



WITTERSHAM CHURCH OF ENGLAND PRIMARY SCHOOL

MINUTES OF THE FULL GOVERNING BOARD MEETING

**Held Virtually on Thursday, 29th January 2026
at 6.30 p.m.**

On a voyage of discovery, flourishing in God's love.

Christian Values of

Compassion

Courage

Cooperation

Present: John Collins (Chair), Jane Burnett (Vice Chair), Stella Coulson (Headteacher), Helen Farmer, Carly Catt, Nick Barnett, Sean Solly and Kerry Dean

Governance

Professional: Jane Phillips

The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm.

| ITEM | PROCEDURAL | ACTION |
|---|---|---|
| <p>1.</p> <p>1a</p> <p>1b</p> <p>1c</p> | <p><u>WELCOME, APOLOGIES, QUORUM</u></p> <p>The Chair welcomed governors to the meeting which was opened with a prayer. The Chair also welcomed Sean Solly, newly elected parent governor. Introductions were made.</p> <p>Apologies were received and accepted for Harry Lingfield (working away) and Fran Rusbridge (work commitments). There were no other apologies for absence.</p> <p>The governance professional (GP) confirmed the meeting was quorate.</p> | |
| <p>2.</p> <p>2a</p> <p>2b</p> | <p><u>DECLARATIONS OF BUSINESS INTEREST</u></p> <p>Foundation governor, Jane Burnett declared she was Chair of governors at The Norton Knatchbull School in Ashford.</p> <p>Sean Solly declared he was Managing Director and his spouse was the CEO of Countryside Group of Companies which specialised in perimeter security solutions, access control and automation of gate barriers.</p> <p>There were no other declarations of business interest made against any agenda item.</p> <p>Governors were reminded to declare any business interests which became relevant during the meeting.</p> | |
| <p>3.</p> <p>3a</p> <p>3b</p> | <p><u>MINUTES OF THE FULL GOVERNING BOARD MEETING HELD ON 11TH DECEMBER 2025</u></p> <p>The minutes were agreed as an accurate account which would be signed electronically by the Chair.</p> <p><u>A Review of Governor and Governance Professional's Actions Arising</u></p> <p>Item 2. Action: HL to send the HT his pen portrait for inclusion on the school's website (carried over since July 2025). SS to also prepare a pen portrait.</p> <p>Item 3. Action: KD to complete her Code of Conduct confirmation on GovernorHub.</p> <p>Item 4. Action: FR to refresh her Code of Conduct confirmation to reflect a date which was after the Code of Conduct had been agreed (after 15th October 2025).</p> <p>Item 7. Action: KD, FR and HL to complete the NGA Learning Link refresher module on 'Essential Safeguarding for Governors and Trustees – 2025/26'. Copies of certificates to be sent to the GP.</p> <p>Remaining actions had been completed or would be discussed during this meeting.</p> | <p>HL/SS</p> <p>KD</p> <p>FR</p> <p>KD/HL</p> |

in primary education. This included low key, low stakes activities which were completed with adults which took twenty to thirty minutes for each child. This provided an opportunity to assess each of the children who had joined in Reception.

As reported earlier, the children then completed a phonics assessment in Year 1. In Year 2, the children completed Key Stage one SATs. The data would no longer require submitting but would be used as part of the school's own internal tracking.

The HT explained that in Year 4, the children would complete the multiplication times tables check (MTC) which was formalised and recorded. The children would then sit their Key Stage two SATs in Year 6.

The HT said formalised assessments were mirrored throughout the academic year. The HT explained the phonics assessment was based on decodable (readable) and non-decodable (tricky words) where the children's phonics skills would be used to understand the words. The phonics check was rehearsed through the children's phonics lessons where the children had flash cards and opportunities to see examples from the test which would provide them with a less intense experience during the test itself. The children would also be internally tracked in line with the phonics expectations to ensure that the judgements were really accurate whilst running alongside the standardised assessment. As mentioned earlier, the small number of children who didn't pass their phonics screening in Year 1 would be able to retake it at the end of Year 2.

The HT explained NFER tests had been introduced the previous year which were rolled out more formally from September 2025. NFER were a testing organisation which also prepared the Key Stage two assessment materials which were then trialled in schools. NFER also provided a lot of practice assessments which ran very closely with the more formal assessments which took place across Years 1 to 6 in terms two, four and six. The tests took place within a formal situation under test conditions. Again, this would prepare the children for their Year 6 SATs.

At the end of the testing cycles in terms two, four and six, staff would then be asked to enter their data into the Insight tracking system with information taken from the formal assessment together with information taken from their teacher assessment. It was about an integration of both which provided a more holistic and well rounded understanding of the children. This would then lead into pupil progress meetings (PPMs) which took place at various points throughout the year.

The HT said there was a more informal PPM in term one with the class teachers, the HT AHT and SENCo who would review how the children were settling in and their wellbeing. The current PPM was more formal based on the term two data when there would be a review of the data set, what it was saying what it was missing together with why the children were or weren't making progress. There would be very powerful conversations about interventions, adult support and what could be done differently. PPMs had taken place during the current week were there were two further PPMs the following week. The HT commented that staff came to these meetings extremely well prepared and it was clearly evident how well they knew each of the children. They knew those children who weren't making the required level of progress and the reason for that. The teachers were very forward thinking where they came to the PPMs with solutions and interventions which they would put in place to support all learners.

The HT explained the difficulty which the school had was in going against age related expectations (ARE) which were national curriculum DfE decided expectations. However, children weren't linear in their progression where they would work at their own speed and excel or decline at various points. Whilst difficult to work within that ARE frame, it was necessary to have a holistic and rounded view of the children. The data currently being presented by staff provided a clear view of those children who were or weren't performing well and a clear indication as to whether they found the testing cycle particularly challenging. There had been much in the press about the impact of SATs and formalised testing on children's mental health. It wasn't possible to shy away from that but to prepare the children appropriately for these tests. In

December, the children had been very calm, the practitioners in the classroom explained and supported them where there were no children with elevated anxiety. Some children hadn't performed as well during the testing cycles where it was thought they would benefit from a reader for the next cycle. All of the formal assessments provided opportunities to identify and pick this up.

The HT said the day-to-day assessment for learning (ASL) was the most important which happened in all of the classes all of the time. As per the School Improvement Plan (SIP) and post-Ofsted, this was an area which was really being developed where all of the information was collated which provided an accurate picture of each of the children.

The HT explained an assessment proforma was sent out to all families at the end of term two which was generated by the Insight software. This was in response to feedback from the last parental survey where some parents had wanted that hard data for their children. As it was generated via Insight, it didn't create any additional work for teachers but was generated from the information which had already been inputted into Insight. Parents had responded very positively to the information sent out where there had been some very constructive conversations as a result.

The HT said it all came back to the SIP and the school's robust approach in tracking the children. The new Ofsted framework was also very different to the inspection which had taken place in June 2025 where inspectors were beginning to look at data a little more than before. The school was also getting a more rounder picture of all learners where it was possible to identify and celebrate success. The HT commented that with smaller pupil numbers, each was worth a higher percentage. If there were several children who weren't making on track progress, this could then distort the levels and areas of focus. For that reason, pupil numbers had been added to the Insight data rather than just percentages.

The HT said it was known there were twenty nine pupils on the SEND Register who would need a very different curriculum and level of support in order to make that progress. There were also children who were making accelerating progress in maths but were really struggling with their reading and writing. It was about celebrating those learners to include those areas where they were making rapid progress.

A governor asked those governors who were also parents of pupils at the school whether they'd found the Insight data useful. A governor said it certainly hadn't come up as a parent conversation. The governor wasn't a huge fan of data relating to her child. It was understood that it was a necessity but that it brought up more questions which were then followed up on with the class teacher. There had been a very constructive conversation where it had been possible to follow up on the data.

A governor queried the work involved in sending out the data to parents. The HT explained the data was already held on the Insight platform following data drops across the academic year. Referencing the parent survey, the HT didn't want parents to think that their views hadn't been heard. However, it wasn't thought necessary to continually report on a child's data because if there had been concerns, they would have been raised directly with parents. There were also parent evenings and an end of term report. The Insight data was considered the middle ground. The HT was aware of three parents who had contacted teachers directly who'd had positive and fruitful conversations to include how they could provide support at home. It was about striking a balance to meet all parents' needs. The HT said there were parents which she'd see on the gate every day who were dropping off younger children whilst there were parents which the school would never see. The Insight data provided an opportunity for the latter to be kept in the loop as regards their child's learning and the journey which they were on.

A governor commented it was about transparency with families where there were no surprises. What guidance was provided to parents which would accompany the information to help them navigate it? The holistic integration of both the teacher's observations together with the formative assessments

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| | <p>was a particularly important feature of it. It was a point in time for a child where a school was then held to account for those figures. The more holistic approach had more value for the young person. The HT explained she had worked with the Senior Leadership Team and Office Team on the guidance provided to ensure that it was extremely clear both as a parent and as a professional. A different proforma was also sent out for EYFS as they were judged on a different curriculum to that of the Key Stages one and two learners. Effort grades had also been included next to the hard data which showed those children who were struggling but were putting in a great deal of effort. Where children weren't making progress, it was emphasised during parent evenings the difference it would make if parents read with their children each evening.</p> <p>The HT commented that at the heart of this was the school's relationship with the community. There wasn't a parent which the school didn't communicate with every week in some capacity, whether it was via the class dojo, the messaging board, via the newsletter or a staff member on the gate. There were those continual conversations where parents were very much in the loop. The HT was confident that there was that transparency that parents would contact the school and have those conversations. However, the school had a duty to make parents aware if their children weren't making progress and what that would look like.</p> <p>A governor referenced the formative testing where he helped to invigilate the SATs each year. There was one particular year when there had been lots of complaints about the SATs and talk from teachers more widely about distressed and tearful pupils. However, at the school the children had just taken it in their stride. The children were then able to give of their best as they weren't anxious. This was because of those actions which had happened beforehand. The HT said when she was a Year 6 teacher, she'd explained to pupils that this was their opportunity to show off how great they were and get the job done. There was nothing to be afraid of.</p> <p>On behalf of governors, the Chair thanked the HT for her impressive overview.</p> | |
| 7. | <p><u>HEADTEACHER'S REPORT</u></p> <p>The HT's written report was made available in advance of the meeting (filed electronically). The HT responded to governor questions which had been submitted in advance of the meeting.</p> <p>A governor noted the HT was now tracking in-year admissions as a separate cohort. What did this tracking highlight? The HT said this tracking had only just begun in response to the recent increase in in-year admissions. As this was a new focus, there wasn't as yet a full picture of patterns or trends. The HT would be able to provide a more informed response following the Spring term assessment analysis, when there had been sufficient time to monitor progress, attainment and wellbeing for this group more closely.</p> <p>A governor asked what strategies were being used with the focus on raising attainment in writing? The HT said the work in writing was centred on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicit modelling of sentence construction and vocabulary choices. • A clear progression of writing skills across year groups. • Increased opportunities for extended writing. • Consistent use of scaffolds such as sentence stems and vocabulary banks. • A focus on handwriting and presentation. • Daily opportunities for purposeful writing, not just within English lessons. • Stronger links between reading and writing so pupils can draw on high-quality texts. <p>A governor asked the HT if she could explain "There has been a decrease in the proportion of homegrown pupils, linked to an increase in in-year admissions." The HT explained that in this context, homegrown pupils were those who had joined the school at the start of Reception and had progressed through the</p> | |

school. In-year admissions referred to children who had joined Wittersham at points other than Reception, often partway through the academic year or during a key stage.

A governor enquired as to the meaning of Ever6 FSM and of scaffolding within a lesson. The HT said Ever6 FSM referred to pupils who were currently eligible for Free School Meals or had been eligible at any point in the last six years. This was the measure used for Pupil Premium funding.

The HT continued to explain that scaffolding within a lesson referred to the temporary support provided by the teacher to help pupils access learning. This might include sentence starters, worked examples, visual prompts or structured guidance, which were gradually removed as pupils become more confident and independent.

A governor noted the HT had stated that it wasn't more intervention strategies which were needed but rather first-quality teaching. What were the elements of this? Based on the HT's lesson observations, was she able to provide us with any measure of this? How do the HT use staff meetings to focus on pedagogy? The HT explained that first-quality teaching at Wittersham focused on clear intended learning being shared with pupils, where the learning intention reflected the skill development rather than simply the activity. Lessons were shaped by what children need to know next, informed by purposeful AfL. (What does this stand for?) This was supported by strong modelling and clear explanation from adults, frequent checking for understanding during lessons, appropriate scaffolding to support all learners, skilled questioning to deepen thinking, the effective use of partner talk, strong deployment of adults within the classroom, opportunities for child-led reflection, and consistently high expectations for presentation, effort and independence.

The HT said learning walks showed that where these elements were consistently in place, pupils were far more likely to move from working towards to secure age-related expectations.

This work was further strengthened through targeted teacher and LSA (Learning Support Assistant) CPD and was a regular focus of staff meetings throughout the week. These meetings provided time for professional discussion, sharing of good practice, revisiting pedagogy, and developing practical classroom strategies linked directly to the SIP priorities.

In terms of raising attainment the HT mentioned intended learning within a lesson. The Term 1 monitoring report for SIP 1 highlighted that only one class had the learning intention highlighted. A governor asked how was this followed up with teachers? The HT said this was followed up through individual feedback to staff, whole-staff discussion in staff meetings, and inclusion as a key focus in subsequent monitoring.

It led to a wider professional discussion with both teachers and LSAs about the purpose and role of learning questions, learning intentions and the importance of making expectations explicit for pupils. Staff explored the difference between describing the task pupils were completing and clearly identifying what pupils were expected to learn by the end of the lesson.

This professional dialogue directly informed further first-quality teaching training delivered on the first INSET day of Term 3, where clarity of intended learning, modelling, scaffolding and checking for understanding were revisited as key components of effective classroom practice.

During the previous week's learning walk, the learning question and learning intention were visible in all classes. In several classrooms, these were also displayed on the working wall from the previous day, demonstrating that they were being used as an ongoing reference point for pupils rather than a one-off statement at the start of the lesson.

Looking at the attendance data in the weekly newsletter, a governor noted the HT had stated that the overall figure was slightly increasing from the data last December although it was still beneath 94%. Was there still a lot of pupil

illness? How many families was the school working with relating to punctuality rather than attendance? The HT said there continued to be a notable level of pupil illness this term, including seasonal viruses and a recent outbreak of chicken pox, which remained the main factor affecting overall attendance. Holidays had reduced, but illness was still having an impact. However, punctuality had improved significantly. Last term, the Headteacher, Office Manager and FLO worked closely with specific families where lateness was a concern. Through meetings, regular communication and practical support for morning routines, a clear improvement in punctuality had been seen.

The school had also refined its communication with families regarding the use of Calpol and when children were well enough to attend school, which had supported a better understanding of medically related absence.

The HT was asked if she could briefly expand on the small groupings morning structure? Was this in all classes? Although it was early days, what impact was this having? The HT said the small group morning structure was currently being modelled most explicitly in Year 6 due to the focus on SATs and the particular challenges within the cohort. However, the principles of this approach were being applied across the school within morning core lessons.

On arrival, children began the day in smaller, adult-led groups focusing on core skills such as reading fluency, handwriting, arithmetic and early writing practice. This provided a calm, purposeful start to the day and ensured that every child had immediate adult interaction and targeted practice.

To support this, adjustments had been made to adult deployment across the school to better meet need. This was working well in practice, with positive feedback from staff in terms of wellbeing, more effective use of adults, and a noticeable reduction in learning disruption for pupils.

Although still early, an improved focus was already being seen at the start of lessons, greater writing stamina, and increased confidence in arithmetic. Early arithmetic scores were showing improvement under this new structure, and the end of Term 4 Spring assessment data would be a key indicator in measuring its wider impact.

A governor asked how much of the school's approach was supported by outside professionals such as Educational Psychologists, Speech and Language and OT Therapists? Was there the opportunity to discuss strategic approaches for the school alongside the specific needs of individual children?

The HT said the school's approach continued to be well supported by a range of external professionals including the Educational Psychologist (EP), Speech and Language Therapy (SaLT), Occupational Therapy, STLS (Specialist Teaching and Learning Service) and other specialist services where required. However, this system had changed this year in line with the new community model, which focused more on a cohort and whole-school approach rather than one-to-one reports for individual children.

The HT said SaLT now operated as part of the Balanced System where the school had an assigned Speech and Language Therapist who visited the school termly. The EP also now visits termly, which was new for the school this year. These visits focused on cohort-based advice, classroom strategies and whole-school approaches rather than producing individual reports or direct recommendations for specific pupils.

STLS were a new service for the school following the move between communities. They had supported the development of the new Year 6 morning structure particularly well, and a whole-school review was planned with both the EP and STLS to further strengthen this work.

The HT explained that in addition to this, the school was able to access advice through the SENIA (Special Educational Needs Inclusion Advisor) clinic, which allowed staff to discuss specific children and seek guidance. This didn't result in written reports but provided practical advice and direction. A clinic would take place on Friday 30th

| | <p>January following the recent behaviour incident in Year 3 to ensure staff were responding appropriately and proactively.</p> <p>A governor said the data was great but was it also possible to track the rate of progress of cohorts/individuals and were there triggers to review and ensure staff were using the most effective strategies with them? The governor assumed the expectation was that the rate of progress should be similar across the cohorts even though attainment levels might be different. The HT said the rate of progress was tracked for both cohorts and individual pupils, not just attainment. This was done through termly assessment analysis, ongoing teacher assessment and termly pupil progress meetings, which took place earlier that week. During these meetings, staff reviewed a range of pupil groups based on identified concerns, with each meeting focused on a specific group such as SEND or Pupil Premium. Where it was felt that progress from a child’s baseline was not being made, this was discussed with parents and might result in the pupil being added to the SEND Register.</p> <p>The HT said there were clear triggers for review to ensure the most effective strategies were being used. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupils not making expected progress across a term. • Widening gaps between current attainment and age-related expectations. • Concerns raised through teacher observation or AfL • Attendance or wellbeing factors impacting learning. <p>The HT explained that when these triggers were identified, classroom strategies were reviewed first, in line with the focus on first-quality teaching, before considering additional intervention. The expectation was that the rate of progress should be broadly similar across cohorts, even where attainment levels and starting points differed. The focus was on pupils making strong progress from their individual starting points rather than simply comparing attainment outcomes.</p> | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|--------------|--|
| <p>8.</p> | <p><u>SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (SIP) 2025-26</u></p> <p>The RAG (red, amber, green) rated SIP for January 2026 was made available in advance of the meeting (filed electronically).</p> <p>A governor commented that the summary at the end of the document was particularly useful for governors as it provided an immediate overview.</p> <p>A governor asked if the HT was happy with the progress made so far against the SIP priorities. The HT reported the new School Improvement Advisor would visit on Thursday, 5th February who had already received a copy of the SIP enabling him to track progress. The HT commented that having a governor for each SIP area had made the direction and the focus of the SIP and governor involvement much more streamlined this year. It had also driven whole school leadership. The HT had met with the School Council the previous week were a child version of the SIP had been provided which would be shared with their class councils and wider community.</p> <p>Action: The HT to add the child version of the SIP to the GovernorHub folder for this meeting.</p> | <p>Head</p> | | | | | | |
| <p>9.</p> <p>9a</p> <p>9b</p> | <p><u>GOVERNOR MONITORING</u></p> <p><u>Governor Monitoring Activities in Term Three</u></p> <p>The Chair explained that it hadn’t been possible to carry out some monitoring activities ahead of this meeting as it was already quite late in the term. Whilst dates had been arranged, they would take place following this meeting.</p> <p><u>Term Four Monitoring Priorities</u></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="220 1877 1158 1977"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #008000; color: white;">Focus</th> <th style="background-color: #008000; color: white;">Governor(s)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Health & Safety link governor visit</td> <td>John Collins</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEN link governor visit</td> <td>Jane Burnett</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Focus | Governor(s) | Health & Safety link governor visit | John Collins | SEN link governor visit | Jane Burnett | |
| Focus | Governor(s) | | | | | | | |
| Health & Safety link governor visit | John Collins | | | | | | | |
| SEN link governor visit | Jane Burnett | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Collective Worship | Helen Farmer/John Collins |
| SIP Priority 1 Quality of Education | Helen Farmer/John Collins |
| SIP Priority 2 Quality of Education | Fran Rusbridge |
| SIP Priority 5 Behaviour & Attitudes | Jane Burnett |
| SIP Priority 6 Leadership & Governance | John Collins |
| Wellbeing staff survey/School Council | Kerry Dean |

The Chair commented that governor observations and input during visits had been particularly useful to the SLT.

Governors were encouraged to arrange their visits at the start of term which would then enable the HT to spread the visits out. The risk would otherwise be that if all visits fell towards the end of term, it wouldn't then be possible to accommodate some.

The HT asked governors to arrange both their term five and term six monitoring visits at the earliest opportunity.

FINANCE & RESOURCES

10. **FINANCE/PREMISES/HEALTH & SAFETY/GENERAL DATA PROTECTION REGULATIONS (GDPR)**

10a Finance Committee Meeting – 15th January 2026

The draft minutes of the January Finance Committee meeting were provided as a supporting paper for this agenda item.

The nine month budget monitoring report and nine month balance control mechanism calculation were provided as supporting papers (filed electronically).

The Finance Committee Chair highlighted several items from the meeting.

- At the time of the meeting, there were one hundred and thirty nine pupils on roll based on the school's official published admissions number (PAN) of one hundred and forty. Whilst the school could not go over a PAN of twenty in Years R, 1 and 2 due to the legal reasons around infant class sizes, there was no legal limit on pupil numbers in Years 3 to 6. However, it wasn't thought preferable to have a class which exceeded thirty two children.
- Nine Month (December 2025) Budget Monitoring Report

The nine month budget monitoring report was provided as a supporting paper for this agenda item (filed electronically).

Year End Revenue Budget Projection

| | (£) |
|--------------------------------|----------------|
| Revenue Income | 1,029,602 |
| Revenue Expenditure | 974,837 |
| Revenue Balance | 54,766 |
| Revenue Balance B/F 2024/25 | 46,793 |
| Revenue Balance C/F to 2026/27 | 101,559 |

- At the nine month position, an in-year Revenue surplus of £54,766 was predicted (original budget plan: a surplus of £40,482).
- There was a positive variance under Revenue income of £62,104 whilst there was a negative variance of £47,821 under Revenue expenditure.
- The predicted Revenue budget carry forward to 2026/27 was therefore £101,559 (original budget plan: c/f of £87,275).

- The budget was currently looking extremely healthy to include some additional Education and Healthcare Plan (EHCP) funding which hadn't previously been anticipated.
- The school's allowable balance control mechanism (BCM) was £117,757. The amount over the BCM would be subject to clawback by the local authority.

Year End Capital Budget Projection

| | (£) |
|--|--------|
| Total Capital Income | 5,558 |
| Less Capital Expenditure | 10,668 |
| Capital Balance | -5,110 |
| Capital Balance B/F 2024/25 | 0 |
| Capital Balance Carried Forward to 2026/27 | -5,110 |

The Finance Committee Chair explained she'd met with the Finance Manager the previous day and had asked if she had any particular concerns about the budget. The Finance Manager had explained that governors would need to keep an eye on SEN funding. This was because there had been an influx of SEN children where the school wouldn't receive any additional funding until after the 2027 census. There would be a period of time during which some pupils would require additional support where the school would be required to meet the cost of this.

The Finance Committee Chair said governors had also discussed the school's ten percent contribution to the Diocese towards the school's Capital works. To date, the amounts had been reasonable but the remedial work to the roof and windows were planned to take place during the summer holidays of 2026. The Finance Manager had indicated that quotes had been received in the region of £76,000 for the roof and that it was unknown what would be found until the work had commenced. This was again something which the Finance Committee and FGB would need to carefully monitor.

The HT explained the roof had leaked during recent severe weather and that it was known that the roof was now past its serviceable life. The Site Manager had since been in contact with the Diocese as there was some concern as to how this was generally affecting the underlying roof structure.

The HT explained that when working with the Diocese, there was usually a three to five year plan of works where the rolling renovation had been budgeted for. However, it was those sudden and unexpected things which would become an issue. The Diocese were certainly very supportive of the school. Whilst it was thought financial year 2026/27 would be ok, it was possible there might not be the funds available for renovation work to the very old building in 2027/28.

A governor understood the Diocese had indicated that the school could hold payment of the ten percent contribution until the following financial year. The HT explained it was now possible to spread the contribution across two financial years. The HT was confident the contribution for the roof works during the summer of 2026 could be paid for within one financial year. However, during the summer of 2027, the other roof would require remedial work which would need to be paid for across two financial years.

The Finance Committee Chair reported governors had also reviewed the DfE's Insights benchmarking data for the school and KELSIS benchmarking report which compared the school to sixty eight schools of similar profile and all Kent schools (copies available in meeting folder). Governors had agreed that the variances were nominal.

The school had also moved to contract cleaners which would require careful monitoring.

| 10b | <p><u>Any Items in Respect of Premises, Health & Safety or GDPR</u></p> <p>Premises had been discussed under item 10a (Finance Committee meeting – 15th January 2026).</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--------|-------------|--------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|--------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------------|---|-------------|---|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------|
| <p>11.</p> <p>11a</p> <p>11b</p> <p>11c</p> | <p><u>POLICIES</u></p> <p>All policies within this item were made available in advance of the meeting (filed electronically).</p> <p>The Chair explained those policies under agenda item 11a had previously been reviewed by the Finance Committee where their recommendation was to adopt.</p> <p>Governors ratified those policies presented.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="220 488 1217 723"> <thead> <tr> <th>Policy</th> <th>Next Review</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Accessibility Plan</td> <td>January 2027</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Finance policy (Kent model)</td> <td>"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GDPR & Data Protection policy</td> <td>"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gifts & Hospitality policy (Kent model)</td> <td>"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>School Emergency Management and Business Continuity Plan</td> <td>"</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Further Policies for Approval</u></p> <p>A governor identified a minor amendment to page 13 of the Staff Capability policy which related to the omission of the policy’s next review. (GP note: The DfE recommended an annual cycle of review.)</p> <p>Governors ratified the following policies subject to one amendment as identified.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="220 981 1217 1149"> <thead> <tr> <th>Policy</th> <th>Next Review</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Anti-Bullying policy</td> <td>January 2027</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Attendance policy</td> <td>"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEND policy</td> <td>"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Staff Capability policy (HR Connect)</td> <td>"</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Action: The HT to send the GP the updated Staff Capability policy for uploading to the GovernorHub policy folder.</p> <p><u>Updated Policies Not Requiring Governing Board Approval</u></p> <p>Governors noted the following policies had been updated since the last meeting where copies were available within the GovernorHub policy sub-folder. All would be reviewed again in one year’s time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback & Marking policy • Lone Working policy • Manual Handling policy | Policy | Next Review | Accessibility Plan | January 2027 | Finance policy (Kent model) | " | GDPR & Data Protection policy | " | Gifts & Hospitality policy (Kent model) | " | School Emergency Management and Business Continuity Plan | " | Policy | Next Review | Anti-Bullying policy | January 2027 | Attendance policy | " | SEND policy | " | Staff Capability policy (HR Connect) | " | <p>Head</p> |
| Policy | Next Review | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessibility Plan | January 2027 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Finance policy (Kent model) | " | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| GDPR & Data Protection policy | " | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gifts & Hospitality policy (Kent model) | " | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| School Emergency Management and Business Continuity Plan | " | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Policy | Next Review | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Anti-Bullying policy | January 2027 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Attendance policy | " | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEND policy | " | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Staff Capability policy (HR Connect) | " | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OTHER | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12. | <p><u>WEBSITE/TEP GOVERNANCE MONTHLY BULLETINS/DFE UPDATES</u></p> <p>The HT reported she had recently completed a compliance check of the school’s website. Following several minor updates, it was now considered fully compliant with DfE requirements.</p> <p>The HT advised she was waiting to hear from the school’s Data Protection Officer regarding the school’s privacy notice to ensure that it fully aligned with the GDPR & Data Protection policy.</p> <p>The Education People’s (TEP) governance monthly bulletins for January 2026 was provided as a supporting paper for this agenda item (filed electronically).</p> <p>The contents were noted by governors and there were no questions arising.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| 13. | <p><u>CHAIR'S ACTIONS/CORRESPONDENCE</u></p> <p>There were no Chair's actions to report and no correspondence had been sent or received.</p> | |
| 14. | <p><u>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</u></p> <p>A governor explained that as a small village school, with small children and predominantly female staff members, thought should be given to the installation of CCTV security around the school premises. It was suggested that PIR cameras would be located around the school premises, in locations which could cover all blind spots and the main entrances into the school and playground and field. First and foremost, this would be for the safety and security of children and staff members at all times. It would also provide protection of the school premises against theft, vandalism and intrusion.</p> <p>The HT reported that security of the school site was currently being looked at to include additional fencing around the building which had been moved to April 2026 by the Diocese. The HT explained it would be necessary to speak to the Diocese regarding any adaptations to the school building. Further guidance would also need to be sought as regards general data protection regulations and that there would need to be a CCTV policy in place. The HT said it was certainly something which the school would benefit from and that it would be raised with the Diocese once further information had been gathered.</p> <p>The Chair commented that whilst there were financial implications, over recent years gradual improvements had been made to the security of the site in respect of door fobs and the new gates. CCTV was considered the next step and that it was on the agenda for discussion with the Diocese.</p> <p>A governor raised some concerns regarding the parking outside the school, particularly during the morning drop off and the afternoon collections where there was no safe egress into the school. The road wasn't considered wide enough for vehicles and parking where there were occasions when parents and young children had to walk on the road to get their children into school. A number of suggestions were made to include speed bumps outside the school or to make an area accessible for parking at the rear of the school which would reduce the traffic on The Street. Entrance to the school would then be via the back of the school field.</p> <p>The Chair explained this was an issue for lots of village primary schools. The HT regularly raised parking issues in the school's newsletter such as not parking across people's driveways where the majority of parents had been very considerate and had taken this on board.</p> <p>The HT said she was aware there had been an ongoing issue with the parking in the road for some time where the governor had made some extremely valid points. The HT explained the Diocese owned the school building whilst Kent County Council (KCC) owned the land to include the school field. Whilst there were calming measures which KCC might put in place, it would all come down to cost.</p> <p>The HT explained that earlier that week due to extreme weather, there had been a rolling collection between 3pm and 3.15pm when parents arrived at staggered points to collect their children. It was a positive experience for parents and the road was very calm. Looking to September, this was something which the school might roll out subject to not impacting on core teaching time. It was thought there was very little the school could do from a building perspective.</p> <p>A governor commented that the speed at which vehicles went down the road was a concern. Was there school signage? The HT said there was KCC signage on the Old School House wall by the staff carpark. There were also KCC pamphlets in the entrance area. However, the school did not have a crossings person to help families cross the road. The issue was also that the paths were very narrow where families parked in the village hall and then walked down.</p> | |

| | | |
|------------|--|--------------------|
| | <p>A governor asked if there was someone within KCC who could carry out a proper assessment of road safety and offer advice. The Chair suggested that people on behalf of the Parish Council could monitor the amount of traffic going through which would form the basis for advising the Parish Council on what needed to be done. It was thought unlikely that KCC would agree to anything which would incur significant cost. It would be a combination of the speed of traffic, an awareness that there was a school there, to continue to encourage parents and what the school could do from September in terms of minimising the number of cars at any one time.</p> <p>A governor explained that if a strong case was presented to KCC, it was possible to get the speed limit reduced but that this would take time.</p> <p>Action: The Chair and HT to investigate whether the local authority had a highways road safety person who would be approached to carry out traffic survey in the vicinity of the school.</p> | Chair /Head |
| 15. | <u>CONFIDENTIALITY</u> | |
| 15a | There were no discussions which were considered confidential. | |
| 15b | The Business Continuity Plan was considered a confidential document. | |
| 16. | <u>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</u> | |
| | <p>The next FGB meeting would take place at school at 6.30pm on Thursday, 19th March 2026</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The next Finance Committee meeting would take place virtually on Thursday, 7th May 2026 at 6.30 pm. | |

The meeting closed at 7.58 pm.

Signed: _____
(Chair)

Date: _____

ACTION SUMMARY

| ITEM | AGENDA ITEM | TO BE ACTIONED BY | ACTION |
|-------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 1. | 3b | HL | To send the HT his pen portrait for inclusion on the school's website (carried over). |
| 2. | 3b | KD | To complete her Code of Conduct confirmation on GovernorHub. |
| 3. | 3b | FR | To refresh her Code of Conduct to reflect a date which was after the Code of Conduct had been agreed (after 15 th October 2025). |
| 4. | 3b | KD, HL, FR | To complete the NGA Learning Link refresher module on 'Essential Safeguarding for Governors and Trustees – 2025/26'. Copies of certificates to be sent to the GP. |
| 5. | 4 | Governance Professional | To include the appointment of the Chair within the agenda of the 20 th July 2026 FGB meeting. |
| 6. | 8 | Head | To add the child version of the SIP to the GovernorHub folder for this meeting. |
| 7. | 11b | Head | To send the GP the updated Staff Capability policy for uploading to the GovernorHub policy folder. |

| | | | |
|----|----|------------|---|
| 8. | 14 | Chair/Head | To investigate whether the local authority had a highways road safety person who would be approached to carry out traffic survey in the vicinity of the school. |
|----|----|------------|---|