detail but the outcome was that the member of staff was issued with a final warning. Since the hearing the member of staff has resigned.</p> <p>JB, does this create a vacancy? SY, yes and an advert has been written to go live on Thursday with interviewing to take place final week of the term. Preferable for them to start the 1<sup>st</sup> day back after Christmas but it will probably be mid-way through the term next year (depending on their notice period).</p> <p>JB does EGPS have staff in place to cover? SY, part time member of staff going full time to help. Cover has been sorted in different shapes, ways and forms.</p>	
<b>14</b>	<p><b><u>Confidential Items</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Mangotsfield Out of School Club</u></b></p> <p>SB updated that Will Roberts has been in touch as he is retiring, so the out of school club will be closing at the end of the academic year. Lyde Green and Mangotsfield have decided to take their Out of School Clubs in house and SB recommends that EGPS do the same (breakfast and afterschool). Bradley is keen to do holding provisions. Staff will be moved over to in house.</p> <p>SY will manage breakfast club if member of staff calls in sick but will normally be able to sort staff out with the supervisor as we tend to overstaff. SY we need something but just need to find a way that makes it worthwhile for us as a school. We don't need to make a decision now but this is to be added to the business plan for March.</p>	<p><b>ACTION: Out of School Club to be added to business plan in March.</b></p>