



Minutes of the Full Governing Body Meeting
Wednesday 1 November 2023 at 8.30 am via Zoom

Membership

Name	Initial	Term Expiry Date	Governor Category	
Leon Choueke	LC	N/A	Head Teacher, Ex-officio	
Debby Kuypers (Chair)	DK	09-11-2025	Co-opted Governors (10)	
Richard Holmes (Vice Chair)	RH	01-02-2026		
Eddie Webb	EWe	25-09-2026		
Elena Wolf	EWo	26-01-2024		
Jean-Michel Garcia-Alvarez	JGA	10-02-2025		
Becca Monahan	BM	17-11-2027		
Vacancy				
Vacancy				
Melian Mansfield	MM	19-01-2026		LA Governor (1)
Schirin Kishore*	SK	08-11-2026		Staff Governor (1)
Morinade Akinbobola	MA	05-11-2024	Parent Governor (3)	
Nomi Tysman	NT	30-11-2024		
Vacancy				

* Denotes absence

Also in attendance

Darren Heath	DH	27-09-2023	Associate Members
Adam Crosier		N/A	Clerk

PART 1 MINUTES

No	Discussion	Action No
1	Welcome and Introductions DK opened the meeting at 8.30 am and welcomed all governors to the meeting.	
2	Apologies for absence Apologies had been received from SK. These were accepted.	
3	Declarations of interest in the current agenda None.	
4	Governing board business <u>Election of Chair and Vice Chair</u> Chair of Governors: DK agreed to be re-nominated as chair and was seconded by RH. There were no other nominations and DK was elected unanimously on a show of hands. Vice Chair of Governors: RH was nominated by DK and seconded by MM. There were no other nominations and RH was elected unanimously on a show of hands.	

<p><u>GB structure and membership update</u> DK reminded governors of the decision at the previous meeting of the FGB to change the structure and composition of the governing board. She said that the future of the board would comprise 12 governors, down from 18 governors. It was AGREED that governors complete a skills audit in advance of a formal submission to the local authority to amend the board’s instrument of government (IOG).</p> <p>ACTION: Governors to complete the skills audit with a view to approve the structure and composition at the next FGB meeting.</p> <p><u>KCSIE23 and safeguarding training requirements</u> Governors were reminded of the legal requirement to confirm on Gov Hub that they had read and understood Part 1 of KCSIE23 and to confirm having completed annual safeguarding training.</p> <p>ACTION: LC to arrange online safeguarding training for governors.</p> <p><u>Annual declaration of interests</u> Governors were reminded to complete their annual declaration of interests on Gov Hub.</p> <p><u>Code of Conduct</u> ACTION: DK to update the Code of Conduct in line with the changes to the IOG. Governors were reminded of the importance of reading and committing to the Code.</p> <p><u>Link governor roles</u> The following were identified as required link governor roles: SEND and Safeguarding. Agreement of other roles would follow agreement of the SDP.</p> <p><u>Governor training and development</u> Governors were asked to commit to undertaking regular training to inform their roles as governors. It was AGREED that governors should undertake at least one training session per term.</p> <p><u>Governor visits</u> DK said that governors should commit to 1 visit and 1 learning walk per year as a minimum. At every other meeting of the FGB there would be space on the agenda for a report from link governors.</p> <p><u>Pay Committee TOR and membership</u> The following were appointed to the Pay Committee: RH, EWe, JGA, DK</p> <p><u>Headteacher appraisal committee</u> The following governors were appointed to the Headteacher appraisal committee: RH, EWe, JGA, DK together with Dawn Ferdinand (HT at Willow School) to act as the external advisor.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p>
---	---

	<p>ACTION: DK to review TOR for the Pay committee and the Headteacher appraisal committee and to arrange a meeting before 14 November 2023 when paperwork for pay progression is required by the local authority.</p> <p>ACTION: LC to propose dates for Pay Committee and Headteacher Appraisal Committee meetings.</p> <p><u>Governors' development plan</u></p> <p>ACTION: LC/DK to arrange training for the whole board from Director of HEP to inform the governor's' action/development plan.</p> <p>Q. EWo reported that she had not able to access training via HEP because of an online password that should be given to all Governors. A. LC agreed to investigate and resolve this matter.</p>	<p>4</p> <p>5</p> <p>6</p>
6	<p>Minutes of the meeting 9 October 2023 and 29 June 2023</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Accuracy The minutes of both meetings were approved as an accurate record of the meeting and signed by the Chair. ▪ Actions <p><u>29 June 2023</u></p> <p>ACTION DK to send a Doodle Poll arrange an extraordinary meeting of the board before the end of term. STATUS: Closed.</p> <p>ACTION: CP to address question about the effectiveness of the zones of regulation intervention. STAUS: On agenda under SDP. Closed.</p> <p>ACTION: LC to include information about zones of regulation in the newsletter to parents. Also, to arrange training for staff and governors and the wider school community. Information on zones of regulation should ensure a consistent understanding of emotions between home and school on this area. Short videos on the school website about wellbeing. STATUS: On agenda under SDP. Closed.</p> <p>ACTION: LC to provide information on SEND spending to the Haringey group. STATUS: Closed. LC reported that there was a rebanding of EHCPs currently taking place by the local authority. He said that this process was taking a lot of staff time but would lead to a fairer system for schools.</p> <p>ACTION: LC to seek advice on the use of terminology relating to British v civic values, from HEP and report back to governors. STATS: Closed. LC said that the issue was complicated because of advice from Judicium that Ofsted may ask children about what they understood of British values. Governors had an in-depth discussion over the matter and agreed that LC obtain advice from HEP SIA advisor and to advise Ofsted inspectors at the point of inspection that the school refers to British values as 'civic values'.</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Matters arising <p>None.</p>	
7	<p>Chair's report</p> <p>None.</p>	
8	<p>Headteacher's report</p> <p>LC had circulated the SEF in advance of the meeting. This included evaluation of the work of the school against its stated vision and the following five values that it seeks to instil in the children, to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - inclusive - creative - caring - aspiring - resilient <p>The SEF focused on what was going well and areas for development. He said that on the advice of the SIA, he was also producing a more traditional SEF that included the Ofsted headings. Both documents would be used for an Ofsted interview: one would cover values the other the Ofsted headings. He said that the SIA would conduct a mock 90 minute phone call in preparation for the Ofsted inspection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development priorities <p>He reported that the priorities from the SEF were as follows: curriculum, behaviour and attitudes (there were still children struggling with self regulation). There were a lot of SEND children struggling with behaviour and while the zones of regulation work was positive, it required further embedding in the school: some teachers were using it very well, but others less so. He said that he was hoping for a reduction in stage 3 and stage 4 behaviour reports among both SEND and non-SEND children. The aspiration was for consistency across the school.</p> <p>He reported that the school was looking to participate in an intervention called 'sports for thought' that would also help with self-regulation.</p> <p>Q. DK asked whether there was a plan for achieving the desire for consistency across the school.</p> <p>A. LC said that there was and that it would involve training of staff: SLT to review the planning, ensure there was staff training in place, have clarity over expectations, evaluation and seeing desired impacts. Where poor behaviour was observed, teachers should be using the language of the zones of regulation and ensuring that this was communicated to parents too.</p> <p>Q. EWo said that it was important that the approach was used at home too. She said that in the previous year there had been a presentation to parents and wondered what arrangements were in place for new parents about what works/does not work, for SEND parents.</p> <p>A. LC said that the plan included an element called Zones at Home that included parent talks, conducted both on MS Teams and in person with a video uploaded to the internet also available for anyone who could not attend.</p>	

	<p>He said that the work on DEI was continuing: the aspiration of the development board was for the school to be an active anti-racist school. He reported that the success of this would be assessed externally and if successful the school would receive accreditation from Leeds Beckett University. Key measures of success would be that all families, regardless of ethnicity, would feel confident in telling the school their concerns and that the school would address these appropriately.</p> <p>Q. DK asked whether this was the only element of work on DEI, which implied a much broader focus than anti-racism work. She said that she was uncomfortable that this was listed as DEI when there was no action on other groups.</p> <p>A. LC said that school development priority for the current year was on becoming an anti racist school. He added that the school was considering issues of intersectionality as part of the work on the school curriculum. This included work on religion and religious groups.</p> <p>- Pupil Premium</p> <p>LC reported that there were still gaps in pupil outcomes between children eligible for PP and their peers. This was a long standing concern. He said that it was not surprising to see gaps in attainment data despite the efforts that had been put to increase provision for children eligible for PP. The kind of work that the school had in place included modelling, scaffolding and cold calling to further embed good work. He said that success factors would include increased attendance at extra-curricular activities and increased school attendance overall among children eligible for PP.</p> <p>Q. MM said that she was concerned about labelling of children eligible for PP and the risk of feeding negative stereotypes of this group by referring to these children as ‘PP children’.</p> <p>A. LC agreed.</p> <p>Q. MA asked if there was a different strategy for children eligible for PP v others.</p> <p>A. LC said there was not. All under-performing children received additional support regardless of their eligibility for PP, in accordance with the understanding that there was an educational plan for each child based on their specific and individual needs.</p> <p>He said that with regards to the language, there were clear and specific about the PP grant and that this related to the income of the child’s family.</p> <p>Governors discussed the difficulty of terminology and acknowledged that terms such as PP and SEND were sometimes unhelpful as they implied homogeneity when there was in fact a very wide range of ability regardless of these labels.</p> <p>NT said that for both groups the rationale for these terms was related to the provision of additional funds and accountability for expenditure.</p>	
--	--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Curriculum development <p>LC reported that there was a focus on writing in the current year. Evaluation showed that writing curriculum had not been reviewed as recently as the maths and reading curriculum. He said that success would be assess in the writing results in KS1 (where there had been a dip in this area in 2023).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pupil outcome data <p>LC reported that the national averages for 2022/23 had been below pre pandemic levels. At the school level for EYFS, overall the school had achieved outcomes that were around 10% above the national average. For Phonics Y1, the school had achieved 86% of pupils achieving the expected standard, which was 7% above the national average. KS1 Reading and Maths: again the school had achieved results that were around 10% above national average. Writing results had been in line with the national average.</p> <p>Q. DK asked about the impact of the Maths interventions. A. LC said that there was a need for more time and for a full assessment to be made. It was not likely that impacts would be seen directly and work was continuing. The subject lead was ensuring good practice was embedded and gaps addressed.</p> <p>Q. EWo asked about the number of dyslexic children identified by the school, and whether governors could see how they were progressing in Reading and Writing and report to next meeting.</p> <p>KS2 LC reported that Reading was above the national average, but progress levels were only just above the national average. Maths: there had been a 1% increase on the previous year. Results for Writing had been excellent, including results for disadvantaged groups. He said that he was planning to review the Writing results because he suspected that they may not have been moderated accurately enough.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Attendance <p>The national average attendance had been 95.3% The school had recorded attendance at 96.2% from 4 September to 13 October. 96.2 4 Sept to 13 October. This included unauthorised 0.94% school v 1.4 national average and authorised school 2.8% v 3.2% national average.</p> <p>LC said that the school’s work with attendance was good: staff had raised the profile of attendance at assemblies and via the use of rewards etc. Families of concern were flagged and followed up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pupil numbers <p>Overall pupil numbers were down by 13 from 882 to 869 but had now increased by 3 making a total of 872. LC said that he had met with the local</p>	
---	--

	<p>authority and that, as reported previously, there were significant concerns across the borough about the decline in pupil numbers. He said that he expected the following year (2024/25) to be very tough for Reception year recruitment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Behaviour monitoring <p>The school was now using an online tool to record and monitor behaviour, ‘My concern’ which provided a chronology of behaviour incidents. The challenge was the categorisation of behaviour to enable a valuable report on trends. LC said that Helen King from Judicium had described the school’s record keeping as being very thorough.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parent communication <p>LC said that 90% of parents were now using Parent Hub. He was undertaking a refresh of the school’ website. He reported that he had written to parents about the war between Israel and Hamas and had provided advice about how to talk to children about the conflict.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coleridge Families <p>LC reported that CF had imploded. He said that two meetings had been held with parents to date about the future of the organisation and that another was scheduled for 9 November to try to identify parents who may wish to relaunch the organisation.</p>	
9	<p>Safeguarding and safer recruitment</p> <p>LC had circulated a safeguarding audit conducted by Judicium on 3 October 2023.</p>	
10	<p>Financial management</p> <p>Information had been circulated in advance of the meeting.</p> <p>LC reported that the school was forecasting an in-year deficit of 341,497 which would leave the school with a total deficit at 31 March 2024 of £247,768 once the existing surplus of £93,929 was taken into account. He said that there were several areas of variance that need to be reviewed, including a significant one, catering, where there was a variance of £28,000.</p> <p>Q. A governor asked whether there was a need to provide a deficit recovery plan.</p> <p>A. LC said that he was working on this currently and was looking at areas to cut costs. Unfortunately, the one area that appeared unsustainable at its current cost was the wellbeing and counselling service. He added that it was likely that there would be changes to the leadership team in the new year which would impact the school’s finances. However, this was not confirmed, and he proposed to provide further information at the next meeting of the FGB,</p> <p>It was AGREED that the SDP be circulated to governors for review via email and formally approved at the next meeting of the FGB.</p> <p>Governor link roles would be allocated alongside key priorities in the SDP.</p>	

	ACTION: LC to circulate the SDP via email to governors for review ahead of approval at the next FGB.	7
11	Pupil and staff welfare Not discussed due to time constraints.	
12	Staffing LC had circulated a full staffing report in advance of the meeting. He reported that there had been a lot of movement. The previous SBM had left. The SBM role had been split: the finance manager worked across LB Haringey and at another local school. She worked 2 days from 8.00 am -2.00 pm and there was also a school operations manager (covering catering, estate management, lettings and income generation). He reported that he had recruited/replaced 2 x class teachers plus 1 mat cover and others: 2 Admin Assts and 2 TAs. A part time teacher was absent on long term sick. 2 x premises staff and site mangers long term sick 1 x TA and one cleaner were on long term sick	
13	Estate management LC reported that regular H+S walks had taken place since the previous meeting. He said that the planned repair to roof had been put on hold (West) by the local authority because it was over committed, due to other schools issues affected by RAAC. Q. MM asked whether the school had adequate site management. A. LC admitted that the staffing was patchy for reasons given above. He said that SLT members were helping out. The school operations manager had reviewed compliance and H+S and site team and admin. He said that if the school required additional support, he would ensure it was provided. Q. EWo asked that at the next meeting when LC reviewed the staff structure, to include the role of the SENCO as part of SLT.	
14	Policies None.	
15	Any other business None.	
16	Date of next meetings • TBC	
17	Part 2 business None.	

The Chair thanked everyone for attending. Part 1 of the meeting ended at 10.45)

Signed..... Date.....
Chair

Action Table

Action	Action	By Whom
1	ACTION: Governors to complete the skills audit with a view to approve the structure and composition at the next FGB meeting.	All governors
2	ACTION: LC to arrange online safeguarding training for governors.	LC
3	ACTION: DK to update the Code of Conduct in line with the changes to the IOG. Governors were reminded of the importance of reading and committing to the Code	DK All governors
4	ACTION: DK to review TOR for the Pay committee and the Headteacher appraisal committee and to arrange a meeting before 14 November 2023 when paperwork for pay progression is required by the local authority.	DK
5	ACTION: LC to propose dates for Pay Committee and Headteacher Appraisal Committee meetings.	LC
6	ACTION: LC/DK to arrange training for the whole board from Director of HEP to inform the governor's' action/development plan.	LC
7	ACTION: LC to circulate the SDP via email to governors for review ahead of approval at the next FGB.	LC