



	<p>The Chair commented that much work on PP is taking place, which is heartening to see. PP attendance can be improved, and good work is going on with this, for example the school has introduced a star chart system to encourage attendance, with a reward given for the achievement of good attendance.</p> <p><i>Question: A governor wanted to know whether this reward system works.</i></p> <p>Governors were advised that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A child needs to achieve 90% attendance to receive a reward.</li> <li>○ There were 21 children whose attendance was below 90% in the last term.</li> <li>○ Of this group, there were 4 children who did not achieve 90% attendance last week, and 4 this week, 2 of whom are the same children as the previous week.</li> <li>○ There are some children who consistently have very good attendance. These children receive a certificate and house points as a recognition of their good achievement. The school is exploring establishing a reward system for those that achieve excellent attendance, to be awarded at the end of the year. The threshold for this reward would be to achieve 98% or more attendance. Illness would be considered and would not affect a child's chance of receiving the reward.</li> <li>○ The attendance of pupils at Primary school is the responsibility of parents, and often is not children's fault, nor in their control, so the system is aimed at incentivising parents. The reward is a gift voucher which can be spent anywhere and can be used by parents. There is one family for whom no child has been at 90% attendance and, since the reward system has been in place, they have not missed a single register.</li> <li>○ Governors discussed whether the school could make such payments to parents, concluding that this is an approach used by other schools.</li> </ul> <p>It was raised, that it would be helpful to have the actions from the meeting minutes communicated to governors as soon as possible after the meeting.</p>	<p>For the Clerk to post actions arising from FGB meetings on GovernorHub as soon as possible after each FGB meeting.</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>School Improvement</p> <p>i. Data and progress – Insight</p> <p>LM led this part of the meeting. Both LM and BF were thanked in advance for their contribution. LM advised governors of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● There is a new system in place for data management and assessment, called <i>Insight</i>.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The process for adopting this new system began in January 2025, informed by a curriculum review.</li> <li>○ The school reviewed various systems and approaches for data management.</li> <li>○ Senior leaders were given time to review each curriculum document.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ With Insight, a conscious decision has been made to only assess certain aspects of the taught subjects.</li><li>○ This would ensure that everyone was very clear about what they wanted the children to learn and do and, informs lesson recaps and focus. This also helps with teacher workload and provides a focus for planning.</li><li>○ The school started implementing Insight in the summer term of 2025; training has taken place and teachers over the Autumn term have been using this system to plan objectives to be taught. These have been reviewed by LM and teachers are cross- checking each other's assessments. There are arrangements for moderation to take place to assure the judgements are accurate.</li><li>○ In adopting Insight, the school has started with a blank canvas, as data from the previous assessment system did not carry over; the school has been seeking consistency across assessment processes. This will continue to be a focus of monitoring to ensure accuracy.</li><li>○ When teachers log into Insight, they have objectives to assess, with three options available to them, each of which is colour coded:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Red coding means that the objective has not yet been taught or if so, not understood.</li><li>▪ Amber coding means that there is some evidence, but the child objective cannot yet meet it independently. This is the point at which most children will begin.</li><li>▪ Green coding means that the objective has been securely met and the child can meet the objective independently which may include testing of this.</li></ul></li><li>○ The terminology used to describe achievement has been changed from that used previously and now aligns with the terminology used to describe achievement at the end of Year 6. This will ensure consistency of language through the school. The terminology used is: Beginning. Working Towards. On Track for expected (to be used for the summer term only). On Track for greater depth to be used for the summer term only. The language used makes more sense for all, ensuring that the assessment terminology used to describe pupils' achievement is consistent. This terminology, which is used for reporting to parents and colleagues, will be the same through the year.</li><li>○ The above represents a change for the school who have written to parents explaining the new approach. Class teachers have been encouraged to verbally tell parents at their consultation evenings informing them if their child is on track for expected or greater depth. This will help to maintain consistency with the previous approach, for parents.</li><li>○ The Insight system uses a colour-coded bar to show summaries of achievement for each child with regards to the objectives taught/assessed. Teachers review the objectives and make an assessment. At the end of the year, the bar will be used to make evaluations which will be sent to parents, so they can view this, receiving an assessment breakdown for each subject. This will be used by the next teacher.</li><li>○ Parents have each been sent an 'objectives report'. Parents of children who have Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) have received a report.</li></ul>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ For the end of year report an ‘objectives report’ will be created showing learning that is secure, learning for which some evidence is available, and for learning not yet understood. Parents will be able to see what has been taught and those areas for which extra help is needed, for which they may be able to provide support.</li><li>○ The Early Years (EYs) is different, using different terminology (‘expected’ or ‘emerging’) that aligns with the EYFS framework and judgements made against the 17 Early Learning Goals.</li></ul> <p><i>Question: A governor wanted to know whether the school had concerns that teachers will just teach to the reduced number of assessment points (15), and when they come to an exam, they may face questions that have not been taught.</i></p> <p>Governors were advised that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ There are more than 15 objectives for the core subjects.</li><li>○ In each year group, teachers must plan the objectives they will teach for every subject every day, this is checked by the AHTs. In maths, the school is focusing on the most important aspects, for example the 4 rules of number. There may be questions in SATs which they may have covered light-touch way through the year.</li></ul> <p><i>Question: A governor wanted to know whether there was a risk that a child’s underachievement could be missed by this approach.</i></p> <p>Governors were advised that this was not a risk, as every aspect is being taught that needs to be taught.</p> <p><i>Question: A governor wanted to know whether there was a risk of teachers assessing in a cursory way and some children’s learning being missed or barriers/slow learning going unnoticed.</i></p> <p>Governors were advised that the colour coding highlights to teachers those children at risk of not achieving as they should. This would lead to teachers reflecting upon how they can ensure the learning is achieved.</p> <p><i>Question: A governor wanted to know if the school is confident that the system offers enough scrutiny for accuracy.</i></p> <p>Governors were advised that they were confident of this, as the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) and teachers review the data; anomalies would be identified and reviewed through further discussion.</p> <p><i>Question: A governor wanted to know whether this new approach would have a positive impact upon teacher workload.</i></p> <p>Governors were advised that teachers find this system an easier one to navigate. The objectives have been planned, and they know these are being covered in various aspects of teaching.</p> <p><i>Question: A governor wanted to know whether this new approach made data interrogation more straightforward.</i></p> <p>Governors were advised that this is the case. Teachers have input the data, have checked this, and there are follow-ups if needed. The criteria are in place to avoid unconscious bias. LM has gone through the system, reviewing every single child’s data, and has been rigorous in ensuring its accuracy.</p>	
--	--	--

*Question: A governor wanted to know whether the school's expectations for the data were being changed to suit cohorts' achievement.*

Governors were advised that the system allows the school to be responsive if they observe a significant decline. The data expectations are benchmarked against national test data ensure accuracy.

*Question: A governor wanted to know whether the assessment outcomes can be benchmarked externally.*

Governors were advised that the objectives the school is using are too specific, and bespoke to them.

Phonics.

LM led this part of the presentation, showing the last 3 year's data, advising governors of the following:

- The end of year target is 81% which is likely to be met. There are 9 children who are not anticipated to reach the expected standard; 6 of whom have SEND needs. 2 new children have started over the past two weeks with low starting points. The school does have discussions about these children, some of whom have Speech and Language needs and another child with EAL. Attainment in phonics at the national level was around 80%, and the school is hopeful their outcomes will be in line with this.

Commented [DB1]: Did I capture this correctly here?

*Question: A governor wanted to know whether all the other children will reach the expected levels of attainment apart from the children mentioned above.*

Governors were advised that this is the case.

Year 4 Multiplication check.

- The end of year target is 50%. National achievement was at 37% last year. Last year, 6-7 children's results were less than expected with them having incorrectly answered only one question. The school still achieved above national values. Attainment is at 20% for the current Year 4 group, with a key group of children likely to reach the expected standard as they do not have significant learning issues to address. Generally, it is the 6,7,8,9 multiplication tables that cause difficulties, and there will be maths workshops coming up in the term. Year 4s will be sharing some of this at the forthcoming parent consultation. Governors commented that the national benchmark for maths is very low and wondered why this was. They were advised that the way the assessment is structured means that the children either achieve 25 or more answers correctly, in which case the threshold is met, or they do not achieve this, and therefore do not reach the threshold. The questions require a timed response from the children, and this can cause undue pressure upon them, leading to a lowering of performance.

Year 6.

- Over the last 3 years, reading achievement has improved through the school practice tests and is in a much better position than previously. The school is

<p>expecting achievement in reading to be better than that achieved nationally and in line with national values for greater depth. The reading fluency project has made a good contribution to this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• For maths, the school has reviewed pupil achievement concluding that arithmetic has been an issue, along with time, and the variety of questions they are required to focus on. To address this issue, teachers are regularly changing the questions and focus in lessons. There is confidence that end of year achievement will be in the 80% region, and many children are on the cusp of achieving this.</li><li>• Teachers have supervision on Fridays during assembly, and this is the time when intense intervention and boosters are carried out. There is confidence that the end of year targets will be met.</li><li>• Achievement in spelling, grammar and punctuation appears to be positive and the school is expecting achievement to exceed national values and in line for those achieving greater depth.</li></ul> <p>Teacher assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Those on track to be at greater depth is low at this time; this is in line with what would be anticipated for this time of the year.</li><li>• The percentage on track to be expected for Years 1, 2 and 3 were shared and governors were informed that this data is likely to change in the Spring term.</li></ul> <p>LM commented that he will need to keep checking the pupil voice element, questioning whether pupils can articulate their learning. Governors commented that the process looks very impressive and is a step forward and they were thanked for the thoroughness of the approach and the data presented.</p> <p>ii. Headteacher report including staffing update.</p> <p>The Headteacher advised governors of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Pupil numbers are dropping over time. The school has 49 pupils in Reception and 47 in Year 1 so next year they will not be able to run mixed age classes in KS1. In Year 2 there will be 46 pupils and in Year 3, 54 pupils so there cannot be mixed classes there either. If the pupil numbers remain at this level, there are no limits on the size of KS 2 classes, with advice being, from the LA that these can be as high as 34. This means the combined numbers need to be over 102 in a year group for KS2 classes.</li><li>• The above has implications for the school for the future; in a couple of years, they will need strong arguments about why there should be single age class groupings for KS1 and KS2 classes. In-year mobility does not seem to have a significant impact. Classes in Reception, Year 1 and Year 2 would likely remain single age classrooms, however, there could be the possibility of mixed age classes from Year 3 onwards, and through KS2 in the future.</li></ul> <p><i>Question: A governor wanted to know if many schools in the area are having mixed-age classrooms.</i></p> <p>Governors were advised that some schools do. If schools are oversubscribed then Burwell Village College Primary (BVCP) could benefit by admitting some of these children, however, if their pupil numbers are low then BVCP's numbers may reduce. The local housing development may affect this in the future.</p>	
---	--

Commented [DB2]: Is this accurate?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In a couple of years there will need to be discussions with the LA about class composition and beyond, this may mean the school will struggle. It will be important to have a plan for this.</li><li>• Safeguarding checks have all been completed and the Vice Chair has completed Safer Recruitment training.</li></ul> <p>Staffing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Having lost 4 staff at the end of last term; Year 1 now has a supply teacher, and there is a supply teacher in Year 3 who is an Early Career Teacher (ECT) who will need support. The school will not be putting this teacher through the ECT year. There is a new teacher in Year 5 who is doing well.</li><li>• A support staff appointment has been made and one Teaching Assistant (TA) who was going to leave decided to stay.</li><li>• The ECTs are both on track to be successful at the end of this year.</li><li>• The Chair commented that the opportunity for those teachers leaving at the end of last term to have an exit interview was offered, but all three declined this.</li><li>• There has been a severe bout of flu over Christmas, and some staff have not managed to shake this, so a couple members of staff were absent for the first week, some children were not attending school through illness and parents have been complaining about feeling unwell.</li></ul> <p>Attendance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The overall attendance rate for the school is 95.2%, which is better than attendance nationally (94.8%) and for the LA (95.0%). Attendance always drops over time; the school's goal is to slow the rate of decline.</li><li>• The attendance figure for non-PP pupils is 96% and for PP pupils is 92% currently; these figures were at 98% for non-PP pupils and 91% for PP pupils. The school is tracking this carefully, with the Headteacher receiving a daily report.</li><li>• The persistent absence tracker shows there are 21 children at risk. Their attendance now is at an average of 94% for persistent absences over the term. None of these were above 90% prior to starting the rewards system, and this shows some progress.</li></ul> <p><i>Question: A governor wanted to know whether the school had received attendance data comparing the school with national values, which was due to be updated on the 4th of December 2025.</i></p> <p>Governors were advised that this had not yet been received but the Headteacher will have another look at this.</p> <p>Behaviour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Behaviour in Years 4 and 5 has been less than consistently good since before and after Christmas. Changes of teachers will have had an impact upon this, also the level of need in these year groups is higher than for others. Pupil mobility is higher with a quarter of the pupils in Year 4 being new since Year 2, with many of these children also having additional needs. The Headteacher has written to parents to help to reset expectations. He will have further conversations with parents but is unsure as to whether this will have any impact.</li></ul>	<p>For the Headteacher to find out whether there is National level attendance data so the school can compare its attendance with schools nationally.</p>
---	--

	<p><i>Question: A governor wanted to know what kind of behaviour the children are displaying.</i></p> <p>Governors were advised that the behaviour is generally low-level; continual calling out, getting out of their seat and chatting to the person next to them. This impacts upon learning for themselves. These issues must be addressed. The children have experienced changes in teachers and have the habit now of doing what they please. Now the situation is that the teachers are securely in place, so the hope is that they can now resolve the situation.</p> <p>Governors commented that this is exactly what the children have said about the new teachers.</p> <p>iii. SDP update.</p> <p>Governors were advised that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reading fluency professional development has taken place, aligning with the Ofsted theme of strong foundations.</li><li>• The Chair commented that it is good to see the new units in the servery which will help with the breakfast club, a new dishwasher and toaster.</li></ul> <p><i>Question: A governor wanted to know if there was a possibility that the breakfast club roll-out could be brought forward.</i></p> <p>Governors were advised that new staff might be needed, as well as a new budget, and so there was a lack of certainty about whether this provision could be brought forward.</p> <p><i>Question: A governor wanted to know how the costs of consumables such as bread and milk, would be paid for.</i></p> <p>Governors were advised that they will ask for funds or PP funding could be used. Governors discussed how local businesses are being contacted to make contributions to such initiatives. Governors also discussed how staff will need to have food hygiene training and for Reception age children a paediatric first-aid trained member of staff would need to be present.</p> <p><i>Question: A governor wondered whether parents could be asked to donate to the breakfast club, and about untapped sources of funding.</i></p> <p>Governors commented that the breakfast club offer is not a universal one, and the school does not want to label children as this could potentially act against the aims of the provision. Governors have met with Willows staff to explain the purpose of the provision, and they were very supportive.</p> <p>Continuing the discussion about the SDP, governors were advised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There are targets for every aspect.</li><li>• SLT reviewed the SDP before Christmas and the next stage is to review it with staff to check for anything missing and to check the realism of the school's ambitions. They will be thinking carefully about the actions, for example for SEN. Some of these have already started and it would be important to explain what has been done so far, the rationale for these actions and what the next steps are. This will take place on the 4 or 5 February.</li></ul>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The actions identified for Year 1 of the plan, will in due course be reviewed, the outcomes of which will inform actions for Year 2 of the plan.</li> </ul> <p><i>Question: A governor wanted to know how the school helps parents who are unaware that their child may have SEN issues, understand the school's SEN support approaches.</i></p> <p>Governors were advised that the school has sent an invitation to parents for whom the school has a concern regarding their child; the children early on in the process are a focus. Anyone who has a learning plan and pupil summary will be asked to attend, along with there also being a general invite for anyone interested.</p> <p><i>Question: A governor wanted to know whether he was expecting any difficult parents to attend.</i></p> <p>The Headteacher advised governors that he will explain the statutory timelines, explaining that Cambridgeshire, along with many other counties is struggling to meet these timelines. One of the key aspects is to be clear with parents, that there is a lot of support that goes into school actions with the aim of trying to avoid the need for an EHCP. This is not always successful for all, but there is support in place to avoid the situation reaching this point. It's worth trying to explain to parents the changing landscape of SEN over the last 5-10 years and how issues presented to schools have changed over this time. These changes have included dyslexia being a common issue presented to there being more of an emphasis upon Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) or Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD). Support has been provided in the past for dyslexia issues, and these now are much less of a presented issue. It is of concern to the Headteacher that diagnoses of ADHD or ASD are time consuming and for some the causes of such diagnoses is environmental. This situation leads to resources being taken away from those in genuine need.</p> <p><i>Question: A governor wanted to know how this could be communicated to parents.</i></p> <p>Governors were advised that this would be said in a sensitive way, communicating that the school has the best interests of the child in mind, so they can do their best at school. The question is, will the ASD label help a child obtain an EHCP, in which case the school will support this, however it might be better for the child to take advantage of the support the school offers.</p> <p>A governor commented upon the effectiveness of support for their own child in school who has learning differences. Governors added that children understand that everyone is different, and that observing something different is not seen as something unusual. The Headteacher noted that he does try to impress this upon parents early on; the school will adapt provision. He also noted that it is unlikely that a child will not need some kind of difference and intervention for the short or medium or long-term.</p> <p>A governor commenting on the SDP noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding SDP Priority 2, whether pupil assessment might be a part of this i.e. pupils assessing the quality of teaching. This is potentially controversial but has proven to be useful in other settings. Commenting on section 3, that there should be more of an emphasis upon professional development opportunities for teachers.</li> <li>For Priority 3, there could perhaps be more around pupil collaboration, teamwork and something about responsibility and possibly self-discipline.</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Priority 4: should there be reference to children and parents feeling safe? Also, that inclusion needs to be mentioned more.</li></ul> <p>iv. SEF</p> <p>The Headteacher advised governors of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The safeguarding element has been achieved. There is always more to be done, but the school is meeting the expectations.</li><li>• For inclusion, there is still work to do regarding gathering evidence. The school could potentially be at a strong standard, so gathering evidence is important for this. The school is currently at the expected standard. There has been much work tracking those children known to social care. This is challenging as information sharing with teachers needs to be carefully managed to avoid the possibility of unconscious bias.</li><li>• For curriculum and teaching: the school evaluates itself as meeting the expected standard. The school is targeting to meet the strong standard linked to foundational knowledge in KS 1 and evidence is being gathered for this.</li><li>• He is finding it a challenge to have an inclusion element for each part of the SEF, as it already has its own section.</li><li>• For achievement, this relates to the data, which will be reviewed again by SLT.</li><li>• For attendance and behaviour, the behaviour of the Year 4 and Year 5 groups will have an impact upon judgements about behaviour.</li><li>• For attitudes to learning, the question is how the school demonstrates that children are fully engaged in every lesson. Again, in the Year 4 and Year 5 classrooms and especially for the Year 4 classrooms there is distinct difference in the way these children are participating.</li></ul> <p><i>Question: A governor wanted to know how staff were finding the Year 4 and Year 5 classes.</i></p> <p>Governors were advised that staff are finding the classes challenging. There is lots of support in place for them, for example, the ECT meets weekly with a mentor, and he discusses with SLT members how behaviour could be managed more effectively.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Personal development and wellbeing.</li></ul> <p><i>Question: A governor wanted to know whether there were pupil school librarians in place.</i></p> <p>Governors were advised that this was the case, but in Year 5 only. There are also play-leaders, but he questioned how effective they are.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• For the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS), the Headteacher had not had a chance to go through the SEF with EYFS staff yet.</li><li>• Leadership and governance will be completed once the other sections have been finalised.</li><li>• The Chair commented that much progress had been made and hopes that by the end of term the SEF will be completed. This was agreed.</li></ul>	
--	---	--

		<p>For the SEF to be an agenda item for discussion at the first FGB meeting of the summer term.</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Governor business</p> <p>i. Governor visits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ST has carried out a Health and Safety visit; the report is on GovernorHub.</li> <li>• DS is in the process of organising a visit for the second half of the term to review SEND and visit a lesson or two. The Chair commented that it might be useful to review whether the support in place for Year 4 was having an impact and to discuss this with staff. This was agreed and will be carried out in the summer term.</li> <li>• DS informed governors that there will be a subject review, to be held on the 9 March when they will be exploring science and geography.</li> <li>• FJ will arrange an EYFS visit in the next couple of weeks.</li> <li>• MC has not been in school. She will carry out visits during the second half of term.</li> <li>• LS has visited with regards to the breakfast club and has visited Year 1 and Year 2 and will carry out a visit to Year 5 and Year 6. A report will be written up, with initial findings being very positive.</li> <li>• The Chair had carried out a reading visit, observing a reading fluency lesson, which was very positive.</li> </ul> <p>ii. Governor recruitment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Chair noted that RB's term of office is coming to an end, and consequently there will be an election taking place for a staff governor. RB was thanked for everything she has done for the Board.</li> <li>• The Chair informed governors that there are two potential candidates for the one coopted governor vacancy.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ An overview of the skills, knowledge and background of each candidate was discussed.</li> <li>○ Governors unanimously voted that Martin Hutchins be offered the position.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>For DS to review the effectiveness of support for Year 4 in the summer term, as part of his SEND visit.</p> <p>For MC to carry out a school visit during the second half of the Spring term.</p> <p>For LS to present a report of her visit at the next FGB meeting.</p> <p>For staff governor elections to be held.</p> <p>For the Chair to contact the parties interested in joining the</p>

Commented [DB3]: Is this correct?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The Chair will contact Mr Hutchins and will write to the other candidate thanking him for his interest. She will ask him if he would be happy for his contact details to be shared, as there may be other governing boards that he could apply to join.</li> </ul>	<p>Governing Board informing them of the next steps.</p> <p>For the summer term it was requested that the school and governors bring ideas and a list of potential visits for the next FGB meeting. One of which could be reviewing reading in more detail.</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>Finance</p> <p>i. Budget Monitoring Report (BMR) Governors were advised of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The school is in a reasonable financial position. There has been a meeting with an LA finance advisor earlier in the term, who is confident of the school's financial position. The school can set a budget next year.</li> <li>• The school is more worried about years 2 and 3 of the financial plan and sustainability.</li> <li>• The school will have a healthy carry- forward of around £183,000.</li> <li>• The most significant issue is pupil numbers, and until this is addressed, the budget will be tight.</li> <li>• The school appears to have saved £23,000 on energy costs when compared to the projected spend for this area, however this is not completely clear.</li> <li>• The budget has remained stable since originally set with the Headteacher's extra work contributing to this.</li> </ul> <p><i>Question: A governor raised a concern about the budget context and SEND leadership, commenting that a SEND lead with 0.6 FTE is less than would be expected for a school of this size. It was also raised that spending for ICT equipment is at £0 for this year and it would make sense to have a reasonable allocation for this area.</i></p> <p>The Headteacher commented that the school had allocated £10,000 annually to the ICT budget but removed this from the budget for this year, as much had been spent previously. He will consider this issue for future budgets.</p> <p>ii. Process for review and approval of SFVS, and review of school financial benchmarking data. Governors were advised that MC and ST will complete the SFVS process and submit it to the FGB for approval.</p> <p>iii. Process for approval of the 2026/27 budget.</p>	

	<p>Governors were advised that the school business manager will prepare an initial 3-5 year budget. This will be discussed with an advisor and quotes for Service Level Agreements (SLAs) will be sought. Once these are all known, governors will have the opportunity to scrutinise and approve the budget. If a substantive issue arises from the governor budget scrutiny, a further meeting can be arranged to explore the issue further. The budget needs to be submitted by the 21 May. The school aims to have this ready for the 1 April.</p>	
<p>9.</p>	<p>Policies/Document review</p> <p>a. BVC specific policies/documents</p> <p>Discretionary leave of absence (an EPM model policy).  <i>Question: A governor wanted to know whether, within the section on p4, point 2, bereavement and illness should be separated. It was also raised whether three- days compassionate leave for a death is appropriate and may leave staff requesting sick leave, rather than compassionate leave.</i></p> <p>Governors discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ That bereavement leave should be about attendance at a funeral.</li> <li>○ That the policy structure and phrasing is typical for businesses.</li> <li>○ That it would be useful for this policy to align with the pupil policy concerning these issues.</li> <li>○ The Headteacher noted that it is important to have a policy in place which is straightforward to apply.</li> <li>○ That the policy left room for interpretation. For example, how should a request from a member of staff to attend a sibling’s funeral be responded to.</li> <li>○ The Headteacher commented that he would not deny a member of staff attending a sibling’s funeral and they could request further days, up to the three days indicated in the policy. If after three days they could not come back to work, then this would be a sickness absence. Effectively this would allow them nine days of absence, beyond that, sickness absence policy would be applied, alternatively the member of staff could request unpaid leave.</li> <li>○ The three days indicated in the policy do not have to be consecutive. The school in the past has allowed members of staff to carry out the actions they need to.</li> </ul> <p><i>Question: A governor wanted to know if there were any recommendations from HR regarding the Discretionary Leave of Absence policy,</i>  Governors were advised that this policy is HR’s recommended policy.</p> <p><i>Question: A governor asked, there is a different value to death of, for example, a child or partner and is this a differential worth keeping?</i>  It was suggested that Option 2, recorded below item 6.7 on the policy, should be removed.</p> <p><i>Question: should the references to pre-56 days and post-56 days, the line about the cancellation of parental bereavement leave, and that the circumstances of the member of staff’s return to work will be discussed with the line manager be removed/amended?</i></p>	

	<p>Governors were advised that this matter would be managed through HR. The policy is not saying that parental bereavement leave can be cancelled, as HR would always be sought for advice.</p> <p>The Chair noted that the policy is written for a reason, and that it would be best not to deviate from it. HR would be needed to support the process. A governor commented that in his view the policy is outdated and outmoded, however, the need to be compliant with HR processes was recognised.</p> <p><b>Decision: The Discretionary Leave of Absence policy was approved with the proviso that the reference to the cancellation of bereavement leave be removed and that the Headteacher checks with HR the contents of the table within section 2 of the policy.</b></p> <p>Governors commented that regarding first bullet point within section 6.4: although parents are entitled to up to two weeks leave a bereaved parent, the member of staff concerned does not have to take the full two weeks.</p> <p>b. Standard LA policies.</p> <p>Managing allegations against staff. <b>Decision: Governors approved the Managing Allegations against staff policy with the proviso that the phrase ‘SMT’ be changed to ‘SLT’.</b></p>	
10.	Safeguarding and Behaviour.	
	This item has been discussed above and there were no further issues to report.	
11.	Health and Safety update.	
	<p>Governors were advised that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ST had carried out a visit, a report of which has been saved within the documents for this meeting.</li> <li>• He completed an annual check, following up on any outstanding items from the previous visit.</li> </ul> <p><i>Question: A governor wanted to know whether there was a problem with the emergency lights.</i></p> <p>Governors were advised that the issues reported were in areas where emergency lighting is not required. However, these issues are noted and reported.</p> <p><i>Question: A governor commented that she had been approached by Year 1 parents who wanted to discuss the homework policy and the system of sanctions that relate to this. She advised that they speak to the class teacher and contact the school to discuss further.</i></p> <p>Governors were informed that parents, staff and governors were consulted in the construction of the Homework Policy and it is not due for review. The policy is agreed and clear. The expectation is that children complete a sheet of maths and read at home every day.</p> <p>Governors commented that it may be worth thinking about whether it is reasonable having a policy and sanctions system which may punish the child for parents’ inability to support this.</p> <p>Governors concluded that it is reasonable to expect some maths and reading to be carried out each day.</p>	
12.	All meetings are held on a Wednesday and start at 5.00pm.	

	11 March 2026 20 May 2026 15 July 2026.	
	The meeting closed at 19:30	

DRAFT